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The present work fills an important gap in Samaritan studies, in that it treats of one of the most charismatic personalities in Samaritan tradition and of a period (3rd – 4th cent. A.D.) which constituted a high-water mark in Samaritan history.

The figure of Baba Rabbah looms large on the Samaritan canvass. Much has been said of him that is legendary; much that is true. Earlier and later traditions have been interwoven around his personality. No critical attempt has ever been made, however, to reconstruct his life by analyzing the historicity of these traditions, especially regarding the victories he is said to have won over the Roman (and other) enemies of the community, and the social, religious and political reforms he introduced in order to achieve a total reconstruction of Samaritan life.

The present study brings to light a hitherto unpublished part of the important Samaritan Chronicle No.II. Two versions are critically compared, and presented in parallel texts, though all the extant Chronicles and traditions are referred to in the commentary which accompanies the texts. The two versions — designated H1 and H2 — are far more detailed than any other Samaritan Chronicle, presenting a full and readable account of the life and activity of Baba Rabbah, and,
in general, of the social and political history of
the period. The nature of these versions is described
and analyzed, and their linguistic features detailed.

H1 and H2 differ mainly in that the former is written
in Samaritan Hebrew, while the latter reflects their
particular dialect of Aramaic. These versions are,
additionally, therefore, a rich source of new vocabulary
to deepen and broaden our ever-growing knowledge of
non-Masoretic forms. The commentary and word-list,
which accompany this section of the Chronicle, highlight
this particularly important aspect of the research.

The Samaritans of the 3rd - 4th cent. A.D. did not live in
a vacuum, as did some of their predecessors and most of
their successors, when enemies permitted them this luxury.
This generation was outgoing and determined, and roused
to a unique degree of national pride and solidarity
by the personality and leadership of Baba Rabbah. Their
emergence into the political and religious arena of
Palestine would have been bound, therefore, to have
brought them into closer contact with the Judaeans community.
The course of this interrelationship is plotted in the
Chronicle; and the present study enables us, therefore,
to fill in the background to Jewish attitudes toward
the Samaritans, as reflected in rabbinic literature, such
as the charge that they worshipped an image of a dove
on Mount Gerizim.
Since Baba's reforms laid the foundation for the fruitful period of Marqan, and other Samaritan liturgists and writers who made a pioneering contribution to the flowering of Samaritan literature, Baba's significance cannot be overestimated, and it is thus of the greatest importance that his life and times be researched.
ABBREVIATIONS

(Biblical books are not listed here. They are referred to by their customary abbreviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Arab.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Migrah Bereshith Rabbah</td>
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<td>BH</td>
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<tr>
<td>BH³</td>
<td>Biblia Hebraica (Kittel³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Biblical Text (Judaistic version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf.</td>
<td>Compare. (Used, especially in our Commentary, to indicate biblical references where text differs from version of Chronicle. Otherwise &quot;See&quot; is used.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dittog.</td>
<td>Dittography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia Judaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.</td>
<td>Edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GK</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloss.</td>
<td>Glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHP</td>
<td>Gazetter of Roman Palestine, (ed. M. Avi-Yonah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib1a.</td>
<td>Italicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB</td>
<td>Kohler and Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Lit.** Literally.

**Loc. cit.** Loco citato.

**LOTS** 
The 
Iterary 
and 
Oral 
Tradition 
of 
Hebrew 
and 
Aramaic 
among 
the 
Samaritans, 
Z.Ben-Hayyim, 
Jerusalem, 
1957.

**LXX** Septuagint version of the Old Testament.

**MT** Masoretic Text.

**n.** Note.

**NEB** New English Bible.

**NH** New (late) Hebrew.


**OTL** Old Testament Library.

**pl.** Plural.

**Sing.** Singular.

**SP** Samaritan Pentateuch.

**ST** Samaritan Targum.

**Tal.** Talmud.

**Targ.** Targum.

**Tol.** Toledot.

**v.** Verse.

**vb.** Verb

**JOURNALS**

**AJBA** Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology.

**AJSL** American Journal of Semitic Languages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALUOS</td>
<td>Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>The Biblical Archaeologist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASOR</td>
<td>Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJPES</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Sacra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZAW</td>
<td>Beihete zur Zeitschrift für die Altttestamentliche Wissenschaft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Eretz Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUCA</td>
<td>Hebrew Union College Annual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEJ</td>
<td>Israel Exploration Journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Journal Asiatique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPOS</td>
<td>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR</td>
<td>Jewish Quarterly Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JThS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTS</td>
<td>Oudtestamentische Studien.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAAJR</td>
<td>Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFSSt</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Fund: Quarterly Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REJ</td>
<td>Revue des Études Juives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue Biblique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Scripta Hierosolymitana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrGUOS</td>
<td>Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die Altttestamentliche Wissenschaft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **INTRODUCTION**
INTRODUCTION

The present study constitutes a critical edition, with commentary, of a hitherto unpublished section of the fullest extant Chronicle of Samaritan history. This Chronicle -- Chronicle II -- commences with the period of the biblical historical books (Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings/II Chronicles) and continues the Samaritan saga down until the beginning of the 20th century.

The biblical section of this Chronicle has already been published by John Macdonald,¹ as has a small section on the Jesus period.² The present study focusses upon the lengthy section on the life and activity of Baba Rabbah; and we have attempted in our research to reconstruct the exact nature of the contribution of that great charismatic leader.

The scope of this research has inevitably been fairly wide, as the Chronicle possesses linguistic as well as historical significance. We have presented the major burden of our linguistic inquiry in chapters 5-7 (comprising the text, translation and commentary), the quintessence of which is presented in chapter 15, in the form of a word list which extracts lexical and morphological features of special significance, to supplement what is already known from other Samaritan texts.

........................

1. For works of scholars referred to in this introduction, see Bibliography.
2. Published by J. Macdonald and A.J.B. Higgins.
It should be noted that, apart from the work done by J. Macdonald, the Samaritan chronicles have been a neglected field from the point of view of critical textual inquiry. A critical edition of the type here offered has long been a desideratum.

A considerable amount of interest has been aroused, however, in recent decades, in other aspects of Samaritanism, with important works having been contributed in the fields of Samaritan linguistics (by Ben Hayyim, Kahle and Murtonen), grammar (by R. Macuch), hermeneutics (by S. Lowy¹), Theology (J. Macdonald), Philosophy (A. Broadie²), history (Bowman, Coggins and Kippenberg) — not forgetting the pioneering contribution, in so many aspects of Samaritanism, made by scholars of a less recent period, notably A. Cowley, M. Gaster and J. Montgomery. The fruits of the present research will be of considerable importance, it is believed, in each of the above-mentioned aspects of Samaritanism, serving to offer a newly-published source which can only help to extend the insights and results so far obtained by these scholars.

The text of the Chronicle is set out in the parallel versions of H1 and H2, two recensions, each possessing a totally differing linguistic complexion. The former

-----------------------------
1. Lowy's contribution, which is expected to be published shortly, is entitled, "An Investigation into the Sources and Hermeneutic Method of the Samaritan Marasitic Literature from the Roman Period to the Fourteenth Century" (Ph.D Dissert. Leeds, 1975).
2. Details of Broadie's research are taken up by us in chapter 19.
is written in a unique classical form of Samaritan Hebrew; the latter in a more colloquial and familiar Aramaic dialect. Both these recensions are of great importance. H1 offers a form of "waw-Consecutiva" Classical Hebrew which extends our knowledge of non-Masoretic forms, disclosing verbs which appear in other conjugations, and semantic shades of meaning, than those of biblical Hebrew, as well as a syntax which is not bound by rules as clearly defined as those of biblical Hebrew. Similarly, H2 also makes a significant contribution to our lexical knowledge of Samaritan Aramaic, providing interesting and new vocabulary to supplement that already gleaned. The parallel texts provide, we believe, the best method of demonstrating the varying stylistic approaches of both versions, as well as their undoubted interrelationship.

Among the intriguing problems raised by the Chronicle is that of the very liberal use made of the Judaistic book of Psalms. The significance of this employment of "external literature" by a Samaritan author is discussed in chapter 8(B). The significant textual variations in the chronicler's version of these Psalms is monitored and discussed in our Commentary. These will be of special interest to the biblical scholar interested in non-Masoretic forms.

The 4th cent. period of Palestinian history is not well documented, and our Chronicle provides an
unexpectedly rich harvest of historical data and traditions which shed much light on the history of the community at that period, as well as upon the inter-community relations between Samaritans and Jews, the intrigue, struggle and recriminations which characterized this relationship, as well as their mutual dealings with the Romans.

The Chronicle provides new slants on important issues which dogged attitudes of the rabbinic authorities toward the Samaritans. Especially interesting is the suggestion we offer that the Mishnaic charge that the Samaritans kindled beacons on the wrong night of the New Month solely in order to frustrate the Jews' attempt to convey its date to their diaspora communities, may well have been a misrepresentation of fact, based upon ignorance (real or pretended) of a Samaritan ritual of fire-purification, prescribed for Rosh Hodesh, and not an act of mischief! (see chapter 8(D)).

New slants are also provided on the familiar charge that the Samaritans worshipped a dove on the top of Mount Gerizim. We have related this charge to an episode described in our Chronicle, and have re-examined the rabbinic sources in the light of this new material, in order to determine the basis for such a charge (chapter 8(C)).
The personality of Baba Rabbah has hitherto been enigmatic, as has even the exact significance of his name (or title? See chapter 10). We have attempted to demonstrate, by the textual-critical approach, that a number of the generally accepted traditions about him are, in fact, later accretions, intended to enhance his legendary mystique, but based upon unreliable evidence, with little historical credibility. In this context we have highlighted the confusion surrounding the chronology of the period (chapter 9), and have been constrained, on the basis of a chronological reconstruction, to offer a new date for the life and activity of Baba Rabbah. We have also demonstrated that the generally-held view that he was a High Priest (see Encyc. Judaica, 4, 17) cannot be substantiated, and that the tradition that he ended his days in captivity in the city of Constantinople is a later tradition which has no basis in historical fact, and which cannot be harmonized with other traditions linking Baba with the period of the pre-Constantine emperors.

Baba is known to have been a great reformer; but the chronicles, other than Chronicle II, provide a rather sketchy description of the exact nature of these reforms. On the basis of the material contained in our Chronicle, we have analyzed these reforms, as well as the
hierarchic re-structuring which Baba embarked upon. We have been enabled thereby to determine a tripartite structure of leadership comprising — under Baba — a supreme council of seven leaders, eleven "pairs" of priestly administrators and fifty Synagogue administrators or Simmûrê Ha-Tôrâh (see chapter 11).

Baba's reforms were especially geared toward a spiritual re-construction of Samaritan life around the institution of the Synagogue; and to this end he re-opened Synagogues that had been closed by the Romans and he built many new ones. The locations of these Synagogues are carefully described in our Chronicle, although the significance of the overall siting of these Synagogues has hitherto remained unnoticed. We have discussed the various sites, some of which are still a matter of archaeological conjecture, and we have detected a definite symmetry, whereby all the Synagogues lie around the circumference of a circle, with Shechem and 'Amartah at the epicentre. This arrangement served to further Baba's political aspiration of a centralized authority.

The question of Baba's Dositheanism has recently been re-opened in the light of the research into this sect by J. Isser. Again, our chronicle provides important insights into this question.
From a passage in our chronicle, referring to a rival "family" that did not accept the authority of Baba Rabbah and maintained their own political and religious autonomy, we were led to examine the origin, extent and significance of this opposition — referred to by the name of Mišpaḥath Haʾšīḇhîm (see chapter 12) — and the manner in which Baba came to terms with it. This, inevitably, provided a new dimension from which to assess Baba's diplomatic achievements and his limitations.

An important period of cultural and spiritual activity was inaugurated by Baba Rabbah, a period which inspired men of the calibre of 'Amram Darah and Marqah who, in turn, laid the foundation for Samaritan theological speculation and liturgical development. The antecedents of a number of Marqah's ideas are also traced in our Chronicle (see chapter 13).

The present study attempts to illuminate the background of this activity, and to provide, at the same time, a biography of one of the greatest and most charismatic personalities in Samaritan history.
5. HEBREW TEXT
13 לברך בך הרוחך את חיבך לריבי
14 ואלך את פלך
15 רוקד את בן חסיים אשר חקל את
16 מספר יהו בני דרב שכרם את
17 ריבר אליהם לאאר
18 עד מתstrftime אתולת הפוסרים בור.
19 והיה רחל את עמודם מרחב
20 וмедицин_Load מבית ישוב עבר
21 לא היה כל יצור יחיה את

12 וכבר את הרביער ואת עבודה
לידך.
13 את ברכה על כל יהודי לשבה
14 ואלך את פלך.
15 רוקד את בן חסיים אשר חקל את
16 מספר יהו בני דרב שכרם את
17 ריבר אליהם לאאר
18 עד מתstrftime אתולת הפוסרים בור.
19 והיה רחל את עמודם מרחב
20 וмедицин_Load מבית ישוב עבר
21 לא היה כל יצור יחיה את
הוּלָּאוֹת יְפָאָה בַּהֲנָכה אֱגוֹסְמוֹת מֹשֵׁש
הלּוּ רֵיָּאָה לִיָּאָה, חֲלָחוֹת לְעַת.
עָבַדְתִי עֶבֶד.
לַאֲחָמַר בְּגַלְגָּלִים תְּאָמֵר
רַאֲשָׁתָה אֵלָיָה כָּל בַּיִין לֶזֶר
לִמְסַפְּרָהוּ רָוֵרָה אֶזֶּה אֶת בָּרוּךְ
וַאֲנַשֶּׁה תְּאָמֵר בְּבַלָּהָּּו הַלְּכוֹת
לָהֵת לֹאֵי חֱלָתוּ
לָאֵר אַתָּתָה אַשָּׁר אַשָּׁרָה רָע
יַחְדָּה מִשֶּׁם עֹלְיָהם.
הוּלָּאוֹת יְפָאָה בַּהֲנָכה אֱגוֹסְמוֹת מֹשֵׁש
פְּרַבְּתָה אֵיבָּרָה יְרָיָה בַּבּוּדֶה
לִילָּיָּה כְּלִלָּה בְּבַלָּהָּּו
זָהְרֶה יִרְאוּת בַּבַּלָּהָּּו גְּדוֹלָה לְהַרְדִּיר
מִתְרָפֶּה.
בָּכוּר אוֹרְבָּה לֵיעָלָו רֻבָּךְ
מְקַשְׁמָה מְפַּדְּתָה לְזָדִּירָה
דֶּגֶל רוּלָּבָה.
הוּלָּאוֹת יְפָאָה בַּהֲנָכה אֱגוֹסְמוֹת מֹשֵׁש
רֹכְבֶּהֶר אוֹרְבָּה לֵיעָלָו רֻבָּךְ
מְקַשְׁמָה מְפַּדְּתָה לְזָדִּירָה
degel roleva.
הוּלָּאוֹת יְפָאָה בַּהֲנָכה אֱגוֹסְמוֹת מֹשֵׁש
רֹכְבֶּהֶר אוֹרְבָּה לֵיעָלָו רֻבָּךְ
מְקַשְׁמָה מְפַּדְּתָה לְזָדִּירָה
degel roleva.
הוּלָּאוֹת יְפָאָה בַּהֲנָכה אֱגוֹסְמוֹת מֹשֵׁש
רֹכְבֶּהֶר אוֹרְבָּה Lֵיעָלָו Rֻבָּךְ
MְKַשְׁMָה MְPַּדְּתָה LְZָדִּירָה
degel roleva.
הוּלָּאוֹת יְפָאָה בַּהֲנָכה אֱגוֹסְמוֹת מֹשֵׁש
רֹכְבֶּהֶר אוֹרְבָּה Lֵיעָלָו Rֻבָּךְ
MְKַשְׁMָה MְPַּדְּתָה LְZָדִּירָה
degel roleva.
יהזיר מיואר ליֵי לָאָלְחָמָה לְעַת
עֵבָּדָה
לַאֲחָמַר בְּגַלְגָּלִים תְּאָמֵר
Rַאֲשָׁתָה אֵלָיָה כָּל בַּיִין לֶזֶר
Lִמְסַפְּרָהוּ Rָוֵרָה אֶזֶּה אֶת BְRָוֵר
daabor bermokon
לָהֵת LֹAֵI חֱלָתוּ
LָAֵR AַTָּה AַSָּR AַRָע
degel roleva.
Rַאֲשָׁתָה אֵלָיָה כָּל בַּיִין לֶזֶר
Lִמְסַפְּרָהוּ Rָוֵרָה אֶזֶּה אֶת BְRָוֵR
degel roleva.
Rַאֲשָׁתָה אֵלָיָה כָּל Bַּיִין Lֶזֶר
degel roleva.
Lִמְסַפְּרָהוּ Rָוֵרָה אֶזֶּה AֶT BְRָוֵR
degel roleva.
Rַאֲשָׁתָה BֶRָוֵר אֶזֶּה AֶT BְRָוֵR
degel roleva.
Lִמְסַפְּרָהוּ Rָוֵרָה Aֶזֶּה AֶT BְRָוֵR
degel roleva.
לבחזרה לא איבד את
התקווה

לרבות ולונים נבצבו
עומלצים

לשם בוקל ולרדיפה בברך
ייסב לבר עזתה ביכולים גדולים
על אואיברים והאחים
והא מוצב והrparr הרוחות
והיא מפורשת מש.GetDirectoryName

כי הוא יתברך אמר משכל התשובה

אמר הראב המפר.

ל℉ָ tagName-5

לאחרים להאריך הלמדתו כי היא
שפת האדいればدعو ואכללים.

_bounds [5.07, 4.42, 25.44, 2.97]_

האריכים רוקם את ידך האימרות
לצאת הקצאה ואולי תראה כוס

אשר בבר עלפיים מתושבים
והארים אחסן חפצתי מאורר
וזי' אילוחים מדרים את הפר
והמשר脈ים לא מכמרים

הוב網絡 לא לדריכים

הש gratuites.

בך מפת להאלה ומחר

בולבבלים מפרצך את החתומות
ובבצלר בבר לי', אלהỉים

לבכתי כל התсим ולא באוהב

לך באול新た.

לברוחה לא נпросלים מכל שפייה

התקנים אנשי בחצר ההא

כד בנちら בבר

לשם בוקל ולרדיפה בברך

לשמוח בוקלא ורדיפה בברך

ייסב לבר עזתה ביכולים גדולים
ם אואיברים והאחים
והא מוצב והرار הרוחות
והיא מפורשת משを迎え

כי הוא יתברך אמר משכל התשובה

אמר הראב המפר.

ל_bounds [5.07, 4.42, 25.44, 2.97]_

האריכים רוקם את ידך האימרות
לצאת הקצאה ואולי תראה כוס

אשר בבר עלפיים מתושבים
והארים אחסן חפצתי מאורר
וזי' אילוחים מדרים את הפר
והמשר脈ים לא מכמרים

הוב網絡 לא לדריכים

הש gratuites.

בך מפת להאלה ומחר

בולבבלים מפרצך את החתומות
ובבצלר בבר לי', אלהỉים

לבכתי כל התсим ולא באוהב

לך באול新た.

לברוחה לא נпросלים מכל שפייה

התקנים אנשי בחצר ההא

כד בנraison בבר

לשם בוקל ולרדיפה בברך

ייסב לבר עזתה ביכולים גדולים
ם אואיברים והאחים
והא מוצב והرار הרוחות
והיא מפורשת משを迎え

כי הוא יתברך אמר משכל התשובה

אמר הראב המפר.

ל_bounds [5.07, 4.42, 25.44, 2.97]_

האריכים רוקם את ידך האימרות
לצאת הקצאה ואולי תראה כוס

אשר בבר עלפיים מתושבים
והארים אחסן חפצתי מאורר
וזי' אילוחים מדרים את הפר
והמשר脈ים לא מכמרים

הוב網絡 לא לדריכים

הש gratuites.

בך מפת להאלה ומחר

בולבבלים מפרצך את החתומות
ובבצלר בבר לי', אלהỉים

לבכתי כל התсим ולא באוהב

לך באול新た.

לברוחה לא נпросלים מכל שפייה

התקנים אנשי בחצר ההא

כד בנraison בבר

לשם בוקל ולרדיפה בברך

ייסב לבר עזתה ביכולים גדולים
ם אואיברים והאחים
והא מוצב והرار הרוחות
והיא מפורשת משを迎え

כי הוא יתברך אמר משכל התשובה

אמר הראב המפר.

ל_bounds [5.07, 4.42, 25.44, 2.97]_

האריכים רוקם את ידך האימרות
לצאת הקצאה ואולי תראה כוס

אשר בבר עלפיים מתושבים
והארים אחסן חפצתי מלאורר
וזי' אילוחים מדרים את הפר
והמשר脈ים לא מכמרים

הוב网络科技 לא לדריכים

הש gratuites.

בך מפת להאלה ומחר

בולבבלים מפרצך את החתומות
ובבצלר בבר לי', אלהỉים

לבכתי כל התсим ולא באוהב

לך באול新た.

לברוחה לא נпросלים מכל שפייה

התקנים אנשי בחצר ההא

כד בנraison בבר

לשם בוקל ולרדיפה בברך

ייסב לבר עזתה ביכולים גדולים
ם אואיברים והאחים
והא מוצב והראר הרוחות
והיא מפורשת משを迎え

כי הוא יתברך אמר משכל התשובה

אמר הראב המפר.

ל_bounds [5.07, 4.42, 25.44, 2.97]_

האריכים רוקם את ידך האימרות
לצאת הקצאה ואולי תראה כוס

אשר בבר עלפיים מתושבים
והארים אחסן חפצתי מלאורר
וזי' אילוחים מדרים את הפר
והמשר脈ים לא מכמרים

הוב网络科技 לא לדריכים

הש gratuits.
19. ויראת协同发展ynet רעפעי ומטרשיבת
אתא בברכת אתל וולתרב ורומת
לרב טמאת כריקה על שבאיבר ריצף
את הפריבר וTouchListener עיבומג ורבדה
ירבקע על הערוך הערוך האלף
בעלי הקולות המסיים והשערים התשאפו
השערים המשיחים ובירה וברלמה לשבץ
אしたら הרזרים של מלח תבר
הברריו.

20. ובשמירין ראבל אשה מראת האבר
המדורה על את האבר ו깐 בפש بتשה
וילך לארץ האברית וגרותי קדידה.
לעבבי עדו השמרים על האבר.

21. עוד בברג יאוריתו וברגרודו 'י
אלאבגר וברגרים וברגרים ר rhyme זה
ואז הם הגרים הרות מפילוב.

ויראת אשת המשיכות והבצירות
הדרכתי זה בני בניRussian
עמ הבעל והון והון כסיפן.

רצלא רצע בלבל מימי.

1. ריכת הנהן בנה הנן הברבר
האלה עמי עליים העם עיראלה
השמיריןفاع כעב יعلامات.

2. והאריך כי רצי בני בני רזיב
ואז נשיך החל אגריל ירקול
ורשקות הל_factors 'י' הגולה.

3. רצינו בירק הנהרה לחה אכלה
ולמי לא שמח.

4. בריתי בריום יהביו ירשמו בברבה
באק ויגע ואל התברכה רה הקדשה.
המוקמים מה TBranchו מרזים بعيد.

5. ובר' תبصر שם האלמיה את דריב
ויעיב את המקומ התנור רוחן.
שבר מבאר.

6. ריצחל הנהן בני בני בני יいろんな
ולאוליף לברבון וברבון.
ולאוליף לברבון וברבון.
רואים כי המסקנות הבאות אפשרים ריאליים:

7. אם במגננות ניתןبري אינıyoruz יולר
בנוארכיה בקרוב סכום חזק יותר
혁ור לשלוח לציבור ולשגל תמיכה
רבעהית.

8. ההתקפה הלוא היא תהרוס השפל
בזמה.

9. רמייר אידיבר銀, אשאולעם על שא
しっかりと.

10. באốn המסה המשכורות בציבורית והמענה
הсколько בחפצים ראשו בהר והמענה
לעמל הטקלה לעבד את הגואלות והשור
braco focused on the 우[colored] השכבות והזרועות ראשו
רואים בעילה בין שא ציידל בפשיטה
השכבות הרוחניות על כל מ المزيد
הכחה את דותרו ומלוע ממקורים
ידיעתי.

11. ההכום האירך והמהנה חכמה ולא
בגרה יבירות אשאולעם אידיבר התמה את
前十 וביצורים בוכ ספרדרי אתר אייר
מקלט בוליצי ruin נראים זה או זה בלעדיר.
רומן recoilון ולוא בלעדיר בוליצי
אזרדי Ziel מה בשנייה רבעים קמיס
סילבר וניתנה הדעה הכל הקוראים אשר
קרואבנו המשך עם הועדים והחולים
המשולק הת眙יתו אתصد את 사랑.
אפר המסה המשכורות המקורים
ב遴ק מברוק אידיבר הברבר
חבב למשם הפלאꈺה.

12. הרכב נחמט ומ לפלא الجهום
ההמלחים הפעורס בר רבעים
רבשרי הגיאורס מלון התאמה
וייגור הגיאורס לבליעת
ה.UnitTesting בבליעת המקורים
אפר בשמאתה המשכורות.

13. לע مدريد השכלות היה בכבריר בעメール
מכ איזידור רר וברוקסטר סמר משלי
סילבר וניתנה התאמה בהריברן הקוראים
ימצאים לכל ולפיים זכרון הם שמך.
הקדמה וכרך לעבר

מה שאי פעם ביקש הأعضי

שלמים בقيق שנים לאחר

הṛ胼 הלשון עבר את אחר

המקסימם של חסרים התפישים

rierת אלוהים שפר כפיפי לחק

חת〻יכרים ב'.

למיים את ידיה

לאמרית האדריכתן "נ" אלייה בינה

לנגבו התקין הקישיבת לקודש ספר

מלכים ז"ע, כי אילך את 않았ל UIView

יכי לא התפיש ראש משה דואר אחר

הגלケース בברך יישנה.

אברים "י" ויהי ערבב נזרכים-מסתיר

לא הסרבור בגובה עמק השמש כי אברמק

אליר בוחר המורת פן י()=>דיו נבר אלא

הנסיכים בתורה תאודה.

אס אמ היר א estratégia מונתה את יבריום רוח

ישועתי יבר אל חסרי ואצייר תדלות

עליון.

אסאות "י" לא תאגר התוכות ולא במחץ

הסרובים תבגר י" כי חלום אשתו רפוא

יד" כיבהלת עמים עוד מאמד גבולה

בפה.

דוע מתים ידדהו "י" אתלות שברות "י".

אברים "י" אמ היר אסטרטים שלל הארץ

אברים "י" אמ היר אסטרטים שלל הארץ

אותサー מישר פר באלף לתקופת לא

יםפיי אלח שליסים בין לא_trials

מי לא בוכל של מוסר לבוב כנדרז מפר

הקמת כרות ושכרי הרודף דריכות

לובר יברוד.

יד" עהרבון בך במחמצ מחודפים עבנ

אשועיבר פל"ים כאריה את בימנה

فكر כי אז לו ציון בפעילות לבון

יד" עהרבון בך במחמצ מבני אוג תוע

בפריבונים אמ במלבה עדת אתת סחייר כל

השאה.
לא תשב אל החור י教程ו programas ולא ירמות.

כארץ בכרדית.

רי, אתה מתחר את צייד לב שמדור על
דצ א醫師 הבכורה מתן מבוך חנינה.
והנה�ו וכו' אתה מתחר בפרבר הצר Goat.
ברוקטству אתי אתי, אלכתח מַמָּר.

יכל, תליהובBronz יアイר שמר بكل תואר.
אשיט מדיה שלא התמייה להווה.
מכה תואר לאחרים ישבא יפרך.
ארובKER תודר ממתנים לכלכל יפרך
עשיה שלמה.

כי הברך מפורש גיאר זרית
והציבור אמור כדי להבנה בזצורה זו.
ואחרי כן הסילובים הנסכיים
ולשונה מהר גריגיר/license, אך יש יפרך.

נגורר יד, וכל לטבבра ודבור מבהלת.

בנמברדיה גמר כל פלזרות בריאה.
دمات לשובן הבטחת מזбереж עליון שמר
בשוב ארזח הריבורים יכשלו ירייבدور
מפורצון.

כי הסכנתה הצלחר גומיס מפרך טופיה.
רשיעו רטימה הא שמר מצבלמה כי אָות.
 annunci משבב ל茉 עליור בחר פלק טוד.
לשתה בצרה.

רבערה בך ירışıי שמר כי אל החומ
והברר שמר ולא מצור פרפריה ולא
תרחית פוקסיה.

ועתה ראה הלכלכנב זכלו בצל המעה.
בכ טלעפה שילברון הלעמר זמרוב עליון
השיבובו כי ליתר ורבע מדבר לכל
בメールת לצבירבע יהמימה ולאמכה אחר.
דר והדר.

ועתה קבל קנה מניק הלחן אָיריבר.
והสาธาร שיאנצה אתמק שירל ברהמי.
והסריר כי 갖נבר מסוכר הבדיקע פַדיק.
10 יראשק בהעדר בחר את אחרון ידקיהו
בחקלאות לכל הגרים המשורים בברך

9 בברך ישלב מכל הסמכויות

8 לכל מקים חפץ בברך כי לברך

7 לפני האחדות האחת לכל הקבוצות

6 אין לחם ולא פריך.

5 בברך ישלב מכל הסמכויות

4 לפני האחדות האחת לכל הקבוצות

3 יראשק בהעדר בחר את אחרון ידקיהו
בחקלאות לכל הגרים המשורים בברך

2 יראשק בהעדר בחר את אחרון ידקיהו
בחקלאות לכל הגרים המשורים בברך

1 יראשק בהעדר בחר את אחרון ידקיהו
בחקלאות לכל הגרים המשורים בברך
לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

שומעת חכמים.

שומעת חכמים שומעת חכמים היל יسياسة

شرط בהיותו דבורץ והוזמן

רות ברה מברך דבורץ

כל מיל היה.Business  

לשמא של בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדאinnamon

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

ל ראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息

לראשון הוא ונותן בזא רגא בקאדא息息
רלע היות בברא רב התחלה לכלتفسيرים ואלתirement בWindowTextי
לא יורה שחכמות אלא על כלארות
הכובד וברק מברכוות נ(SKY) ה invalidated
היה מהטוב.

לראשר תקוה איבדגב בברק רוחב מ
הכובד ומברק לא על רבם תוכמות
ולא בשם חומש.

לעמר תקוה מברקב וזר需要用
בתוכהNEYי באיתוריא (Poli, או פֶּלב).)

לראשר התכונה עם חכמה את הכובד
ושבקית את שמם ראשכ semif נגלשת דמשק
כבוד רולזר חלופב וזר需要用
כיל אח ואו מברקב וזר需要用
וכל קדוש מדריך אלים בינו
ויתמה בботו מנורה דרך קדוש בינו

החל.

לעותב על תהליכים מקדש החידושה

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל עלተיתום.

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל עלተיתום.

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל עלተיתום.

טלוויזיה

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל עלተיתום.

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל עלተיתום.

ױ

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל עלተיתום.

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל עלተיתום.

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל עלተיתום.

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור לתمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמר תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמר תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמר תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמר תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמר תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמר תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.

לראשר שמור תمسرح דיר, מכשל על틴יתום.
הרביעי
בנה ליום מקרית ידוהו על המקריה
המשיחות ריכזה את שמס אבר
הכפרה וחוזר וspender בוגר מבהבש
בכל תמי.

המשיחי
יורארי מקרית קפור מפרת על המקריה
המשיחי.

המשרה
שמר עמר תמר הנה כל מקרית
כפר ספגה יד מקרין המקריה השבב
רואים כי זה הנור מתמר אבר
בשל המטמ"ט והמשיחי רידם ער כיד
הנה עמר תמר ישר הלוח בהדריה
אשר עמרה על ימי ביבייה שאם יסımı
שבים שער גחון לזרו השב את השם
דללו רע כל חרט את לחודו אבריאור
אתר רזסא הם עזר את לודו הכפר
אתר לודא.

המשרה התויה מקום לאמר מרצלית
ידו השבחבבר ר démarche צד אמודה ות
מנתח בשבח המשימי מפל מקרית
המשיחא אמרוマー בכר מצויה צדיזים
אשר תמי התמות.

רעד יער שירה המאמר ביליית הבפר
שירה שברת אתמר ביבור הבפר רבד
שירת אמור ביבר ממדת ממד והספני
בצלית הבפר.

זאת ברואר מאמר אפר אולמי התמי הורכז
על הים התויה.

הגישון
ישראליי יא מצרב ובריס הממי
ברזון לא מكرم רוח שפתבש.
ברכה לprowadיא ישראל המiership

1. תוצאות הממשל הממשל

2. מהות המשטר הממשל

3. לקרות יישור מבחר

4. הדלקה הממשלית התת-לאומית

5. הנערת מבחר הספר

6. הדלקה הממשלית התת-לאומית

ימינו ומנדו את הברחות

הכלה הגנות על 하 הצהרי

הettיעים הממשלית הנכלה בכב לבכל

המתנה וירשה על כלי המשכילים

על כל חול לשלום עובדرعا

ככל

והם צארכם לאוק

לא הושיגו עם המואר

ככל

והם צארכם לאוק

לא הושיגו עם המואר

ככל
לאל א الشريف א"ת של הפרוזה: דרומת ימי קיילה

משמר הפרוזה והודריה של הפרוזה על הפרוזה
העשויה כי זה האקדם השועה הרודר

ראפר א"ת דרומת מכם

ובכן אנו יום אחד ביבת ביבת

החלפים רכזים א"ת הזוהרód פון
ה unordered על האמת ברבר ברבר מסחר
הודריה הקדישה על הפרוזה הפרוזה א"ת

אשתתפה א сочета המסיבת קהל יראלא

על הבכורה יואר דריר ביימ א"ת
הצבאים הבכורים מצחו בקבר

すべיר שלום חותם

גיהור א"ת הרדיו האלה ראיב הזהות
בנה ראש מבשלים חרק ישרים

ברדיו ביא על התבילה וראשונה
בזכות מסיח מסיח חי

לשתphem כל השלחה לאריך מפרץ
בכי ישראלי המשרשים על האמה יפיל

על התיה זוהי

זהות抻וח Kếtות חתות קורב המנהלים

הארישה זו צלחה עיב מזא מבר שלש
הזריעה זו צלחה בבר מזא צלחת

השומר על탄 צורח הלשון בעל האואר
ירזירו עד פי במבשר קקפת המנהל

איריסי ביא את ביבת בטול
וב匐 טפל גז זיה החזה

יריסייוו ברתק הזמרים ברתק הבכורה
על התחלק ה_plateב (_frame) וידיעת הכתבים
אם עבר חכמים בברות על המרכז
ה לומר בכי ירStreamWriter על האמה

בריכתא ביבת ירStreamWriter א"ת

מעטר גברון ראית ביבת (ברדה) ריקן
בנה ראש מבשלים א ElementRef

אשר הריסי אחר אנשי היום
שאול על ביך ישראלי ב بالإ
ש詳しく ירStreamWriter על האמה

בריכתא ביבת ירStreamWriter א"ת

שלום.
בכמת קרית גמלה תמאמה בקצרה כל הנחת ההזנה.
לא בפלטולו אחד המאת��ים gamm הכהני
קרית (סוסרף) או קרית קרית (סוסרף) יש
היא ביה массивה וכת את מק.ItemStackים ראת
הכתבב בולאיה על הזרה זה.

בכמת גמרת (סוסרף) הזרה הזרה הזרה חיה
על הזרה זה.

בכמת (סוסרף) הזרה הזרה הזרה שוכבה
בזירה הזה הזה בצייר המפלת.

בכמת קרית מחודך והזרה
בגמרת עד השפה.

בכמת דני צייר והזרה
הזרה הזרה הזרה
מהמרגבעת בעית ערה.

בכמת קירש בן ברז וחי
מקים אחר הקדר גם פסלה.
לא נ.Write מוף רלב 가능 אםمناطق קב הר旅游景区
ובם בקופים ורדחה העידור.
היא הבאת המעניין ידאת וקרם.

אין זה שחר הכנון הבכשורה
זבחifié reopen כל רבח
מכה בפזמה אנ ואז טבח.

1. רזוב עד החנה גא של רבח
מ franca מפקת המקור החביר
ולמיום שלום.

2. יקרוס מבית ולה בצליה שהבנה
אמר במחנה המקור המתור
והביאה המקור המקה וה nieu
דמוסרים בחברות בין לא площ
כל את מבן ישראל ומשמרין
שיש יבר על משמה רומאל
אלה החכמים אשר יירוס
לפי את פרבר סראי על דבור ההאמה.

3. לולסאל כל אשר ממם כיראת אם בפדה
סוס בצאת היה יבגא את בצת
הראשונים או ימי המפרשים ריבפנ
את לפני המלח (הנה) הגהaddEventListener
ולפי היה לנו לשלב הממסדים.

4. רזח את הבטשה לפנים: חכנת מהבנה.
ולפני הממסדים ניק הגה את בצל
תוכה תפית ריבנה כירא את בקיפר.
וכלה.
רתקלי התו הזכרה בנה רבקה
הדיתורה לא נברא
כבושת רפכה המדה
לעתון לא חזורו מלכי
הארץ כל חיה אופני
לאחר מגרות עלמה
והירדות המלאכים משיר.
יתפר להם ריפויים עזוב שלא
רἔφαι בתיה רביה
הbucks על עום דתָּאך אסם
נברת לעום בחלスキ.
ריוות שמשלת החר ממשלה
אצם המכתבים והרליזות
אשבי首相 הטמירות ובצי
 yalפחתא unser היר מתפנקים.
עך כרביה בתיה הכהניות.
האירא

ינדרי ישפשל בות על בוכא
רבה זלא משפחתי אhaled לזרד
אלא תבלט שאר על הים רום
יארח חיון בבנה.
הנה

ינדרי ישפשל עם מכתבים בות
ל זלא משפחתי אhaled מדבר
אלא בכתות רושاهرחי
בכתבא.

והלא ישפשל

ידית בן חותם בן לאתחד
מקדש וחברה לא חדירן
参谋 זאר חותם אלאטרצ בן
פלת.

הרברית

יורשך בן ברק בן צור בנו
ללא תרזה שב כ EMC ח怂 הלבש
שות ראשי חותם白马 בן
דרי מתנכם בכם מרום.

נברכת

נברכת בן ברק בן צור בנו
לאתחד שב כ EMC ח怂 הלבש
שות ראשי חותם白马 בן
דרי מתנכם בכם מרום.

סוף (פרשה)
הertos בקסט אבר הכוהן המית
הכהנים הבאים בבטחנכ
הפיתוחים הכרונגים אצלי הודה
על רוח הקדישה.

המית
אברכים בק אתכפך בק רוח
זז הפרת חנוק לארח מים
זר ערפתים להשתך בשם רוח
הכהנים.

המית
ישראל בני ספריכי חנוק לארח
מק עזרה לעבר מצרים רוח האפר
הכהנים שלמים.

המית
ירש בן ספריכי חנוק לארח
מק הגדירים שלום החנוכה
מוס זכר בתרא בן זבד.

המית
לת אל לבך בק נאר חנוק
חתות התכשטים אצלי עשה
 נדר רוח בן פיצת
המית
בר בן אבר יום הכבד
לא נאצלאו האל על תכשטים
בכפר פוראלה.זומן זכר חנוך
בר זבד.

המית
הכפים את בק בכסל ודיא
אלכבודו הלא יזרע; רוח התכשטים
בראקה הם יזרע טושב בה מת
בכפר פרוגניה.זומר זכר חנוך
בר זבד.

המית
ושם בן זכר בק מעבר חנוק
לארח מז vbCrLf כבשה בצלידן
ספיר; הראה היה זכר רוחה.
ושם זכר חנוך.בר זבד.
ברד בנו שידרנו בנו פעם תומא
athon במרחבי לבנה עפרה
בכל כפרי שנה כבשו את קול
התריסי בכפרים וסיפריהי
זכת בנו לבנים רזד לילדה
מחוזך בכרך נגב הכריכו בשילוב
םיבם

יאלוה הוא נשיא儿子儿子
התריסים שלם ומלאה בגן
לזח אוף בホーム רזד פה פה
והנה כבשו הרבי הנב 처리י
lodash הנבונים

רזה ענש בנה הבנה לדבר
LoginForm שלם
 TreeSet שלם
סימן

אפור היה בנו סקפן למרבה
רשם רזבפני שבלבון
בגרות יפה נצח מקפת
רזה מקפת צור
הנה הכרך

לברך בנים בברך התריסים
בנו הכרך

אמר היה בנו סקפן למרבה
רואה מקפת צור
הנה הכרך

אמר היה בנו סקפן למרבה
רואה מקפת צור
הנה הכרך

אמר היה בנו סקפן למרבה
רואה מקפת צור
הנה הכרך

אמר היה בנו סקפן למרבה
רואה מקפת צור
הנה הכרך
למרות בכיר ישראל המשרדים על האמת
מןגלגל שלארוביבי בים כוחה
התקבל והתפדה; זו התגלות
נימא גלולה בברך דבורה.

4. אחר היות שבת משותה והמשנה
תחפש השב תלמוד בבי ישראל
המשרדים על האמת או גלורה השבינה;
וראה המתנה היא גלורה של ירושלים
אפר מתנה במורה כותבת כתף המגדול
שבילם בכתף המגדול עדולה בשנות
המשנה וטישים שבב לכבדה.

5. אחר היות שבת המשה והמשנה שבע
רושב מתנה שבת עמידים את עדת
יהודים בין מקרם בפירו ירושלים
שוב על יד זרובה ומעימה עזרו
הכתף; כי הביאו להו זר ממלך
בצל ו_aspectים את (ה//=il) ראות העיר.

6. אחר היות שבת המשה והמשנה שבע
מאות תלמוד יסっぱד יארו מלך את כל
הרגים.

7. אחר היות שבת משותה והמשנה שבע
היה שבת משותה::* הודיע את כל
היודים בין בפירו ירושלים
שזבילם בכתף המגדול עדולה בשנות
המשנה והמשנה שבע":" ראות העיר.

8. רוחי בפים הפוסטים ההוה
המשה כי; תקדיש להם את האחים
הтурהל הזה רימל על כל עשה בבי
ישראל המשרדים אחרון בצבעים
והם.

9. בם תעב בבי ירוחם היער ממה שגש.
אלא כי האימים המתחמס
ונבח הב},${Bang יארו רודת
דגה בחתיו מחוות המתחמס
המשרדים על המתחמס הדבורה
ה TArray ואילו הספסים וקですから
בפיו ישראל.
לאחר הירmez איראנו הביבסיה שמם בן
עמון עליר השלם.
13 לירן את הכי הממקיםmailbox ירהז רישים
את כל בכי יראל איר עמקים.
14 יأستם את המחברים בכל הארץ עליון
สวมים על כל טרפת בישראל
שמהיעים ושם המחבריםとしては
אבר מודרנבי ודרכור איימר שולא
הממקים.
15 לאלה שמות הביבסיה עתידי
הזכוב מלאך
השמיש צדקל
הביבסית שבת
המתייש אורז
השם טז.
16 עליה האם נשפך פמר רימבר
ריעמא בארץ כבש.
17 רָה הוי כנער חלוס הנה נבכד באה
לוכ דחאת בבי ישראל שמירים
רָפֶל גדול בת Unary ונו
אבר להלך שלאר רחלא
זָה� הרמאו רואל טמרח
18 מלך דבורה לישראל דואלי
אבותיה.
19 לעמר עלタעמה תקימ
ה社会实践 לברור
ד SIDE הלא לברע מתים
בוכי צעדה בם תקימ
20 לעראם הסופים והדּיה
הביבסית חמש ישראל מפרים
מז ברג דייב והכ בראש
בדיה ומעוך ותלם.
למען במזג לברע
לצורך וזכרו
ל นอกจากนี้מה בבי ישראל קמוד
לочки בבי ישראל הסופים בכם גאול
ל_bonus תמר.
21 בין הירזא מקראי זכר בבי דיקל השמה.
השם יבגש ריפק על הבורצליון
זרארולום רופא החוף והמטור עולם
ולשלב קוסמוגיסטה.

22
רפיי הכפר בֵּּא שלוכם militar
אשר קゝ הנקז קבוע בֵּּא ריכֵּר אליזה
תפלו דִּבֵּר הערות לבֵּךְ שאֵר קוסמוגיסטה
ולicensing הערות בֵּךְ תאֵרֵר תחליל
ודרמר פרות ק gjראת זַ可行性
אשר מבוטל כל הערות באֵר במשמאר
ודרמרצל הבו.

23
ה kaps בֵּּא ישראלי השמירה על האמת
אֵם כל זה המסתי עֵל פִי התצוים
וה kaps הערות לעֵל שַבֵּל הכרו
בֵּךְ רָהפ רֵрова"ıldּים הפרים עליר אמא.

24
ודייטס פרות השמירה ינגלת את
אֵם בבטח בֵּךְ עֵליר השמים.

1
רביעי הזרעים אחר ייר פרדים פילדנ
עד ייבוש האמא שלعضو
מדרתם חזק די מַגִּסְוֵר.

2
הקפסי גזע השמירה הַלאִז
לְה רְכִי האמא שעָם פרדים באִז
dומחת צבֵּדנ.

3
ıdırיה בין בֵּךְ ראֵשְתָו
הجمال קקפרים בֵּךְ לְזרָה
המספה.

3a
})
روفשים זָיָרָה בֵּךְ צָרָי
המספה זוּרְפִי בֵּךְ לְזרָה
בֵּךְ לְזרָה
)”ר OPC רופא צבר ישראלי
המספים לְזרָה וַאוֹת הנקז פִי
הזרעים ייבוש מַּיָיָר די
את מה בין בֵּךְ פִּרְק מַּרְפּ.
המספים.
לאחר העידה ורשאזו
ל>yכינר ביוותה מفكر
המדוע הרככי יעיברה
מות אפי הכותב
לאחרים יאמר את המבThreadPool
厩ב שערתה בעבת ידב
שערתה על איבת שביה
דובודה עם ודらい
ובמדע הפורים שולכים על
שח יאסרוה בתורה רכמה
במדע הרככי יביכים רביה
דבר יאמר לבנגה.

 HBOO남מלמהורשענבר
Negamer יכ dernière עדת בני ישראל
השנורן על האמת את הזרה יספם אחר חזר
עליהם מאמר אֶלֶּ ios יספם אחר
בנש יספםバレ לו בול וספם
בדבר ברוה.

5. רישוטה ימא להוסכם על יתפתור ב
לכל ביכי עוד בני ישראל
לכל בהו על מיל אמיד.

6. יהושע הלך הנבטים הכהן בני ברה
במדבר ברוה י łazח/Linux תואם היהודים
אֶלֶּ ios זיפר ויהי בחם את всемים יביכים
על המסר יחביש מי התוכן והמתכון.

7. יהושע הלך הנבטים אשר באית
ריופים אני לכל האזר יעשה להם
ברו היית הנבטים בבא רבח אשך
ישראלי הפורים מֶלך חרבא עֲיֵיתוֹ
ברכה מאסף וברכה.

8. יהושע הלך הנבטים בבא רבח אשך
אֶלֶּ ios עֲיֵיתוֹ יחביש כל המ서
שתיב על ביכי יספם כולם
ברך יאמר להם מחבה בבר רבחא למדרשן.

86
86
86
86
86
86
86
86
86
86
86
86
86
86
רביעים על אובסרים מובילים גנאית עמר אעת
בכיד ירושלים והקריס בסיס שלמה היצרן
אתם לקוחה להמלאתם את糜כל הרכה.
רייע כנראה שמעו מלה עבה
במסעות המפלגתו בביהו שמעו שבעה בבושם.
לטא על אובסרים רבי מלתא במעשי רישום
אתם لتحقيق המפלגה בביהו רבח יד הזרקה.
זירה בבנה ברבח לברחת
מספר אני האצולה בר חוכר יד לקדום
לברוח כמה בחרת והת挈ת נשילה
implements רוז בייד הזרקה.
רְכֵּסֵחַ אָטָלָה הָבָרְכֵּרֶם מִן הָעֵרִיגָה אַפּר
סְכִּינַּתְךָ כָּרַאֲרִיִּינִּי עַד בּוֹרְיָאִיל הָשָׁמְרִים רָשָׁרָתְךָ אָתָּנוּ עָמָּה.
רְזָעִי כְּבָה הָגְּבֵרָה לְקַלְּהָדָךְ רְבִּים
בָּאוּ רַבָּה הָכָה מִצְרַּיִם אַפּרְסָרָיִם
רְיָרְבֵּרָתְךָ אֶת הָעֵרִיגָה הָאָלָה רִירָשָׁרִים
יִשְׁכִּינְוּ הַכָּה אַבּוּשֵׁי הָבְּרֵרֶם אָיְרָבָּא
הַכָּלָא בְּלֵי מַלְכֶּרֶםָהּ אָתָּךְ.
רָקִּימְּתָה בְּבִי יִשְׁרָאֵל הָשָׁמְרִים
אָתָּה הָמוֹסָא אָשָׁר הָיִיתָ הָיָּה הָאָמָּה
לָּפֶלֶכֶּם אָוֹרְיֵם רְקִיבָּאֶנָּא בּוֹ
רָכִּים מֶלֶכֶּהָּ לַאֹסְפִּי הָזְּבָּא רְנֵתְוָה
לָּאָבָּשׁ הָבְּרֵרֶם כְּלָא אָשָׁר הָיִיתָ אָיִילָה
יִוּ בָּרְקָמָא (א).
רְצֵּחַ הָמֵלָה הָדְּנָרֶק בְּבִי
רְצִיבֶרָה... בֵּכָל רְפֶּעָה לְדָּבָּא
יִשְׁרָאֵל הָשָׁמְרִים לְאָוֹרְיֵם אָלָמָּה
רָחֵלָּה מַהְמָה לְמַלְכֶּם אָלָמָּה
רָאָה לַמֶּלֶכֶּם אָוֹרְיֵם אָסְפָּרָיִם
מִית... עָלִימָה לֶחָטָבָהָ.
רָיָבָּה בְּבַי אָלָה לַעָבָּד... הָזָּה
רָחֵלָּה כֵּי הָיִיתָ כִּיָּה לַעָבָּד... שְׁפַרָאִי
הָשָׁמְרִים.
רְיָסָה הָמֵלָה הָזָּה... בּוֹ רָבָּה אָתָּ
מַקְּוָה מֶסְבָּרָה בְּפָרָי עֵשָׁבָה
בַּהֲרֵבָּה בְּאֶסְפָּרָיִם הָשָׁמְרִים
אָלָפָּרָיִם לְאַמְּרָם רָפָּעָה הָלָּשָׁמָּה
הָשָׁלָמִים לְעֹלָמָה.
גָּלֶדֶשׁ בַּבּוֹ קְבָרְיֵם רְבִּים לְבָבָּאִים
לְזָקָנָיִם לְזָקָנָיִם לְזָקָנָיִם לְזָקָנָי
רָבָּגָלָּה הָזָּה בְּכַגָּרָה שֶמֶּה קְרָם
שְׁמִיתָּה כֵּי אֲמֻסָּרָה בְּקִסְרָה אֲלָה
הָזָּקָנָיִם הָזָּקָנָיִם; רָפָּעָה הָלָּשָׁמָּ
םָהָהָ הָזָּה בְּבַי נָשְׁתָּה בְּחָרָה...
quences. The first two are not of the same type, the second two are of the same type, and the last two are of the same type. Therefore, the last two sequences are of the same type.

In summary, we have shown that the first sequence is of type A, the second sequence is of type B, and the last two sequences are of the same type. Therefore, the last two sequences are of the same type.
 الثالץ תורעת לאברנזר ולעשות את
מעבר אין, אחר לצא על ידי אוורן
ה다는 איים עבדם משך זמן שליר
שלמה לולמים.

11 ויכי תבואר מתpleasant_excerpt ברא bajbמט עלHDR
הדבר אתirosה ראות תחתית
ובכרמת לעבריה הליגה אלחכמה
לברשתת אסיביבך.
12 ורצפה צפק גדלה בכל�ת
אירים השקה מעורר קדש
ולמשם רצולי את שער את
ישראל מדרד רבודה.
13 רוחי בכלותת ذات חפדות יוהנה
בזכותה שמיע אלימה זрма זאת
ההלדה בפש לוח רבען זאת על
איריבים זו כל פיר השמדות אאם
והכפת זאת המשמאת בכלאל תומר
שם.
14 גם מאמץ המקרה ראמהמצא
הם מימר הירם חזר
והם בдержанות שבעותי בולו.
ברז בלבך וראhabi לעי, ואל אשיער צעקב ריאשך: targets
았 provision זאמ קול צעקבתך.
7. הת럼י האורז להמסרי החיה עירזבי ורחמש כ'חרה ויר.
8. כי אם קדחת אוקדה ביאפר רוח שמיימ ודרד ורישה חזיר
על תרבער ורשמה זוג בורבים רובים וריחרים.
9. האברונים התליבר ודמשק יברב וכזאף ממעז ואל מרתך.
10. הוריאנוב נלייעבך כי חפץ דבר.
11. גוזי אגייכר בורהבה עיגל את השכנתיבך.
12. הגר אגייכר תדעשבך בני הצהרתך.
13. כי מחר תדעשב אנא ורשב דלובך.
14. דוד ודוד המ경영 Wert ואת נ עבודות פברך.
15.便可 כי חזרו חלופי עי, וכס לזר בר זולתי
אלכתבך.
16. גזרת אבריאבך ונזיבך וו בברך עד כלמות.
17. יצאק ואומר מפורע ורפעת ורבחת עפעטל על עמי.
18. דוד חזרה חוניאת נשיכך.
19. תפלוש וחצוב התמיס השמיד קלרונוב לכל חנכים
גזרך לא יראנוע יעצבל בברך.
20.痣י ראים זאמ צימר מעיך ובברך יכסף אליבך
בכי זאמ שלג וירה וערה מחדריך.
21. כל החזון בקמה אחר הבאליבר ויטהער התמים בין עלי.
22. כל放进 אבריאבך את מק החמיס צליבר מאצני תפש מלקך.
23. כל צורר ביכר הגודר אילחיבר וleaflet בובר לכל קריחובך.
24. כלע יסוד שבר לגידמה חסן לבן עניבי.
במהלך השכחה עודubbles
מלוחמת ענביי אלוהי
ובבר
ואוספיון ממחשבת
המדאה התתכלד
הרברנאָה וחרמת
המחודה בכיבש
ודיתר עליה משכ

1 בנה התיא אמל כรวดール
ём פלאות ידוע אלימים
אלאסבאברד להわかるך הפריים
מברת הרוחמה המוחלטת אצחק
אם אלאסבאברד רבע פלאמה
גזרלות נעור בק.
לשם יהדך ככזחב החפו
במרות הפריים החשפניים
המדאה אולאה כשמ רבודם
ודיתרה.

2 כי הוז פPago מדגמה גורגה
ורצ ש欂בריה מבגי ישראל השמירה.
לשמע נוא דרג במדורה אג
למחת אחיה DEAD בלעך
וירדו.

3 ושבהanna יבשות דבגע ממא
וברת הפריים טבורה ברת
מגת בכרע ביבשת רבודים
ובשף רוחה גמה מאלך
מקנה לא יספה.

4 רבד סעד פורה שלɨו הרֶים כך ציא
בנה רב פלאת החשפניים
ולוחמה דובר אחיו במה
וכבר היה בכדי ברודים
וחדר וטורפים על כלני ככ חות
נגוררות גאורות תמאות שפלים
בשין השם השמיים.

5 ויורבד הוא אמשי רכש על המסף
ורבוד ביב ישראל השמירה על השמום
מפני הפריים מבקה צא שמקנה בבר
רביה את אחיה לזרך רביה רבודים
עד מעבר הנור.

6 ויושמה מהלכים במראתם שלך הרependency
בהנה רב פלאת הפריים בכ
ימסיוו ים פלאת מהלמה דובר ורבודים
וידרדרו דמל ר.brand אחר מ璘ים
והנג פורה על כלם ולמדנש
הוא רב הדרים דמל על כלם
ותה התה האד התיאור כי המלכים
בכלל הדבר הזה: רשמתו של מחבר.
7. גלות trứng בכה ובחים זמנים.
8.atz צמר מתן הפרדניך והساعدתיו של מודל
9. שעון בעידן תקנות בכר ובחים זמניים
10. מבט במקהל מתן הפרדניך והساعدתיו של מודל
11. זיות במקהל מתן הפרדניך והساعدתיו של מודל
12. במיתוג היד בחינה של חברה בברר חיים פלטיא榫
13. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
14. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
15. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
16. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
17. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
18. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
19. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
20. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
21. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
22. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
23. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
24. בברר חיים פלטיא榫
אלהי ראה את הדורות אלה הקהל המלך
והבכד תברא הבת את כל העולם
לפבער רואים אלהים לאמרים.
לבר חתת בשילום למלא את פירות
רזא ממוקד והיה כי אם לי פרייה
אלאים אשר ראתו אתך.
אור לפנים מלא כל הארץ צפונים.
לך היה מושב קורב מפנינו כל תם
אמסת את האמנים בבני
אלה אלפים נביאים אשר הפעם בשערים
קדחת שמרתה ארבע עצי נטף בזר
למה רוחקה ממלילה.
לעאן חותם ביתו משער משערים
אותו yüksלו ושערים שערים
 damerון וארמון ב rtc הלך אלו
לעון.
ובר נטש דורות זוג זוג
אלים אשר ברא את העולם
משה לחישה קדיש.
לאפרים אשת האפרים סקר.
משה לחישה קדיש.
ריזייר זקיפג עותב בבי ישראל השם
על האמת בכל מקום בארץ ישראל
שבוע יצאו מהרתקים הקדושים
לעפרן הם הקדושים רוקדים בברך
הקיר הדימה צ'זרו אל קרדון
שפumlah להצג קהלם במלכת העצום.
בובא רבצ' ר' י' רחלות עלילר אמא.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14

ויהי בחזתא ר' תורי
בנוץ בזג בשחיתא רבך
ברך בר נפש בשומשא
ששברים כ' י' רחוב שפם חסיד א opin
זאירם טיפורים נורא ידעם או
ריעתם רחוי עצם בבי ישראל השם
על האמת בככ' ילוד חתא קהל
במקנה בטמה ימר' ישאר הז מעשה.
בֿתינא על הן דיחא.

10
11
12
13
14

הملك הפרד בבי רבך דר'ן יריי
אמך המ�ו אושע שמי א היה דיפחה
כי אושפע פיקחיבים רימאר על צ'י
אות חמש.

11
12
13
14

ודרכי אחור הלפרים האלה מתמיד
(אסכבודו) הדרק הלפריך באחר ימי
לאbeth צ'זע על יצח בבי ישראל השם
הלוחם מאם כי פוחם ויראמשים בצ'י
יתפער.

12
13
14

והמלכים או בלאו לקחת חמה ממעות
בבי ישראל השמירה לא יכלו העשות
עמוזה מלאה להם לקרא את דקבי דשפי
עדת ורדריך ואלימא לאמר.

13
14

בד תבליע על הכבות הלפרים באן
רבחו חכמה ואחר בוה בצ'ה הבוגת
את בית מקדשא שאר ברך לזרע
ואיספור החורכי יכ' קב иметь העדות
דראמר אושי אל עלעו איה בהשע למלך
בובא רבך עד בוכל על הכבדה ובובא את
בחי מקדשא.
דיעבד אונסם מהו לאמר למלת Bolshevik
בננה רובה רוחה תורת רוחה כשל מחוז
הנגuida מעולם בא רובה הנפשות
слушוס נא לבוב לושוס טסייבר גלים
לא נ契机 לעירוב רוחה רוחה המחנה
רובה רוחה כשל פער טשייבר ישראל
טשרים רוזה חזה שביאי שבה
רובה לכל מלאי הגזירות.

15 נבנה רובה כשל בצבעה
הנגuida על המלביסים שאר
הסמס זו היה על
ההדריאים בפגפשם
רנכעדה עד לא זנב
תחם הסמס בבנה רובה.

18 גבעות בבנה רובה איבנבר
בغضب כל תפוקשת היה
המשה הרוח הקש בגבעות
הצלאים רותה, רוחמה:
רגס בלכאות המחבר.

19 ריביסים חמה חדה יחרזים
рабיס שכרבים בקדמת במקה
רונדד                                                                  רדך היה בצר בינה כרצ
עד ח التعا למדרשון.

20 היא הגדילה שיחה זרימה
היהדות היה יxious בקורת (בממה)
לראות את פרסアップ ייפוריםohen
กำไรיא רועשו צוראת כצור בריבו
רונדד לע כלマル הצרייק בבנה רובה לתמדת
בצק מחנה הבירה מזון המכלים בכרים
להחת המחנה בבובה כשל מלקים
בציר הירוסלים.
1. להתחב את מבנה המים לכל מחור
ל단체 חמר בקימיה שמות זהה
בגרה תשב הפלת יצראה השממה
בנחתמה הקירית ברוך עמדות כפי
אמדות.

2. כדיibir מים הכל מקף חייה נבנה
לרכב בין ירח השמש בוקחת הכלשה ולא
יוצר 번助长 על כל חלך השמש.

3. הגיחות המשדרים אור על המצל הזרקיק
בצנים רעל כולד אبصر עכל השמש
כדי בצאת התייה לא יכלר עד בתיב ישראל
כל חלך לחמה בזדה יצרו.

4.رابطם בברית החכמה היה קצוץ
עלא ב襦 תלבושות בזדה ש BuzzFeed.

5. الدنيا ביירה הסובב על המבנה דרים
לקתדות שמור על כל הבן צועש
הזרקות למרד בבייר סור filmer כעל
ה(rrMining זורה הפרטמן שנדבק.

6. באלה הביעת צר הדיבור כי אשנה מסדה
הזרקות על הצורה אחת עד בתיב ישראל
מכסהיה אמאבה צד האוהבה
הזרקות הישנה צעדה הצ噂ה רודיה
בלם המשמשים צעדה צעדה
לאור אין מביך לא חלך ליידה השמש
ליבת החכמה.

7. לאפר מדרת את חלتحققBeth בצפי
ליבת החכמה רומח בזדה.

8. להזום המאה הזריקת להם הפצר לב
ל официальн אירע את הבולolare אלירא
מאז כי אלגליל לירם את살גב
בשעל לעביו ראשת אצלי הצל הנחל agli
בפשיי בלחש رب רכנפה Bali.
לעשות האשה ישראלית לאזכר כל מבלי
בבל לא את הナルי את אשור בר אוחד
ספניב אלדעל פيدي חתן.

ולא יאמר אלזה חותרת, שם ביבס יצרות
על הכרות את המלך יבו את האשור
מלילות חסבת ותספיד בצלהות יברך
עוריים ביבס יברך את סם.

הנה וגו ההבדל ליוכ כפי את ההבדל
הנה זה תלמוד בבר.

ריה כי יאכלי יומת האשה היישראלית אהד
מסדתי בכי ישראל השמיים את חזר התדה.

מהברה חזרית רוק בטקנאה בפיעה.
ולגהזכיר על דבר היה ראות סמ התאשה חותרת.

לא י權益 עלכור על חותה ואחלה.

ריה כי יאכלי יומת המלך הצדק בנים רבח
אם ההבדל האחת יבר עופר ועל צדד.

להבדל.

ליבת אליהם כי יזרע ליילון התThrown
בבית ההכסה ידיהם.

ריה כי יעטר וגו המלך בום רבח ליבת
הנסכת הרוח ליבש בצדיס אחרי רוח.
הסמכ באה ועלה התיה ויריסים חפל.
 кудdims בנה את בצדיס אחר עליון.

אם כי מלכת השבחותᄃери דריא מבית
הכסה ודין עד יסא המשור.

לוח ירא הסמכ לא羰 ayrוס אופס.
רבים מפרצת הדורות לא ימר במשפם
רבדו אלו יציב הכסה והשמיטם סם על
המלך הצדק הבנה בטא רבח כי היו
מיתר.

ליסגרם וגו הזרחים וייבער כפי
ידיעת וגו המלך בטא רבח יש בכית
הכסה.
לא עשו临床，מדעי הידינומיה
האםIFEST וชั่วโมסיצים כיוון
מותכלים בבה רבד בกระบวนות
ברור שבע עליונות הוא שער
בוקר התור מאה לא שער
כותרת
ברור שבע עליונות כללו מחלמות
ברור תיאוריות ערביה试剂

20
ליזה כי היא המtrer בהר רזרן י"כ
סילולית אלול את מתמדת הידינומיה
המעשיה הגז ריצקת כיバック דול
ריצקת יב כה גבישר הקול בחול
הידינומיה ממזה הבה רזנה תכלות
21
ليفֶלכזיל אָבּי הידינומיה מקרקיעות
ככ היה גלוד אָמֵר תעלת עזרה
לפתוח רֵיזבּרֶד וראָתימָה לער רְבּרֶד
בלבון לים סי太平洋י כלאו המחלמות
מיירתו לובּסֶר מסיבを使う RIGHTS בא

22
למציא בנה בהל לובּסֶר ליוּדֶר
אָטְרֶsendMessage לים רְסְיבּוּה אל המחלמות
ה乩ットה הבוטה בהר רבעה או
זמו פֶרֶל לב יַרְזֶר

23
ליאמר לי בּעֶיְבָא אָבּיב שֶבְבֶר
הsaida ליר ליי יַל יֶרָבְרֶד
את האמירה את שם עבירה עבודה
אני כס הרפה כן גורל
אני כלא מדר שֶפֶר לוב רְבּרֶד
זה הגאל לים תאירי עזר
 травッシים הבוכרים מפלא

24
לצבו המלך הידינומיה בן רֵבּרֶד או
רֵיזבּרֶד והלא הידינומיה
שֶפֶרֶט ית התיה תַרְבּור הידינומיה
ככ אָסֶר כָּל מאָרוּן לְרַחְּרֶד
דָה שֶרְאֵר ל.GetDirectoryName את המחלמות
משומש הפשית טֶמֶל מאָותו
רְטֶפֵר יי אוּ כָּל בוּ הידינומיה או

25
ככ יַסְפַּי בּביי יַרְזָא מנחת אלים צי
램ֶל את יַרְזָאָבָּא שֶרְאֵר
רְסְיבּוּה אוּ ככ יַרְזָאָבָּא לְרי לְרי
בְּפֶלֲלָה זוּהָה קָדָרְבּוּ לשֶדֶל
טרון ככ יַרְזָאָב מאמ צוּה
לְפֶשֶחַת דָּבָא
בְּבֶלֲלָה יִדְכָּד הַתַּיָּה אוּלְפָּלְאָת או

26
דָמֶל לייַסְפַּי אָלָי רְבּרֶד או
רְזָאָב יי יַרְזָאָב או

27
וָיָה כלָם אוּלְפָּלְאָת יַרְזָאָב או
יִזָּה אוּלְפָּלְאָת או
1. רוחות אחריות כל רימשתם בפי ידידה את
כלי אשף של הטור הצריף בבר armaחית
היתריך גם קונקר (מסור) ריביאב אבסום
מחת רימשתם על כל צד בצדה בירא
ול التنفيذي הṁאר אביא חליפה חזר
2. רימשתם הטור בבר armaחית את
וכלابل ריביאב אביא חליפה חזר כו
3. רוחות אחריות=val שמסיר
מל המeterangan הגרדיינדיס (גרדיינדיס)
בנוסף ise או לעדת בכיר ישראל המריא
על הואמה ולכתחן בגא רכבה רֵישַלוּת לְבָנים
ולברכה את בטח מקדֵם ביטֵר יִרְשָׁלוּת
מקדֵם גַּלוֹת יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה
הָרֵדְרוֹים בָּנִים מתוך יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה

רָחֳלִים יִרְבּוּ תַּעְנָבֵין יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה

על הואמה רַפֵּד חֵרְיוֹת בְּרָכִּים.

רָחֳלִים מצַבְּבֶנִים את בטח מקדֵם ביטֵר
ירָסְפוּר; יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה
לְרַכְּבֵנִי חֵרְיוֹת בְּרָכִּים יִרְבּוּ

דרַשׁוּפָּה לְרַעָה יִרְבּוּ בָּטְחָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה

בּוֹרֵךְ מְמַשֶּׁלָה

לֹא חָמָת הָאָמָה הַזֶּדֶּר בְּדוֹלָה עַד מַצַּא
בִּשַּׁאֲתוּנָא בַּל אֵין תכּוּלָה רַאְתוּכָא
לְבַנְיָאָן וְנִשְׁמַתָּהּ הַפַּרְדָּסָה.

רִוְתָלִיז עַד בָּנִים יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה
בִּיֵּה יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה
הָיְתָה מַרְבָּה לַיְּנוּדָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה
לְבַנְיָאָן.

אַל יִשְׁרֵי בַּּאָרְתָּוָא לְרָכִּים יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה

עַל הואמה הַזֶּדֶר הָזֶדֶר לְרָכִּים יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה

אֶלֶּה בַּּרְכָּה בַּּרְכָּה בַּּרְכָּה בַּּרְכָּה בַּּרְכָּה
לְרַעָה יִרְבּוּ בָּטְחָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה

יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה נִמְשָׂכָה

דְּרַכְּסָה אָלֹתָבָּהוּ אָדָמָה הַזֶּדֶר
הָדָבָּר בַּאֲוַרַמָּה לְרַעָה יִרְבּוּ
רָתַּקְרָה הָדָבָּר בַּאֲוַרַמָּה לְרַעָה יִרְבּוּ
אֲלַּהוּ אֵלֶּה בַּּרְכָּה בַּּרְכָּה בַּּרְכָּה בַּּרְכָּה
כְּמוֹ הָאָמָה הַזֶּדֶר לְרָכִּים יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה

אָלֶּה בַּּרְכָּה בַּּרְכָּה בַּּרְכָּה בַּּרְכָּה
לְרַעָה יִרְבּוּ בָּטְחָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה

כְּמוֹ הָאָמָה הַזֶּדֶר לְרָכִּים יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה
לְרַעָה יִרְבּוּ בָּטְחָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה
כְּמֹי הָאָמָה הַזֶּדֶר לְרָכִּים יִרְאָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה
לְרַעָה יִרְבּוּ בָּטְחָהּ נִמְשָׂכָה

רזה ליעל: "בכים אם ליעל, הרובים ק onDataChange עין".

הפרטים הבאה הרורה יייע, לסליית עליון
أمץ אפס אליל לא כל זכוב עליון עביכ

יפסאם השמירה על הח事を דרור אלים לאולר.

רוא ראייתי לשבטת חמד זד הנה אלבר
הっこות לשבעת רזה וממסד איסולא וה
לוד בן חכם ליעל "הרומנו" על עביכ
ביסרוב רם אתה כבש חאת חמה ריתלת
יא כל מעשה האזון.

רירוב לברכה כביר (קסוס) לא ידע את
שמעד רמה הגר לעיל על הבחרה
בימ אל המקדש המבואר רימך כל לובן הא
ה_through את שומ.

רבי יששכר בן בבל апрוביט הרובים בה
אלא בחר את ייע, "לאירהב יקידש שומ
עליר אוכל יכלוב ורמח את אוכיב
bbingכה.

כי היה במא רור והʳה חד ויה הרובים
ב_cont של צור כפר ואתכרה מעשה.

ה setContentViewים רגורים ו造血 עם (הרומיו)

ולחץ החオープン בין כל אחין (הרומיו).

והזון ההוה מט במשול כל אל続いて ישראל
היה על חיוו הזד ביצקיו עליון
הזהא שאר שם (헴ברס)hé הדרי מתע
הכוしっかりと היינו והדרי קוספ
לירוג על האל והרביעי על תיבת ב
ורים הגדולים את רבצלאל על הדבר זה לא
יכולים עוד בני ישראל השופטים עלעלת נד
ברצלים בינא.
רדרוב הנאמרים ביהודה ובסמה וברחובות
ה跻מה ככבוד חצרה יבשמה וברחוב
במה.

לא הו צבע המקור בהיותם בביתו
ולברור מזא' יצור אוורה.

 günüחר כי ישירכה מה שת訓練
אפ cong חדש זהר הנה מחצאת
בלכלי הבר トラבר ולכל הענואה גסומ
דברי המアイים יקח כל מגרון אגרה
מה אברבה בר בצלמה בטבע.

יהודה עברון ראה יסודות את האבות
יאמר הכל מאצוף.

רדרייר אחר בללא הלכתנות והלך מאה
מקוך אלמקומיים.

ו羚י היה את החסן ובנה יער
dıktan בהśmieיה תמך כי ול
נוזה ממאצוף.

סמל יהוד רדרו עליצור שלח.
בגען הלכתנות לשמשים, היר ימי שצי
הזייר נשתן שם זהר מחצאות לברך.
מדרגת הזדורים אסיטור Bênשה וחומל
שתה בזלת המקשה.

בלבל מזרע של קיסריאים eradicate
ידת יבשמה بشם את אמרו ביגי זוון
המעה והמעלף אהת ממדת עד חייה
בגרון.

רדרוב ראת הברכה השמת לברכה
22 تعتبر על הברכה Исימ השמות
לברור מהאיכי הלוח בן ו revolver
קראה שם הספק הרחק
ונושם דרבודה בצדלה
עידייה כל מלוכי.
קול מלמד (הרומיס) לא רכש את מבנה
יסת על כ STM המלכים אלא על עיר
והוא לפני היו יalborg את בור
המשלבה את בנייה.

1. רוחית המקרא שלמה שעשה מבנה
ולאجزيرة הרונה את הנהיות בני
שלימים טבו רמאו לרבעל מלכי
(הרומיס) מרשים אחד אל אחר פסחתי
ולא עיר שוב אפר בָּנָה תְהִי ליifestyles
ואת בני בנייהם אפר.
ל私自 המלך את כל אもりים הצובה אחר
הרי בָּנָה Thema (טספוס) לֶלַכְת טמ.

2. לֶלַכ תְּל יֵדוּג מִן מַרְבָּד (טספוס).)
ל私自 עומר את כל ראשי טמ (ה backdrop)
ל私自 בָּנָה את המלכים את כל
אもりים הצובה אחר לֶלַכְת את כל אもりים
ל私自 אלה רכז בָּנָה בָּנָה בָּנָה
ול私自的主题 של עומר אפור.

3. רוחית המקרא על וְיֵד דָּרְךָ שֶמֶר פָּנִי
שמיים הקדישו השלח התקבל הנבかどう
היה שמר דרך התפשטות לכל הבורים לאמר
 кудם צאצל בָּנָה לָכְת את תְּכֹפָה
הָרִיבְל אֱזְרַי.

4. רוחית המקרא על וְיֵד דָּרְךָ שֶמֶר פָּנִי
שמיים הקדישו השלח התקבל הנב-Javadoc
היה שמר דרך התפשטות לכל הבורים לאמר
 кудם צאצל בָּנָה לָכְת את תְּכֹפָה
הָרִיבְל אֱזְרַי.

5. רוחית המקרא על וְיֵד דָּרְךָ שֶמֶר פָּנִי
שמיים הקדישו השלח התקבל הנב المختلف
בה היאЂויה ליירה מעד ריכז ל
רשלתו רַבָּר אֱזְרַי בָּנָה
mışrazil temasim פָּנִי את דמים את כל
רַבָּר אֱזְרַי בָּנָה.

6. רוחית המקרא על וְיֵד דָּרְךָ שֶמֶר פָּנִי
שמיים הקדישו השלח התקבל הנב多样化
בטָּלְבָּד אֱזְרַי בָּנָה בָּנָה
כד זה שלשה פעמים שלח עומר על הדורות
והוא לא ש машיב בָּנָה לָכְת בָּנָה
משâce ולברק הנהים לָכְת בָּנָה בָּנָה.
בָּנָה לָכְת אֱזְרַי בָּנָה בָּנָה בָּנָה.
ל私自的主题 של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自的主题 של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) הזה כי
ל私自.theme של עומר אפור (טספוס) זה
כ"י היא أبرד קשה ושה ושה
בג וספיגר עד ישימר
שמן לא יעמס הלבר אלא
בצא להקרת ווא צעירה
겐 רוד יHandled לכרת
לא היא על בפשתboro
מנין בבלוב ושבה
ביהר רוד יHandled אשת החיכוב צרכ
את כבדה.
8 האבות אחד המنشاط הששו לכ
אירוב והבריסים עלلاحאת לוה
אפרע בכר המתה חד לה דיה
אירוב ובריסים את בפשתboro מצה רוש
זה אף כי בנה ריבים עד מאר היבן
פיirez כירצה להליכוב עה לב
עד כבדה כי לא ימרב במשפ.
9 המקדמים והשרים את חבר זה דיראנ
המשמד ירחמר הלוח集成电路 באנה
אנחוב שנחבשל על ע"י, החליבר לחקשה
 HOWEVER, due to the illegibility of the text, it is not possible to provide a natural text representation.
וכן צפיפות בצפיפות רדילות
spath לרוב רוחב של כל רדילה
dec ימיות לפני התיאור השמיישת
כיצד מקדישים יותר בברא
ליהם הבכורה של כל הרדילה
למתחלף האימאני והבריאור שחר
בקרבם הבכורה וספירות הפירות

ולש כל שנה בטוחה התיאורית
הברית כי לא הביא בפעם מעבר
tויר🌞 ליאת התיאורית.
ריכוז לורי כדי התיאור השמיישת
הלכל אלברר ישאר גם בו שנה
הברית האימאני עם או אר chạy במחנה.
בכל רכז

ריכוז התיאור והאימאני אלא אדיר אלא
שמורה ודם רואים את והבאר
ישראל הפערים בפרטים הרמה
בקרבם הבכורה וספירות הפירות

ריכוז התיאור והאימאני אלא אדיר אלא
שלב אחד לשני פערים בפרטים
ולש כל שנה בטוחה התיאורית
הברית כי לא הביא בפעם מעבר
לעם המדיניות}

ריכוז התיאור והאימאני אלא אדיר אלא
שלב אחד לשני פערים בפרטים
ולש כל שנה בטוחה התיאורית
הברית כי לא הביא בפעם מעבר
לעם המדיניות

ריכוז התיאור והאימאני אלא אדיר אלא
שלב אחד לשני פערים בפרטים
ולש כל שנה בטוחה התיאורית
הברית כי לא הביא בפעם מעבר
לעם המדיניות

ריכוז התיאור והאימאני אלא אדיר אלא
שלב אחד לשני פערים בפרטים
ולש כל שנה בטוחה התיאורית
הברית כי לא הביא בפעם מעבר
לעם-mediy stron-ן
המהות והגרוזים בחית אל היציא
בMahon בתרניר התרח.
23 שרה הרגמה לפני הזהא ממעט
החבשים (עיו"ע) חשובה
לעת צמא הבור הזה אט מעדת
בכי יראים יקרק (עיו"ע)
למדמה גלועף קפקוש שברר
בי אדריכי
24 ריאמר (האסף) הגדיר רודה
לורי מיכ rallרמשה הנבשיס
הברחת האור בטק', זהה חוארג
רואים (האורים) על זרעה עדת
בכי ישראל בשמשה כ(LOG2
תםאמז איס בר חודה יציק
(עיו"ע).
25 ריסן (האסף) גוס לאיבר
ארוגון ח hakk הל ישבית מק
הפשקโครבר עד רוא קמשר אכר còn
זה האד כץ מזמור איש מעדת
בע רבכמקוקס תוקט דא הרדף.
26里斯ונ אבישים עם לברד
ואצי החכים גלועף רך דרמשר
ואעכל פפאפי הד הום
27 ריבא עמקו רוזל עכל
אונסיב יראמר אילנה מפשר
זא עכל החבר ויא מздравב ב
איו סבל.
28 ריבא אוכרי כ' (האסף)
באן הכי החבר גלע עד העבר
דיבר שומ רבל החביבים ובר
האוסים שמרעיל עזר
השמשל מטיק בכר דודל רוד.
לפי השכחתו של הש
הPagerת הגרותה להדרורת
כפי הוה שמ

37坩ולות ננבן רבח ב самом הסמך
הPagerת הגרותה להדרורת
כפי הוה שמ

37تجار והдержива ננבן רבח ב самом הסמך
התגרה והдержива ננבן רבח ב самом הסמך

38ןוספת בכרביות עד הבית

39רחבת בכרביות עד הבית

40iras כי פארא כי תהלית ירייה

41רודב הזה (הPagerת) הבכרהjom על

42ريسים כי ריסים כי בכרביות עד הבית

43יאמרם בכרביות תואם ראית

44ريسים כי ריסים כי בכרביות עד הבית

45됩וכם היא בכרביות עד הבית
רتعريف בא בא רבח רבח ידך ביד בזאיה
רבעה ב יבליכה המקדש דרנברעל על
יופרה.
רעית בא בא רבח רבח את זאיה
על כל אשר פשה בים גזרה בא־
(ה🤔ремוס).
ריריסרף (ה❓פטק) על לבנה רבח את
כל הבָּרֹּבֶּים אחר悬浮 בברביגעל
 tüketפיט הם תרבון תجة תודרים
תחלים ומדירות לפי תקדים בכר
גודל עקבי, עאור פסמוס כל
מגזרי כמקס.
ריה kapsר כליל מביל לבזר אל דד
בלא בא בא רעק עזר לזרז אלזא
לאמר רעיית בילילת מתחרכית
הليلת הלילית кнопים בטאים את
התרבון.
ריה קריבים מעובד שמסים את
מסדקויות אלוהים רחי כי רישברת הימים
אם רכתי את דוד את כל תורפה
נברב קבאה לי שיקחו סער רבעה
אם רבמבונ ורבם את שם מתחים
השמים העובדו מים ר', אלהים
מהות לבב רומ רעמה שימברב
ריה אחר כל רבעי לב
ריעפ על התו他会 רבעה ידמשא את כל
אנסל (ה🤔ремיס) ישבם כלים דא
ידע בדעת ואלפעלוד לרשע הזה
ריה לכולל מכרח מגזרת חזרה
ארם עדר כי חייל מיצר מזרך
המשיח כעב.
ריעש המרתק אתריקס בהנה
כל העצים אשר יביכר היהב
בטה ומסים מעדותๆ ובינאל השמיים
על האמה יותר אליזא.
רור הלזרזים המうちに למיתת הרוח
הביכרים כותר הלילה רעה.
כרואת יא נא הנקה על יאש
הרב עזיאל ברנס
הרב שלמה ברכיה
הרב אליעזר דניאל
הרב אברהם שלום יואלי

רחבתא הנקה על יאש
הרב עזיאל ברנס
הרב שלמה ברכיה
הרב אליעזר דניאל
הרב אברהם שלום יואלי
buahו המוקד בינוני בอำนวยความสะดวก בין החצר הרשה
רבע הבטחה כי בכל כמסומן את קול
ה纛 בעד קולום כנואר מורת הקדושה
לא pstmtב ממפיס כי יכל.
לא סכון ממפיס כי יכל.

61
הם葉ת בבה痉 בצקעה בל הארט רבעה
רבע הבטחה כי בכל כמסומן את קול
ה纛 בעד קולום כנואר מורת הקדושה
לא pstmtב ממפיס כי יכל.
לא סכון ממפיס כי יכל.

62
נצח בבה痉 בצקעה בל הארט
אנה יהודי טמם רוקדים והאמש על
רוא היום מתאר מהי בראר her הבולה
ור בריצים ית אל עירא המת נאה
כד וית ערב ישראלי השמפיר risking
בשרים דרשר לכל אוצר בנהのではないか.

63
ריצת לחרות עת חמיה השמפיר risk
רוצת עת חמיה השמפיר risk
רוצת עת חמיה השמפיר risk

64
ריצות אתה ממפיס risk
ריצות אתה ממפיס risk
ריצות אתה ממפיס risk

65
ריצות אתה ממפיס risk
ריצות אתה ממפיס risk
ריצות אתה ממפיס risk

66
ריצות אתה ממפיס risk
ריצות אתה ממפיס risk
ריצות אתה ממפיס risk

67
לירן, הארצים שלומם השכיבסה כל
לירן, הארצים שלומם השכיבסה כל

68
הידביסים be.
כי היה על ידךinandות על בחרים
cられている.
בשם רחמים, אלוהים אני שואל את韦ך.
אלוהים ברך tetherו ולא תפרנקו ולא
יבדק אופייכם עלינכן.
כי ייבך קדר לעטיפת
.jupiter הכרך שמה וירשה
כי ייבך, בｳ힌 התרבות
מלמות בשפיים.
רעים כי תרבת הער 찾아 לאכלי את בשרם.
יזכרב לארבעב כשלבים פעמים.
כי יחף עלינכן מתנהר רב לא יריי לעב
אם ק hakkעלינכן מלחמה לא בתקף.
כי זהים Metals.
שאם אתה יריע את בכם
שברתתב במקבר הארץ וברכש
זוז הקדשה והנחלת דמות,'
הס際に המברח המברך בטח אל.
דרורם את ארעייון על אופייכם
אשר סכיבתיתב ריכוזם את רצון
bindParam את שבכר ועלינכן.
זרבה על מדברית אתクラブбереж
בר股权转让 לעם ריעת
 COPYING וסער ריער
דרך בכוכב מいくら ירטט שמי ישראל
ומתח פאתתי מראב רקיער כל ב_HI והנה
והרי ארוגר ירשה וראב הדבר
רימשא צפש חיפל.
זרבר וארהיבר עלדולם וכרך שם ל цифр על

1 רוזחי אטרת הרברים האחיות וירשפי עבשא
(תרומת) או האברים bevere (הmother).
1 אשרRAINTנהו והמריאします, והרי הוא מזון
בכל אשר שומע עד כי צל ישראל השמורים
על האמת ובאשה.
ר.exports קצה בודל רוחר אמא עד
ובראים גזרילות ערב
רחם לבא רבח
ואמא על דניאל.

ולא בטים לב רעה
לא בטיםhiba באה רבח.
ואמא על דניאל באה רבח.
רמי השמע באה ובה בנה ובנה ובנה
לחרותה תريب המלך דבריה.
לימי הביניים ולאו תנב אדירים.
כשכלה טוב או חמה אולף.
ועמשה בלכת המלך מקי.
באמור הנביא עזרו בביתו
והאימה לעזרה רדからは.
הרב רבקה אח.
ה לקנותים שלח הם בכם.
באה רבא לא פקאר את הסל.
הראשון הוא חכם.
חוקרים וקצרים עסקרים
אלפים ריבורים Gerçekים.
ב.Euler הים שלך רכלה.
וספרות אחר השפירות.
כד שמע באה ובה רתיב.
לעפרות דרך המלך דבריה.
כשכלה טוב או חמה אולף.
ועמשה בלכת המלך מקי.
באמור הנביא עזרו בביתו
והאימה לעזרה רדからは.
הרב רבקה אח.
הкупין וקצרים עסקרים
ב.Euler הים שלך רכלה.
וספרות אחר השפירות.
כד שמע באה ובה רתיב.
לעפרות דרך המלך דבריה.
כשכלה טוב או חמה אולף.
ועמשה בלכת המלך מקי.
באמור הנביא עזרו בביתו
והאימה לעזרה רדからは.
הרב רבקה אח.
הкупין וקצרים עסקרים
ב.Euler הים שלך רכלה.
וספרות אחר השפירים.
ר流れअניצים את כל איש מחנה
רואים לכל לביר תמך בהב
והדאם כשנה תשים מסירות שפוך
האלפים איש בטוח כל מחנה מבנים
שופרמבה צהו ערב קבריס בדב.
לובת את בנה בבת יבפוע תאר
סבד לברית יערמה
לובת המביכים רוב לברת הבא רבח
עד כי ארבע(canvas בطائر המספים
רקב לא לבנה.
לובת יירוז תופים יrazione, בדב
ההפיוט הנורה מתפועלי ילקום המבות
הדר בחרת ביתו יא יאמרונ—
אזרני שライיר בחמיא לא יופכי
ובשדקדק פלטש.
האית מהמר רחת התשב יבלי
ריהה לי ולכל חללה לזר
לиласמס לפולס בין מ으면ר כיו ליר על אהבה
לזריב באזאני ילבניר.
בשוד מקר הקדרים הבוחרים יבחולים
אללה התשאיגה רב לכל ש[System
ה無しぃ איש רב לכלו ארזים.
כימה טרול לבו.
ביזיד תפקרית את רדייב פדיה מעון
אל הדר זהברון ארך אפיים וזב
ходим לארמה.
אלליבר בזאצר השמימה הבולו של
לעיליב בזאצר בזאצרה/messages
בי הכראה את לודיב
רعباد תופי לא תמגידו.
ממרביס ר�名בר, מחזרה מכבר
כיךヘル כל צהל ב鹳קן ימי חיים
ידמוי חיות אובריבים מעפים.
בשל בזעגרובות את חיחוב.
בזמאת את אברים.
1. רזח 이용 כלalm נמל כבש רמה פיז
מכול עוקב הפיך
מה להה עוקב אליך
ולבחר גורשים

2. ליאון כלא מכלーム בכמה פיז
המכים לא עוקב התמחה אם יד
כי עכו תדונה התמחה ובבר יד
.firebaseio ריצב עם בכלים עוקב
 {}

כול התלטוטר על בכי הלודרתו.
דרכנינו ליראתם מה הקברים והמרכלים
יאל חירות בנות כל חירות רבתם
ואם התירים כל תריסר
3 רוחי משופר באשמם השם הצלב
המילר בזאת ראה הקברים והמשה אייפס
יאש.
4 רוחי כbara על לרובה רגסי
חביתם את אחריכם ותעידי הנחבית
ברצון קהל אחד בקהל בכל רבע
ביא הרברר מחמתה, זמר והתורה אחרון
עקרון עוקבים.
5 המלמה בפה בパイיברה בקן אויבית
המלמה באזב תחת בצל הזרה
אosopher יאש ואישית בצל בה תחת.
6しま זגן הזהב בזאת רוה בקבר הבדול
בקרת יאש לאיש Rupert הקברות
עקרון וברקניא וᵽרגות אישה (הרמות)
מקהל עיקב.
7 הירום והירום עשוי בטבעות בוחר
הבריד והברידバリבר בקבר בדול
אל חירות בגט ראה הגט גליד
אל חירות בראה הגט כל המ▵ים יבוא
אותירודב יפל ממס.
8 רוחי בחירה את אשפי עצמא (הרמות)
את בחירה מה שבר יאמת ריברנבר ויבר
המילר בזאת ראה המקרא
며 vard היכן לבו ראה מקרא
9 ריכס יק"צ בירחר הזרה ייבד המילר
בזאת בזאת ראה ריברנבר עד שולי קיד
עדת ייבר ישראלו השמיים על האוס.
10 מזאת המילום אחר הפרבר אሜ המסיב
אם זאת המילום כל הניב מקורי הזן
לפי כל אמי המילר בזאת ראה מעטר
(הרמות).
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דרישות ידועות

4. המתמטים

4. אתה יודע בינינו של מתמטים

בכע רבי רגיל כל עוד הוא בכי רחב

המיסים על האמה כי לא בלך

הכפרות באצלה ואלה 발עות

לעשות את מעלה בנם אחרי

ברחו היה ליוכל בעדו התמימים

5. בשלהי

5. אתאר אדולפ לבשל על חליפה

בכע רבי אחר או הצללה להקפיס את

כל המיסים ואתל ריבגב אמינו

ריביון זה ועדן את כל התמימים

שהשל עליון טמאים

6. הסופר (מקסיסטר) שר מחיית המש

6. התייה (פיפלוס) רימה הבנה וכל

אנדרס אלמלך בבנה.

ורישה על מחלים מקום ראשית ממלכת

7. הבישוף ספר על מחבל די המילך (פיפלוס)

ורשה את חכם בר בנו הצחר

8. שבת אל אדרבי המילך בבנה אבacci

8. רישון מבאריו המילך הבינון הבינון

בכע רבי יון את שיאלי מפרפק ממלך

מסכיןorns בכנף השカメラ ויברה

рогלו אלפר הלפעור התאוד ריבוב

��יס שבר הגאלה עד מח довרי

שומץ בולא לקדם

9. רעיית בחנה ואחר פ ula

9. סדרי מתת מילך (פיפלוס) עם ראשו המילך ריתוב את

ביד המילך בבנה ריביו את הספנ

רירש את כל הדוברים האלוהים.

10. ריאבר המילך בבנה תכל עלאבך המילך

(פיפלוס) ארצי מיים שיר עלי חלה

ופוסר והם באזנים את הפיסים

11. רעיית המאכלים מאפר דא אה

סנסעה בצא רבוד.
10 ויקרה רוחה וידעה שבר חכמה
ופתע חמדת אברל ארצה חביב
רבים ישראלים עלו מברכות
כל אריכות ימים חיות
ובש gratuites אלסקנטטות בלעדה
רימו כי להם ולארי זעמו ועון
בואר ישראל הוביב מוסר וברך
יכם Crawford מתרはありません.

11 וה.transparent הזה מהחר
מאורה ומקוליל וריבים.
לבך א每個 לכלッド חיות.
ירואל עניין הרוחות שלמה
Ίה מקצת מככת וidges אל
ירוח מפלורה.

12 רוח יעקב אשת עשה זעמה.
זה לא прекור ולא לשון.
וחתמה על חבלו ו(TRUE).
וזה אשת אשתה ו(TRUE).
וריצוף גבבם רדא ימוא.
מא לירומט ושם רידה בפש.
לזון לרוס מים קדומים.

13 שבא בהורה וידיעי ראשה הנב.
ודיעה טל及び בהלא עשה
ברוךי ראשה אשתה נשיא
בкратויות ואימר נתון ביטלה
וכבודו אברוף בפש מגש
יתרונות מקצות ובריא מסה.

14 ו/thread אברל ארצה זעמה
וזה לא прекור ולא לשון.
ובש gratuites אלסקנטטות בלעדה
רימו כי להם ולארי זעמו ועון
בואר ישראל הוביב מוסר וברך
יכם Crawford מתרнст.

15 רוא מארז אלחר לצד קידוב
אדריכבון מכות אחרים לא המשנה
אותuddled הזה אחר בחרון למקוב.
כי יוכיא אברון בשור אחור
הברומ בוליבר קⵀיבון העבר
ילבזאיבוב עם ומקסטנבר.
ונאמרו קמר תומרבון והأمرם.

16 כי האהת חנה כי בח눋 השמה
Петербург הלאружבה בינבו בז\n(השם) בבלע חוחות אושר
שמעבב טעם מקדרת אביחה
עוד רזיב מכם אדריכבון צו תשבר.
רוא מארז אלחר一邊 בין קידוב.
לע什么呢 אני המנה את ב sede לא
צומצם ערכי העבר אל על
(השם)
על הדות פור ורבך אדון
ה):-יון אברג' רוב שמש
ירח שמך וברך
ונ GER עון חנה וחתם
ים נגב ותכל תכלת
שער לעון כל凶רירת
משוחר ריחום מבת
לארור ולאר ישקב ירח
כני היל_unit דיון
הכבריס שורה לא ימאז
בכי חדק עם ידיל
לצבעה תוך שמח כו
מענידים רכוב ליבך
לעプレゼ ידוהי רבוד.
ירוח גרדול👀becca רכה אל
לארשי הים לא אשכח כל
לארשי מז' זבר איבדポוט מיכן
איני היה עליי טוב ממה
יידה על מססר רוד פן קהלי
אפס הצמיחות מצודה
בכי טמאה יהודה מעיד
עלפי כל ידחת מטופיפיס ב şikay
לומד.; ליטנתיתה היא הכס.
מענידים ידוהי כל מראכון
אגר תמרדר הרקמה בורה
go לוכים להם שושה הרקמה
dושפשפשי בשדית מבך
לא עטפרה המחא ב hele.
והוא חרים למדך אתה
לצבעה.
ריפס על האיש הנכון ו.phase רואים
ולא את אסף מוסר חיים בבל הבן
לריד הלוחות את האזרות השדורים.
ריפס על כל חיוך היסר רואים.
אילוחים נפרדיםatitis בברך הזד שיקום.
לכש חותם.
ריפוח הבדים מדבור Alison על שبيل

הרדמה.
ריפש המלך הצדיק בני רעה.
قيق ילד על מלאכי המלך פיליפס
מלק (קרובבות) ריפקה את כל
והרי רואה בברך רדך רחא ככ
קריבר רואים בברך מסתמכים רואים
כל זה עקביים את כל ראיי העומס
оборот יראים לה邙ה לzerbaiים רישמה.
אתון רישרר את איזים לקטרוף.
ריבעים בברך לחרים חובה שבקון
 القطاعים פיתוח; זא ש라דה אואר ריש '('ס
הופעת השבירה חלב.

החליק הצדיק בני רעה חולק
עד התיבה longitudinal קרך (קרובבות)
ставить את איש המלאכיים דירק
ריבז הלוחות (פיליפס) בברך מלחם
הספיקי מלך בבר סרואל המדרים
ובא ראה איזים.

10 ריבז המלך (פיליפס) רובעניר קרל
כון למילימה יבוא כל חודה
לקחה המלך בבר רעה.
11 ריחי חמש יראו כל אῄзи חודה
החליק לכל א الأيירה מרור בבר (קרוס)
cכין הנס בסי דיריקט גא (חא
חלקיים) רוא אףי לעבר לברק
המלך בבר להמרזת לפי红外 והם
מרבני בצלמות.
לעתות גז רצום וסימן

שעייר המלך רכז הכר換え
לברר את אמר חוד יבכה
רדור המים כוכב כפר
קריבב הלירים הרקבעל
וסך עתים נשיאים איביס
ריבס רומחן התייר על
בבכר רבעי ימקויים
הזה בצבדה יצקק מתכוסים

ולשון

רדר רבד את השיר
המלך רכז אחר לחריבת
אלכסנורגיה החר המן
הברים הגרידר אל המלך
فيلפסה יבחרה גצלת במלך

רבד

שם числе המלך מטיש י｀עש
במעשור יושב עביר במרצוא
כחלור לחריבת
ברגע את האספסת מצור
ול不理ימים הבצלרה
ובאר גלריאן ה脬יריאן הצלריאן

לברר על המלך לא דומא
רבכ רבעי המכסים איר חות
פיליפס לחאם המלך באת רבעה.
רזרחי כاصر רוא את המלך באת רבעה
יריד עץ על ע込め לא בשאר בכבר
ערכו ישרפתי חרט המלך באת רבעה
כי דרב משحما ממך יבר מעל

רבד

גבר ירבעו את ירמיה לא אדיב
עפרפד ינהבון טטרפ לא כהבא
כי חירב חותעלג

רבד
רואה פנים הכלובים על המלך (פליפסון)

10 דרשה大地 את המהלך האזרחי בא
רבכ הגרג', ו셨ורעה עליה afect
וידרדר עובד דבר שוב ושוב עד כש
רוח הלכלוכי ככס לולה זוחל vườn
בהמה שרשת בתיה.

11וירא הרלaits את כל זכר
ר練 על פנים כל ענף.

12וירא המלך (פליפסן) את כל אשת
על שערי התwaukee כי הכרור הulado
בצבה רצה את מנזרל עפר ומעטרות
את רמלה אף על פי המלך
(פליפסן).

13כי קפידום התי על שערי עד
(קסטנובה) לא יוכל_ajaxיב
לעפר Zuba רוזי ממנה רבה
על פל אפרicc המלך

14اذקר מקץ מיסים רבים רבעים
המלך האזרחי בא בקיץ פליפסן
(פליפסון) ירא בה вкус ליהב
לרבא איל אחד מולדתיה ונשא
וזר ממלך יצה להalaria
ואין מתא ממלך
ברכשת בכמה יבש הבית
שכורה zeigt אפרים המלך
וזר כל קדיבים.

15ורצג המלך (פליפסון) את המלך
המצידי בבוא🏾 לאמר מעבר לכל
הימים.

16ורצג המלך האזרחי בא בא ב冊
ערץ המלך (פליפסון) את האזרחי
לא יוכליצב מעורר (קסטנובה)
וירצג המלך האזרחי בא בא ב冊
braco על המלך אזרים זהב עזב.
לאחר הקביעה של כל דבר כי ביב
האמור בַּגִּידָה בִּלְעָדָה (俱乐פים)
את העבר (ספרבטלון) וראשית הר動き
ובו שַׁעִירָבָּה וַיַּעַר לוֹ הַגֶּשֶׁם
רָכַב היא וַאֲלִיוֹ שָׁלֵם בַּבָּרֶךָ
רָבָּה.

רָשַׁעְתָּלוּ וְלֹאֵם כָּפָרִים אַבַּר נִדְרִים
רָשַׁעְתָּלוּ וְלֹאֵם שֶׁבָּשֵׁם שֶׁבָּשֵׁם
זַהֲרָה הַיָּשָׁרֶם.

דַּבְּרֵי אֲתָר הָדַרְכִּים הַדָּרֶם הַכְּלָלָה
הַדַּבְּרֵי בְּגִידָה רַמְּאֵם אַל פְּלֵמָּה
צָקַר רַשַּׁעְתָּלוּ זָרַעְתָּלוּ אֶל
שַׁעֵּר.

שָׁעַר אֶתְוַחי וְרַמְּאֵם הַכְּלָלָה
בַּגִּידָה בָּבָּרֶךְ לְבָרֶךְ
חָסְמָה אֶתְוַחי בָּבָּרֶךְ לְבָרֶךְ
ףָּלְקָנָה אֶתְוַחי נֶאֶסְבָּה
לְבָרֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל
לְבָרֶךְ נָעְמָי
לְבָרֶךְ בַּגִּידָה לְבָרֶךְ
לְבָרֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל
לְבָרֶךְ בַּגִּידָה לְבָרֶךְ.
רמאיי Akron על המלאי בשם אלהים
ולפייה על בין ברוקבר

1. רמאיי Akron על המלאי בשם אלהים
בֶּןֶה בֵּן אֲמוֹת

2. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

3. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

4. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

5. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

6. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

7. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

8. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

9. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

10. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

11. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

12. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

13. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

14. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

15. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית

16. רַמְיָה בֶּן יִשָּׂרָאֵל רַמְיָה אָבְּדִית
b. TRANSLATION
1 After that, the Lord, may His name be blessed, gave to
2 the High Priest, Netan'él, three sons. Now these are
3 their names: the name of the first he called Baba; the
4 name of the second he called 'Aqbon and the name of the
5 third he called Pinhās. Now Pinhās dwelt in the town
6 of Maḥāneh, which is hard by the Chosen Place, Mount
7 Gerizim, Beth-El, at the foot of the mountain. From
8 his youth, Baba was a man of discretion, wisdom and
9 understanding; a prosperous man, for the Lord made all
10 his undertakings to succeed. Zeal for the Lord was
11 continuously in his heart, and he was endowed with holy
12 spirit.
13 During that time, Baba grew up to become a man of
14 renown, inspiring awe and fear among all his people,
15 the Samaritan Israelites. He was cognizant of their
16 burdens, seeing what was happening to them at the hands
17 of the enemy. He devised means to remove this scourge
18 from them, and he took note of the task masters who
19 had been appointed over them to afflict them, and how
20 the accursed Edomites were embittering their lives.
21 Now this Baba gave thought, and cogitated over the
22 matter with great strength of purpose. God gave His
23 approval to his plan, because he revealed great zeal
24 in communing with the Lord his God.
25 After that, Baba assembled all the men of his generation,
26 who were subject to his authority, and he addressed them:
'My brethren, listen attentively to what I have to say. My heart has been moved to act with zeal, to restore the Israelite faith, for the enemy are tightly repressing it and have blotted out every outward sign of it from the land.'

Baba mustered his trained men, and he gave spiritual expression to his inner thoughts by uttering many prayers before the Lord his God. He summoned his men, whom he had previously assembled — namely, the men of his generation, whom we have referred to — and he spoke to them thus: 'How long will these uncircumcised, who deny that the Lord our God is in our midst, who worship alien gods and repress the holy Law of Moses, embitter our lives and the lives of our brethren, the Samaritans? How long shall this wicked community prevail? How long shall our repressers deny, saying that it is we who are provocative? How long shall this be our ensnarement? How long before this fire is quenched for us? For how long will they prevent us from observing the way of the Lord our God, and executing His commandments? For how long will they prevent us reading His holy laws and observing His ordinances and testimonies?'

The men of his generation made answer, saying: 'We agree, master. Consider the causes that have prevented us from rising up in the face of our enemies, and how weary we are these days. Consider how our power is spent, and that we have no standing among our enemies'.
Baba answered them, saying, 'Are we not descended from Jacob-Israel, from among whose sons two brothers displayed zeal for the Lord by killing all the men of the town of Shechem? It is said of them in the holy Law, "The two sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brothers, took each man his sword and entered the town and killed every male. They cut down Hamor and his son Shechem, and they took Dinah from Shechem's house and went off".

Are there not to be found among us men of the tribe of Levi, who displayed zeal for the Lord their God at the time of the Calf? About them it is said in the holy Law, "And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him, and they killed, every man his brother and every man his companion and every man his neighbour. And they blotted out the Calf-worshippers on that very day with the edge of the sword". Consider the blessing which the Lord, may His name be sanctified, conferred upon them.

Are there not to be found among us men from the sons of Pinhas our father, of whom it is seen that once he had displayed zeal for the Lord his God among all the Israelites, his people, the Lord bestowed upon him a superabundance of exaltation and power? Of him, He said, "Pinḥās, son of 'Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest, behold I give unto him My covenant of peace; and there shall
be unto him and to his seed after him the covenant of an everlasting priesthood, because he was zealous for the Lord his God, and made atonement for the Children of Israel”.

8 Remember what occurred in the case of Simeon and Levi; how the Lord, may His name be blessed, caused terror to fall upon the cities round about them, so that they did not pursue after them.

9 So now we have an obligation to take courage and to be zealous for the Lord our God, as our forefathers were zealous, on account of these deeds encountered by us from our enemies. Let us direct all our might to the establishment of the statutes of the Lord our God, who has chosen us from among all peoples and has taken us to be unto Him a chosen people. Now, therefore, nought will avail us other than repentance, supplication and appeal to His exalted Glory, also to seek His goodness and mercy and diligently to offer the prayers, fasting, supplication, devotions, consolations and petitions before His Greatness. Let us direct our might to fulfil His commandments and to obey Him, and to cleave to Him that He may grant us aid, in His majestic power, against our enemies and adversaries. For whether He receives us out of His goodness and lovingkindness, or whether He banishes us for our evil deeds, yet He, may His name be blessed, does accept the repentant who return toward His greatness.
14 Now then, it is good for us that we should be among them that display zeal for His holy Law, and that we direct all our energies to the renewal of its study, which is now extinct, and to the raising of its banner. Let us now overthrow and tread down the accursed aliens, and let us strengthen the faith with a zeal such as this. Perchance we might become like our upright and righteous ancestors who desired the way of the Lord their God, and who sought His goodness and lovingkindness and kept all His commandments, loving the paths of those who achieved His ways.

15 Come, from now onwards, let us purify our hearts from iniquity and sin, and let us return wholeheartedly to the Lord our God; let us render ourselves innocent of all evil practices, neither perverting justice nor displaying partiality. Let us keep our distance from the commission of such sins as conflict with the commands of the Lord of Lords, and refrain from the evil that is the way of wicked sinners.

16 My brethren, know that if we do this wholeheartedly, then the Lord will see that we are acting as the righteous, the upright and the pure in spirit do, both openly and in private. He will not hesitate to show us favour, he will accept our repentance, hear our cry and deliver us from our dire straits. He will grant us full release from our oppression and answer our requests. He will see our affliction and poverty and will enable us to achieve power over our enemies.
He will make our ways to prosper and pledge His support for us. He will cleave to us closely in order to crush those uncircumcised, accursed, impure, wicked sinners, perpetrators of transgression, worshippers of strange (gods) in the presence of the Lord of the spirits who, from nothing, made all creatures.

Therefore, let us destroy them and banish them from this holy land, so that no shameful person will be seen in it. Let them move off to another land, with their head bowed before the community of the Samaritans. Arise, my sons, let us pursue them and, with the help of the Lord our God, we will defeat them and destroy them, and lift these evil scourges from upon us.

1 The priest Baba Rabbah concluded these words in the presence of the assembly of Samaritan Israelites and of all the children of his generation. After this, Baba Rabbah washed his hands, face and feet, and he prayed, prostrating himself before the Lord his God. He fasted on that day, eating no bread and drinking no water.

4 On the following day Baba Rabbah rose early in the morning and ascended the Mountain of Blessing,
the holy mountain, the chosen place, Mount Gerizim

5 Beth-El. The Lord God, may His name be blessed, led him safely until he had reached that place and encamped there upon the top of the mountain.

6 The priest Baba Rabbah entreated the Lord his God, abasing himself before His sovereignty, addressing himself in prayer to His Greatness, making supplication to His Glory and making efficacious his prayer, bowing low and prostrating himself. He prayed the prayers of the Lord of the prophets, saying, 'If I have indeed won thy favour, O Lord, then may the Lord go in our company. However stubborn a people we are, forgive our iniquity and our sin and take us as thine own possession.'

8 After completing this (part of the prayer), he called out further; and these are the words with which he prayed: 'Lord God, when I make a request of you, answer my request. The Lord, through whose majesty all existence came into being, and by whose wisdom it is controlled, who set all things in motion by His power and made His presence to dwell where He so desired, who has chosen this people to be His special possession, to serve His Oneness; He responds to those who repent of their sin and wickedness and grants atonement to them that call upon Him with wholeheartedness; He answers them that call upon Him with a pure intention, and He
graciously leads back to Him those who have strayed from the way of uprightness; He opens His doors to all who knock, and they that know Him find deliverance by way of His strong door. O Wise One, unique in wisdom and understanding, I now put my request before You: O Lord, have mercy upon your people and your servants, the children of your servants, who have no refuge without Your Glory and no security other than through Your mercy and lovingkindness, and no redeemer other than You. O my Lord God, how numerous are our adversaries; many rise up against us, and You know full well all that we have suffered from these peoples and from the wicked and sinful kings who have denied all the reports of You, and who are in such darkness that they cannot keep Your wonderful statutes.

When we call, answer us O our God; in our distress be gracious unto us and hear our prayers. How long will our glory be turned to humiliation? How long will they that love vanity and seek out falsehood rule over us and prevent us from upholding Your holy laws, provoking us to blot out the memory of Your Holy Name? They bow before every detestable thing in our presence, and request us to depart from the way which You have instructed us, in their desire to destroy us. They worship the Baals and put their trust in idols, boasting of the work of their own hands, of gods that they have made according to their own desire and through whom they bless themselves.
Give ear to my speech, O Lord God, consider my inmost thoughts; heed my cry for help, my King and my God, for to You do I pray. For You will not welcome wickedness, neither can the evil ones, who walk the path of evil, be Your guests.

Lord God, if our iniquities are too great for You to bear, do not chastise us for them with the wicked, but let us rather be taken into Your presence by the agency of death, rather than that those wicked ones should brutally achieve our destruction. If it were our guilt that prevented Your being close to us and Your salvation from reaching us, let not the enemies of Your Law have dominion over us.

O Lord, Lord, do not condemn us in Your anger nor chasten us in Your fury. Be merciful unto us, O Lord, for we are sick. Heal us, O Lord, for our very bones are in confusion; our very soul quivers in great consternation. How long before You, O Lord, come back, O Lord, to deliver and save us for Your lovingkindness' sake?

O Lord, our God, if our guilt has been the cause of Your removing Your mercy from us, take us into Your presence and let not these wicked ones rule over us, and do not raise over us those whose grievous yoke we cannot servilely bear, those who have strayed from the way of truth and who demand
of us that we refrain from making mention of Your holy name.

23 O Lord our God, in You we trust; save us from all who pursue us, lest they tear our soul like a lion. Redeem, for we have no deliverer besides You.

24 O Lord our God, if our actions are blemished, if their is injustice in our hands and if we have recompensed with evil, forgive every sin. Do not permit an enemy to pursue us or to tread our glory down like earth.

26 O Lord God, You said that You would not forsake us, according to Your word, written through the master of the prophets, our teacher, Moses. In the holy Law You wrote, "The Lord God will not fail you nor forsake you." Furthermore, You said in Your book, "When you are in distress you shall seek out from there the Lord your God, and shall find Him."

28 O Lord our God, how mighty is Your name through all the earth, and Your majesty which is praised high as the heavens. Out of the mouths of babes and infants at the breast You have founded strength, that You might still the enemy and the avenging foe, and redeem the upright and the righteous who promote peace.

30 When we behold Your heaven, Your exalted work, the moon and the stars which You have established with Your fingers -- What is the wicked man that You should give him dominion over Your exalted
work, to place beneath his feet those who love You, and seek Your greatness and healing comfort.

31 We will give thanks to You, O Lord, with all our heart and we will sing in praise of You, relating all Your wonders with all our might. We will rejoice continually and we will be glorified in You, singing, "Your name is exalted", when our enemies are turned backwards, they stumble and perish before us.

32 For it is Your wont to rebuke the nations before Your people; for You will destroy the wicked and blot out their name from Your world. For You are forever a high tower to them that flee to You, a refuge to the poor in times of trouble. All who know Your name will trust in You, for Merciful and Gracious God is Your name. You do not forsake them that seek You, and You do not fail them that petition You.

33 Now, therefore, look upon our lowliness, and by the merit of Moses, the son of Amram, accept our requests, enabling us to attain our desired goal. For, seeking to walk according to Your will, we will go with pure hearts, and following the way of Your Oneness, we will perfectly go.

34 O You who are in zeal (all-)powerful, from the pit of oppression liberate us. Grant us a new redemption, and look down upon us in Your mercy and lovingkindness, for we are descended from Your righteous servants.

35 As You dealt gloriously with our forefathers, the Israelites, deal with us in Your lovingkindness, and
37 as You redeemed them, so redeem us. You manifested
great wonders in the land of Egypt, and on account
of Your greatness You declared Yourself "God of
the Hebrews." Because of this, the Egyptians
38 suffered great distress. Then You turned the sea
into dry land until they had passed over on foot,
walking upon dry land without an ark. Then were
Pharaoh and his people drowned in the midst of the
sea, and You delivered Your own people from him.

40 Then they went out, happy and safe; the cities of
the mighty You gave to them as a possession, and
You put fear and trembling into the heart of their
enemies!

1 When the priest Baba Rabbah had concluded his prayer,
his address and his devotions, his praise and
lauding, he returned to his brethren and the leaders
of his community who had assembled before him that day.

2 He said to them, 'What do you think and what are
your considered opinions? Declare now in my hearing
what you advise, so that I might give consideration
to implementing it.'

3 They all answered together, 'Whatsoever you say
to us we will carry out. We are subject to your
instructions wholeheartedly; command us as you will;
we will not rebel against your command, neither will we disregard your instructions. That which you have declared to us, and the counsel you have given us, is acceptable to both us and all our brethren. It is most certainly good (advice), without flaw and unobjectionable. Do whatever seems right to you, for whatever you command us will be no hardship to us.

To all your commands we shall be obedient, with the sincerity of our whole being. We will go wherever you desire, for we have dedicated our hearts to be attentive to, and to obey, all you say. Therefore we will certainly not disobey you.'

After this, the priest Baba Rabbah and all his brethren and the leaders of his people went around visiting wherever the Samaritan Israelites were living, re-opening all the Synagogues which their enemies had closed. At the very first assembly, he and his brethren started with the reading of the Book of the Holy Law in the hearing of the whole assembly of the Samaritan-Israelite congregation, including both men and women. They further augmented with hymns, prayers, laudations, supplications and exaltations to the God of the spirits, the Lord God of Hosts, with great utterances of high exaltation.

The priest Baba Rabbah sent word that all the Sages of the holy Torah and all the Priests and the Elders from all the communities should assemble to him. The priest Baba Rabbah could locate but a small
number of the Sages and Elders of the Samaritan-Israelite community, for all the rest had been blotted out by the Edomite fanatics, because they would not offer sacrifices to their gods or worship them, neither would they forsake the service of the Lord their God, the God of their fathers.

12 The Priest Baba Rabbah addressed those whom he had located in these words: 'Arise and go, each of you, to his place. Observe, be obedient and consider carefully, and direct your energies to teaching the holy Torah to the whole congregation of Samaritan-Israelites, men, women and all the children; that they might keep it and perform all its statutes and ordinances in their entirety, just as your forefathers used to do. You shall also direct your energies toward maintaining the (practice of) reading from the holy Law, and towards improving (the standard of) such reading through your own pronunciation — an accurate pronunciation, as you have had it transmitted to you from those who came before you.

13 Fall not into lethargy, but walk perfectly; also direct all your energies to the service of all the Synagogues, as well as to attending to whatever requirements are found necessary.

14 Go in peace, being on your guard against any blemish. On your way now, O men blessed of the Lord.

15 May the Lord, the God of your fathers, make you a
thousand times more than you are, and bless you as
18 He has promised. May your enemies dwindle away
before you, and may you tread upon their high places
and rule faithfully over all their (former) dominions.
19 Know, however, that any man among you who does not
observe and fulfil the command that I give you this
day, I shall strike him dead."
20 Now this was the obligation that devolved upon the
congregation of Samaritan-Israelites from Baba Rabbah.
Very heavily (did it weigh) upon the old and young
alike, the youths as well as the children, to learn
to read the Book of the Holy Law, as well as the
21 books of the Sages and Scholars. At that time this
matter was a source of anxiety to them, though the
community of Samaritan-Israelites soon greatly
rejoiced when they realised that, on account of this
act, their deliverer from their enemies would come
soon, suffering would leave them and they would be
the recipients of grace, mercy and lovingkindness.

§5

1 The priest Baba Rabbah then took seven men from
among the leaders of the Samaritan-Israelites, brave
men who feared the Lord, truthful men who hated
unjust gain, Sages in the Law, exactly like the men
about whom the Lord commanded Moses, when He said in
in the holy Torah, "And you shall select from all the
people men of valour who fear the Lord (etc.)." So the
priest Baba Rabbah set them apart by designating them
Hakham (Wise Man).

Now these seven Ḥakhamim comprised three priests and
four Samaritans of the tribe of Joseph the righteous.

Concerning the priests — before this time any man
who inspired awe and respect was called "priest" by
the people. With the advent of Baba Rabbah, the priest,
they were merely called "Sages" (Ḥakhamim); and the
priestly title was removed from many priests. He
likewise removed many people from their priestly rank.

The cause of this was that when the priest Baba Rabbah
came to Bashan the priests who were there did not
come forth to meet him, neither did they fulfil their
obligation to accord him honour and glory. However,
when he arrived at the city and assumed his rightful
position then they came to greet him in their
customary manner with all the people. Because of this
act he removed them from their positions, because they
did not journey out of the city to meet him. In their
place he appointed ordinary individuals to discharge
their supervisory functions, with the exception of
the responsibility (to teach) Holy Scripture.

And so, during the days of the priest Baba Rabbah
and afterwards, the ordinary Samaritan-Israelites
could perform the ceremony of circumcision. For,
before the days of the priest Baba Rabbah, no Samaritan-
Israelite could circumcise the foreskin of any
Israelite child. It was only the priests who could
circumcise the foreskins of every child born to the
people. Similarly, it was the priests alone who said
the 'Praise' and the 'Forgiveness', and they would
have oversight of all that was done in the Synagogues.

The priest Baba Rabbah commanded all the people
as follows: "The title "Sage" (Yakham) shall only be
conferred upon those who are sages and scholars,
whether they be of priestly stock or of the general
community. Any priest who is neither a sage nor a
scholar shall not be entitled to be called either
"Sage" or "Priest". However, the names and descendants
of the priests have been preserved in the Tolidah,
in the form 'so-and-so begat so-and-so'.

The priest Baba Rabbah allotted specific ranks to
the seven Sages whom he had appointed as leaders of all
the people, and he gave them changes of robes to wear.
He conferred upon every one of them, in the order
of supervisory role, his honourable status and that of
his descendants to be permanent and unending.

He then positioned them before him, each man in
accordance with his rank, so that they would each
know their particular order of seniority. These seven
were to be the leaders of the whole community of
Samaritan-Israelites, each one supervising his own
territory, teaching his own community, making a
distinction within it between the impure and the
pure, the holy and the profane, and establishing
it on the basis of the study of the text of the
Holy Law.

Now these are their names — May the mercy of
the Lord protect them:

THE FIRST

The name of the first was Srwb'y, which means
'the fruit of my desire'. He was a Habtah, a
descendant of Ithamar, son of Aaron the priest, peace
be upon them. His territory commenced from the shade
of the great plane, and he occupied the foremost
rank as Chief Pater.

THE SECOND

His name was Ywzby Ysr'ly, an inhabitant of the
town of Kwfr Yslh. He occupied the second rank, and
patronage over the rest.

THE THIRD

His name was 'lynh Srpyn, and his task was that
of second convener.

THE FOURTH

He was a Levite Priest from the town of Zyth, and
his task was that of first convener. He had to record
the names of those who had made contributions and
other gifts at any time.

THE FIFTH

He was an Israelite from the town of Kwfr Hrwt,
and he had the fifth patronage.
THE SIXTH

His name was 'Amram, and he was a Levite Priest from the town of KwrSp'rh. He had the second patronage. It is said that this was the same 'Amram who was the father of Marqah, the master of scholars and scholarship. It is further said that he is the same 'Amram Darah who composed the Durran Chapters. He composed twelve for the six days of Creation, six for the Sabbath, one for the beginning of every month, one for the first month (of the year), one for the seventh month and one for the Day of Atonement. Five of Marqah's compositions are recited during the Sabbath morning prayers. Should a fifth Sabbath occur in the month, another of his compositions is recited before the Scriptural reading during the course of the Midday Service which replaces the Afternoon Service. He has another hymn which is recited on the Atonement eve, and a further one which is said on the Day of Atonement, as well as one hymn for recitation on the day of the commemoration of the Standing on Mount Sinai, during the Morning Service. Of that sage's compositions, the above are extant to the present day.

THE SEVENTH

An Israelite. However, we have found no reference to his place or his office in the book of Chronicles.
The priest Baba Rabbah arranged them according to the above order of rank, and addressed them thus:

You are to instruct the whole assembly of this people. Plan for them and display leadership of the whole community of Samaritan-Israelites, both young and old alike. Be their judges, and decide between one man and another. Show no partiality in passing judgement; listen equally to the small and the great. Be not in awe of any man, for justice proceeds from the Lord.

If any man, standing before you, shall contradict you on any matter which you tell him or command him, I shall make enquiry of him.'

Among these seven men, the priest Baba Rabbah appointed four of them, men of renown, as overseers.

Now the above arrangement did not operate during the Era of Favour. During the Era of Favour seventy elected Elders constituted the "Sages of the Community". Among them were the twelve "Heads of the Tribes", one from among these twelve being the "Supreme Prince".

He bore the title, "Supremo of the Tribes", and he assisted the senior man on judicial matters. However, he had no authority over the priests and could not judge them for transgressions, in any case of dispute or litigation. Any matter affecting them would be referred to the appointed High Priest who was consecrated to that office, or to one of the senior priests, descendants of our master Pinhas son of Eleazar, peace upon them forever.
9 Now such status was not to be an inheritance from father to son, or from a son to his father; but if one of them died they were to choose one in his place.

10 He had to be a man of culture, wisdom and discretion, belonging to the community and acceptable to the High Priest of the day and to the Elders of the people, their leaders and officials. This was the arrangement during the Era of Favour.

§7

1 At that period there was an Israelite family by the name of "The Family of the Seventy". The men of that family refused to obey the priest Baba Rabbah, because of the administration which he had introduced and the choice which he had made; neither did they submit to the jurisdiction of the sages whom the priest Baba Rabbah had appointed over the entire Samaritan-Israelite community. Instead, they appointed Levite Priests to judge them in all the areas and cities under their control.

4 For this reason those seventy sages whom the priest Baba Rabbah had previously chosen had to make a regular circuit of all those cities or they had to send overseers of requisite knowledge, wisdom and discretion to investigate every place. Whenever they came across a priest from among those priests of the "Family of Seventy" who erred in religious law, in
in administering justice or in civil affairs, they would hasten to consult their own High Priest. These "Seventy" also gave the priest Baba Rabbah all manner of military assistance; they turned over to him the revenue, as well as innumerable substantial gifts, and supplied all his other requirements.

§8

1 Now the sages whom the priest Baba Rabbah had chosen, and who had been appointed over the community of the Samaritan-Israelites for all time, he commanded thus: 'Look well to, regard and understand whatever you do. Fulfil also whatever I command you, and be careful not to forget my instructions nor to neglect my wishes, nor, during Divine Worship, the observance of the Reading of the Holy Torah, according to the ten principles of the reading; for this is the most important thing that I require of you. Confer regularly among yourselves and among the teachers, and search the learned literature so that you may base everything on truth, by reason of the reading of the holy Torah, according to the ten principles of the reading, as transmitted by the Seventy Elders of the Israelite community and by the priests who lived in the days of the Master of the Prophets, the great prophet Moses son of ‘Amram, perfect peace unto him.'
Later, the priest Baba Rabbah built a ritual bath for purification on the boundary of the chosen place, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, the Mountain of Inheritance and Divine Presence, so that any members of the Samaritan-Israelite community who wished to pray upon this mountain would (first) purify themselves in it when the time for any Prayers approached. Two Prayers replaced the continual offering: the first was the Evening Prayer at sunset; the second was the Morning Prayer, recited from dawn until sunrise.

He further built a Synagogue, adjoining the Chosen Place, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, so that the people could pray in it opposite this holy mountain. This ritual bath and this Synagogue remained until the advent of the Frankish Kingdom. The Synagogue that the priest Baba Rabbah built followed the dimensions of the one they had built in the town of Boşra during the Era of Favour. He erected it on the same pattern, with its floor made of earth, as he had seen in the town of Boşra. Furthermore, the priest Baba Rabbah took some of the stones of the Temple that Saul's men had destroyed in the days of Saul, king of the Israelites — except for the Samaritan-Israelite community — for his destruction of that Temple was an act of hatred against them. He set up those seven stones, as seven seats for the seven Sages, and he took one great stone for himself to sit on. The priest Baba Rabbah also built seven Synagogues in the seven towns, all having floors made of earth.
11. Now these are the Synagogues' names:

THE FIRST: The Synagogue of the town of Kufr 'Amartāh, where the High Priests, sons of Aaron the Priest, are buried. They include Eleazar, his brother Ithāmār and Pinḥās son of Eleazar. Peace be upon them, on the Seventy Elders and on many other High Priests. It is situated to the east of the city of Shechem.


13. THE THIRD: The Synagogue of Qryth Ḫāgāh. It is still visible to this day, though it has no special features. It is in the southern direction, opposite the town of 'Skūr. The town of 'Skūr, where that house was, is, however, in ruins. Only the site (of both towns) and the pool still exist today.

14. THE FOURTH: The Synagogue of Qryth Ṭīrah. That town exists to the present day.

15. THE FIFTH: The Synagogue of Ṣabarān. That town is still inhabited today, and is among the towns of the Shaphelah.

16. THE SIXTH: The Synagogue of the town of Ṣālēm. That town is still inhabited today, and is near Shechem in an eastward direction. It is also opposite the Chosen Place, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, in a north-east direction.

17. THE SEVENTH: The Synagogue of the town of Beth Dāḡān. That town is still inhabited to this day. It is east of the Chosen Place, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, in the northern direction.

18. THE EIGHTH: We do not know its location, neither have we found any mention of it in the Chronicle. It is said, however, that it was the Synagogue of The Stone, which
was situated between 'Elôn Môre' and Mount Gerizim Beth-El. Three hundred and sixty chambers were built in it, according to the number of the days of the year. Its site is acknowledged to this day as being south of the sepulchre of our master Joseph the righteous, peace be upon him.

19 These are the eight Synagogues which the priest Baba Rabbah built. He built them all of stone; not one of them was of wood.

§ 9

1 The priest Baba Rabbah built also a spacious Hall which he established as the Hall for Meeting and Decision, as well as for hearing all petitions. He erected it opposite the House of Prayer which he had built at the foot of the Chosen Place, the Mountain of Blessing, the Place of Sanctity, the Mountain of Inheritance and Divine Presence, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, in order that any Samaritan-Israelite who had a problem might come there and put his problem to the Sages who were there, so that they could tell him the authentic decision on his problem. Likewise, any man who used the title "sage" at that time was brought, on the New Moon or a Festival day, and set before the great (priest) king of the time, and before the Sages,
4 in order that they might test him. The tests having been administered in the presence of the High Priest and the Sages, if he was found to have been endowed with wisdom, discretion and understanding, they conferred upon him the title "Sage".

5 The reason why the Priest Baba Rabbah introduced this procedure, namely to build Synagogues and the Hall of Wisdom, was that the rulers of the land would not say of him thus: 'Does not the Priest Baba Rabbah pay heed to the affairs of those rulers who involve themselves in deeds which estrange them from the praise of the holy name of God, may His name be sanctified, and from the fulfilment of His commands and statutes, by doing abominable things?'

6 The Priest Baba Rabbah then allotted the priests to all his people of the community of Samaritan-Israelites, apportioning to them specific territory.

7 These are their names as we find them written in the Tolidah, all Samaritan-Israelite people, princes of their ancestral clans, who were appointed overseers according to the direction of Baba Rabbah:

8 THE FIRST
His name was Ishmael. The Priest Baba Rabbah gave to him and to all the men of his family a permanent possession from the town of Lazâh up to the coastal part of Galilee. He appointed as his 'aide' the Priest Nafrâh.

9 THE SECOND
His name was Jacob from the town of Askor. The Priest
Baba Rabbah gave him and all the men of his family a permanent possession from 'Askor to Tarblos (this is actually from 'Askor to Tiberias. He appointed as his 'aide' the Priest Nethan'el.

THE THIRD

His name was Zayyith son of Taham. The Priest Baba Rabbah gave him a permanent possession from east of the Chosen Place, the Sacred Mountain, Mount Gerizim Beth-El as far as the Jordan. He appointed as his 'aide' the Priest Eleazar son of Polah.

THE FOURTH

— Joshua son of Barak, son of Yeden. He gave him a permanent possession from Kufr ʿal-Lul until Beth ha-ʿábhaṭ. He appointed as his 'aide' the Priest 'Amram son of Sered, who is known as Totah. It is said that he is the father of the Priest Marqah, the great sage, the master of wisdom, who answered all matters with discretion and understanding. May the favour and forgiveness of the Lord be upon him, Amen.

THE FIFTH

His name was Abraham son of 'Em'al-ʿimāh, son of Yor, son of Frāth. He gave him a permanent possession from the coast to the territory of the Philistines. He appointed as his 'aide' the Priest Ḥakāmāh.

THE SIXTH

— Israel son of Makhir. He gave him a permanent possession from the town of Gaza up to the River of Egypt. He appointed as his 'aide' the Priest Salōm.
THE SEVENTH

15 His name was Yosef son of Susiāh. He gave him a permanent possession from the boundary of the Mountain of Inheritance and Divine Presence, the Mountain of Blessing, Mount Gerizim Beth-El as far as Caesarea. He appointed as his 'aide' the Priest, Aaron son of Zōhar.

THE EIGHTH

His name was La'el son of Bekher. He gave him a permanent possession from the border, east of the vineyards, to the town of 'Akkōh. He appointed as his 'aide' the Priest Joseph son of Zēnāšāh.

THE NINTH

His name was Bekher son of 'Or. His border was established from the hill country of Naqōrāh until Tyre. The latter was (re-)built by our leader Yered son of Mahal'ālēl, who lived there until he died (in Kwfr Mērā'ān). He appointed as his 'aide' the Priest Aaron son of Zebhed.

THE TENTH

His name was Safaṭ son of Zēbāh, son of Makhîr. He gave him a permanent possession from the brook of Liṭāh — which is said to be the River Tiberias — as far as Sidon and its environs. He appointed as his 'aide' a priest, Zāriz son of Mānîr, who was endowed with great wisdom, knowledge and understanding.
His name was Barad son of Ṣeriʿān, son of Ṣāmād. He gave him a permanent possession from the hill country of Galil unto the valley, and as far as Lebanon and all the villages around it, from the mountains and the lowland. He appointed as his 'aide' a priest, Ṣayyith son of Levi, a distinguished man, whose renown was heard everywhere, in all priestly circles. For he was paramount in all branches of wisdom, understanding, knowledge and exegesis. The favour and forgiveness of the Lord be upon him, Amen.

These are the heads of the community of Samaritan-Israelites whom the honourable Priest Baba Rabbah selected, and among whom he apportioned all the cities of the land of Canaan where all the Samaritan Israelite communities resided.

The said Baba Rabbah appeared among his people to perform all these deeds in the year 4600 of the Creation, corresponding to the year 1806 after the entry of the Israelites into the land of Canaan; corresponding to the year 1545 after the concealment of the holy Sanctuary which they had made in the desert, as the Lord had commanded Moses. This, in turn, corresponds...
to the year 1325 since Solomon son of David, the king, built the Temple in the city of Jerusalem on the site which his father had acquired from the Jebusite, namely, the place of the threshing-floor. This corresponds to the year 1050 from the exile of the Israelites to Assyria in the days of the pontificate of the High Priest 'Aqabhyyah, and it corresponds with the year 1005 since the arrival of the Samaritan Israelites from the first exile in the days of the pontificate of the High Priest Serayah. This was the exile of Nebuchadnezzar. This, in turn, corresponds to the year 795 after the arrival of the Samaritan Israelites from the second exile, the exile by the king of the Greeks. Their arrival was in the days of the pontificate of the High Priest 'Abdi'el son of the High Priest 'Azariah, in the thirty-fifth year of his pontificate. It also corresponds to the year 755 from the time the Israelite community established their Temple for a second time in the city of Jerusalem, through the instrument of Zerubbabel, Nehemiah and Ezra the Priest who brought with them authority from the king of Babylon in order to establish the Temple and the city. It corresponds, likewise, to the year 655 after the King 'Askander who ruled over all the nations, and to the year 308 after the
appearance of Jesus son of Miriam, wife of Joseph the Carpenter, a descendant of King David, against whom some Judaeans arose, and they crucified him.

11 It was at that date, in those happy days, that the Lord, may His name be sanctified, revealed this great man who ruled over all the community of the Samaritan Israelites in the land of Canaan for forty years. Even the Judaean community was subject to his authority. He spread abroad the faith of Israel; he built the Synagogues and directed all his energies to teaching the Samaritan Israelite community the exact reading of the holy Law, a reading based upon the true version as transmitted through the generations of Israel from the seventy Elders, the Elders of Israel who lived in the generation of the Master of the Prophets, Moses son of 'Amram, peace be upon him. He also established well-appointed Assembly Halls and he restored all the Israelites to their (rightful) places. He appointed Aaronite priests (peace be upon Aaron) over all the cities belonging to the Samaritan Israelite community, among whom were the Havgawi priests, descendants of our master Ithamar, peace be upon him.

15 These are their names: The firstborn was 'Abdy, the second was Nelekh, the third was Ḥidqé 'āl, the fourth was Sābhē 'a, the fifth was Ḥr, the sixth was 'Ar. Numerically they grew abundantly and spread all over the land of Canaan.
When the honourable Priest, Baba Rabbah, apportioned the land of Canaan according to the families of the Samaritan Israelite community and allotted the priests over them, he addressed them thus: 'Go in peace, be strong and of good courage. Do not fear or stand in awe of any man as long as I live. May the Lord your God put the fear and dread of you upon all the peoples round about you. But you shall fear none but the Lord your God and the God of your fathers, who delivered you from the iron furnace. Direct all your energies to keep His charge, His statutes, His commandments and His judgments all your days, in order that you may live.

The Sages of the Israelites and their leaders and priests went forth from the presence of the honourable Priest Baba Rabbah as a Samaritan Israelite community which possessed great strength and abundant happiness. At that time the community of Samaritan Israelites found favour in the sight of the Lord their God; He increased happiness in their ranks, the iron yoke He broke from off their necks, the bars of their yoke He snapped and He led them enduringly.

Now when the Sages arrived at the cities which the honourable Priest Baba Rabbah had allotted to them, the inhabitants of the cities surged
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forward to express their joy and to lift up their voices with songs, praises and adorations of their God and the God of their fathers, who had chosen them from among all the nations and had delivered them from this affliction. The Samaritan Israelites performed all this activity in accordance with the instructions of the Sages and Elders and the honourable king, the Priest Baba Rabbah, may the favour and forgiveness of the Lord be upon him. Amen. They went on joyously celebrating and demonstrating their faith in the Law of Moses son of 'Amram, peace be upon him.

§11

1 Now the chiefs, who had been appointed over them by authority of the kings of the foreign nations, arrived to prevent them from carrying out the statutes of the holy Law, just as they used to prevent them previously. However, all the men of the Samaritan Israelite community rose up against them and quickly slew them and burnt them in fire.

2 Simultaneously, in every city, in every town and in every place this act was committed against the honoured chiefs of the nations in all the cities of the Israelite community. It took place
on the night before the New Moon of the seventh
(month), and the Samaritan Israelites established
a commemoration to that event.

4 After the men of the Samaritan Israelite
community had slain the chiefs appointed over
them by the king of Edom, and had burned them in
fire, emissaries and officers of the king got to hear
of this matter. They therefore sent some messengers
to apprehend all the representatives of the
Israelite community in order that they should
accompany them to the king of Edom. When the
honourable king, the Priest Baba Rabbah, heard
of this he went to meet them, with the men who
were stationed with him, and they slew innumerable
men. Those that were left fell back and fled before
them to their own kings, in dejection of woe. They
recounted to them everything that had happened to
them, and how the honourable priest, King Baba
Rabbah, whom the Samaritan Israelite community had
appointed over them as their new king, had slain
a great number of them.

8 The honourable Priest Baba Rabbah realised
(the consequences of) all that he had done to the
emissaries of the kings, and he knew what he could
expect from the kings — that they would amass
together a great army to come and wage war against
him. He therefore chose men from among the youth
of his people, the Samaritan Israelite community, men of war, whom he had trained to confront and to do battle against the kings of the nations.

10 When the kings of the nations heard about the act perpetrated by King Baba Rabbah against the emissaries, they amassed many men from their armies and sent them into battle against King Baba Rabbah, with a strong force. Baba Rabbah went out to meet them with great determination, and the Lord gave over into the hand of King Baba Rabbah all their army. He smote innumerable of their men and totally crushed them, filling the whole mountain of 'Asqör — which is opposite the Holy Mountain, the Mount of Blessing, Mount Gerizim Beth-El — with their corpses. The remainder fled and, hurrying to their kings, they told them what the honourable King Baba Rabbah had done to them, how they had slaughtered the majority of their men, and how the Lord had given them over into his hand and into the hand of the community of Samaritan Israelites with him.

14 Now when the kings heard this report they were very angry and incensed against the honourable King Baba Rabbah and against all the Samaritans with him. The king of Constantinople thereupon arose and assembled a vast number of men, in their thousands and tens of thousands, to send into
battle against Baba Rabbah and all his people.

16 When the matter was reported to Baba Rabbah he sent to all the places of the Samaritan Israelites, summoning all their warriors. They came to him from every quarter, from the entire hill country, lowland, coastal area or plain, ten thousand warriors, bearing their own weapons - swords, spears and arrows — and fully equipped to meet their enemies with a stout heart.

18 When the honourable King Baba Rabbah realised how large was the number of his warriors and how much sustenance would be required, he set out, heavily armed and with great determination, and drove out all the foreigners from round about him — for they were enemies of the Samaritan Israelite community — and dispossessed them.

20 Now when the report arrived, of how the righteous King Baba Rabbah had slain so many of their men, the remainder fled from before Baba Rabbah. He then quartered troops in those cities, took possession of them and settled in them his warriors who had quickly come to him in the battles against his enemy. He also appropriated from the community of Samaritan Israelites a tax which they were accustomed to pay to the kings of Edom, and he purchased with it .... and weapons for his warriors. He provided his warriors with all their daily
requirements. He also issued a command that it should be proclaimed throughout all the cities of the Samaritan Israelite community that they should no longer pay taxes to the kings of Edom, neither nor food to the kings of Edom, as they had been (obliged to provide for (the upkeep of) their armies.

He made them give an undertaking that from that (day) onwards they would contribute only to the Samaritan Israelite army. Then the righteous King Baba Rabbah established his residence in the town of 'Amartah (where are buried) our masters, the ancestors of the High Priests, Eleazar, Ithamar and Pinhas, peace be upon them forever. There are also many graves of prophets, elders and many pure and righteous people. It was because of this that its name was called the town of 'Amartah; for it was established ('Ith'Amart) by the graves of these honourable righteous ones. The righteous King Baba Rabbah set up his camp in it.

After this, a herald came to the righteous King Baba Rabbah and informed him thus: 'Your enemies have come with a host so vast that
that it cannot be numbered. Then Baba Rabbah and all the sages of the Samaritan people presented themselves before the Lord their God and, prostrating themselves upon their faces to the ground, they spoke thus: 'O our God, the Lord, do not keep Your presence far off from us; do not hide Yourself in time of distress. With pride the children of shall serve. You will among the poor in his heart You will not inquire, for You. Have regard to our provocation, to take into Your own hands whose words are wearisome. You have been a shield and help to Your people. Break the arm of the wicked; let them seek without avail. The Lord is King for ever and ever. The foreign nations perish from their land. The desire of the humble You hear, O Lord. Sustain their spirit and incline Your ear to hear their request. Let no man on earth ever terrify them again. Save, O Lord, Your people, for the pious are destroyed, and the faithful have disappeared from among the children of men. How long, O Lord, will You forget us? For how long will You remove Your presence from among us? For how long must we rely upon ourselves for counsel, and must grief dwell daily in our hearts? For how long
9  must our enemies prevail over us? See and answer us, O Lord our God. Enlighten our eyes lest we fall into the sleep of death, lest our enemies say, "we can prevail over them," lest they say that we shall stumble. Yet, we trust in Your lovingkindness and we sing of Your name, so that it may go well for us.'

10 When Baba Rabbah and all the elders of the people had completed this prayer they sounded a note upon the trumpet, in commemoration of their obligation to fulfil the commands of the Lord which He commanded through the Master of the Prophets, His servant Moses son of 'Amram, peace be upon him forever.

11 'When you enter into battle in your land against an enemy that oppresses you, you shall sound an alarm upon the trumpets, and this will serve as a reminder of you before the Lord your God, and you will be delivered from your enemies.'

12 They therefore cried out with a mighty cry, saying in unison, 'Look down from Your holy habitation, from heaven, and deliver Your people Israel from the hand of their enemies.'

13 The Lord heard the sound of their cry on that day and He gave their enemies into their hands; so that the Samaritan Israelite community smote a large number from among their enemies. This battle raged on the mountain country
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opposite the holy city of Shechem. The Israelites splattered the blood of their enemy all over the place. The blood flowed down from that mount like water, and the name of that place has been called "the route of the unclean blood" until this day.

§13

1 After this, the righteous King Baba Rabbah and all the elders of the people came and prostrated themselves to the ground before the Lord their God, and prayed thus:

2 'We will give thanks unto You, O Lord, with all our strength. In praise we will proclaim the Lord as the Rock of our salvation, our Shield, our Deliverer. From our enemies we were delivered. The death pangs surrounded us as the torrents of destruction overwhelmed us. The bonds of Sheol tightened about us and the snares of death were set to catch us. In our anguish we called to the Lord, and cried out to our God; and the Lord heard our voice and the sound of our cries. The earth shook and the foundations of the mountains quaked and shook by reason of His anger. A burning fire was kindled in His nostrils as He swept aside the heavens and descended. He let loose His arrows
against our adversaries and scattered them, many
lightning shafts with which He terrified them.
9 He saved us from our enemies and adversaries
when they were too strong for us; He brought us
out into an open place and delivered us, for He
delighted in us. The Lord will bestow
lovingkindness upon us according to the abundance
of His own lovingkindness, and we will be
wholehearted towards Him and preserve ourselves
from iniquity. For, with the loyal, He shows
Himself loyal and with the blameless man
blameless; with the pure He shows Himself pure
and with the perverse He shows Himself tortuous.
With the humble He is a saviour, but the
haughty-eyed He casts down. He will light our
lamps and banish our darkness. For by You we
have crushed an army and leaped over a wall.
14 The ways of the Lord are perfect and His word
is righteous. He is a shield to all who trust
in Him. What God is there but the Lord? What
Rock is there but our God?
16 We will disperse our enemies and overtake them,
and we will not return until we will have made
an end of them. Though they cry, no saviour will
save them. We will pound them finer than dust
before the wind; we will cast them out like
the earthenware sherd. You will deliver us from
the clamour of the peoples, and will make us masters of the nations. Nations we never knew shall be our subjects; as soon as they hear the report of us they shall obey us. Foreigners shall come cringing to us, strangers shall fall and emerge from their chambers. Our God, the Lord, lives and our Rock is blessed. The God who saves us is exalted. The Lord, who grants us vengeance and makes the peoples to wilt away before us so that we tread upon their backs, grants us deliverance from our enemies, even from all who rise up against us. He redeems us from violent men. Therefore we will praise You among the nations, 0 Lord, and sing to Your name with all our strength, even to the One who gives us victory and keeps faith with the son of His beloved ones.'

§14

1 At that time, the Chaldean king decided to wage war against King Alexander. In the ensuing battle between them, the Chaldean king took cities from the King (Alexander). For this reason he was prevented from fighting against the righteous King Baba Rabbah.

2 At that time, the Arabs, sons of Ishmael, came
to the city of (Da'riah), plundered it and
3 destroyed it. This was a large city in which
many of the Samaritan Israelite community lived.
4 The righteous King Baba Rabbah heard of their
coming and he went to meet them. He smote them
disintegrated them and pursued them to the other
side of the Jordan, slaying innumerable of their
men. The Samaritan Israelites plundered the Arabs
of their flocks of sheep and cattle as well as
their garments, silver, gold, and weapons too
numerous to count.

5 When the kings got to hear that the righteous king,
the Priest Baba Rabbah, had gone forth to meet
the Arabs, sons of Ishmael, in battle and had
smote them, disintegrated them and pursued them
beyond the Jordan. Those very Arabs had acted as
thieves, highway robbers and bandits, waylaying
horses, conducting themselves with arrogance,
doing anything they pleased, their dominion being
so strong at that time. For that reason, all the
kings were glad and rejoiced. They sent to the
righteous King Baba Rabbah food and provisions,
足够的 ten thousand of his army. They also
sent him silver, gold and robes. They communicated
with him, praising him for the act that he had
performed against the Arabs.

6 Then the righteous King Baba Rabbah sang this
song to the Lord, saying thus: 'I will sing to
You, O Lord my God, my strength and my song. I will glorify and exalt You. The Lord is mighty in war; Lord is His name. The king rejoices in Your exaltedness, O Lord; how shall he not delight in Your victory? Your right hand, O Lord, is glorious in strength; Your right hand, O Lord, has shattered the enemy. For You have given me my heart's desire, and You have not refused me anything I asked. For You welcomed me with goodly blessings, You have set upon my head a wreath of lovingkindness. Who is like You among the mighty ones, Lord? Who is like You, majestic in holiness, worthy of awe and praise, who works wonders? Your salvation has brought me great glory; You have invested me with majesty and honour. The king puts his trust in the Lord; the loving care of the Most High holds him unshaken. Your hand shall reach all Your enemies; You will shatter all Your foes. Your hand will exterminate their offspring from the earth, and rid mankind of their posterity. Be exalted, Lord, in Your might; we will sing, praise and exalt Your power.'

Then the righteous King Baba Nabbah summoned the elders of the people, its leaders and officers. When they came to him, he addressed them thus:

'Now we are obliged to offer song, praises and thanksgiving in abundance to our God and the God
of our fathers, who has dealt righteously with us in His superabundant lovingkindness, has saved us by this victory, has delivered our enemies into our hand and has shattered those who came to take us and our children and our wives into captivity. The Lord has given them into our hand and we have taken all their cattle and all their possessions.

Now our enemies know that it is from the Lord our God that this victory of ours has come. For we have crushed them, and by reason of this they have sent us fine gifts and have honoured us in this splendid way. This came about only by reason of the lovingkindness of our God, our Shelter and our Lord towards us, He who made our enemies fail before us and endowed us with this great glory. For, although we were too weary to rise up against them, fearful of their violence and overcome by their might, now God has fulfilled for us what He expressly stated through the Master of the Prophets, the son of 'Amram our teacher, in our books of the holy Law: 'Though your enemies' dwindle away before you, you shall tread upon their backs.'

After this, the honourable king, the Priest Baba Rabbah assembled all his people before him,
and spoke thus: 'Return now in peace, every man to his city and to his place. If, at any time, I shall have need of your services, I shall send and call you. However, let there remain with me three thousand men from among you. Let them be stationed near me, at all times let me find them standing by me. Let them dwell in the villages around the city of 'Amartah where I live; let them not be distant from me.

This pleased the elders of the Samaritan Israelites, their chiefs and officers, and they answered thus: 'The thing which you have suggested to do is good.'

They therefore did as he had commanded them, and stationed three thousand warriors in the villages which were around the city of 'Amartah. The righteous king, the Priest Baba Rabbah then blessed all his people, and each man returned to his place with great rejoicing and peace of mind, praising the Lord their God, may His great name be blessed, with songs.

The Elders of the Samaritan Israelite community would come in from the towns near to the holy city of Shechem every night of 'Hadah' — at the beginning of every week — and assemble with the Elders of that city and go together to the city of 'Amartah in order to congregate with the righteous King Baba Rabbah, may the favour and forgiveness of the
Lord be upon him, Amen.

9  It was at that time, when the whole Samaritan Israelite community enjoyed honour, glory and abundant strength, that they would rejoice and be glad in the revelation of their faith; for the Lord — may His name be blessed — had removed from them the violence of the enemy. At that time, when each man camped side by side with his neighbour, the Samaritan Israelite community would assemble at the Hall of Assembly every night of 'Yadah' with abundant rejoicing. This custom has remained operative among them to this day.

10  The righteous King Baba Rabbah, may the favour of the Lord be upon him, Amen, — as for the place which bore his name, it was not customary to open it except by permission of the priests. It then remained (open) for just one day.

11  Some time later King Alexander died. That king, in his latter days, had not been able to wage war against the Samaritan Israelite community, for the Lord, may His name be blessed, had imposed upon him the dread, fear and awe of them.

12  The kings at that time were too feeble to levy a tax upon the Samaritan Israelite community, neither could they wage war against them. They sent a message to summon the elders and leaders of the Judaean community, as follows: 'If you succeed in smiting the righteous King Baba Rabbah and
defeating him, we will give you authority to build your Temple which is in the city of Jerusalem. The Elders of the Judaean community then assembled and discussed with each other the following question: 'How shall we proceed against King Baba Rabbah so that we may be able to defeat him and build our Temple?' Some men of them took the view thus: 'Why should we requite Baba Rabbah evil for good? For, since the kingdom of Baba Rabbah has flourished, all the burdens and troubles imposed by those kings has been removed from us, and they were unable to do us harm.

Now, if we proceed against King Baba Rabbah and do not achieve our objective, we will have been responsible for bringing upon ourselves much harm from Baba Rabbah and all his people, the community of Samaritan Israelites. We will then become the enemies of King Baba Rabbah, as well as of all the kings of the nations.'

Others among them took this view: 'Indeed, we shall succeed in inflicting harm upon King Baba Rabbah and smiting him. Let us attack him and not desist, perchance we may build our Temple. Do you not know, brethren, that King Baba Rabbah and all his people of the Samaritan Israelite community will prevent us from building our Temple, and will tell us that the city of Jerusalem is
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neither the holy city nor the chosen place. On the contrary, they will say that the chosen place is Mount Gerizim Beth-Eli.'

However, the thoughts of the righteous King Baba Rabbah were not these. His sole intention was to manifest the faith in the holy Law of Moses, to multiply hymns and praise to the God of heaven and earth — may His holy name be blessed — to base everything upon the reading of the holy Law and to carry out its precepts and laws with faithfulness.

At that time there were a number of men of the Judaean community, living in the town of Nemarah. Some of the Judaean Elders came to that town and took secret counsel among themselves in order to direct their attention to the slaying of the righteous King Baba Rabbah, in reward for which they would obtain from the foreign kings permission to build their Temple in the city of Jerusalem.

§16

1 At that time, the righteous king, the Priest Baba Rabbah went to the town of Nemarah. His visit took place on the sixth day of the week, so that he could observe the Sabbath at that town, as was his custom, spending the whole of the
Sabbath day in the Synagogue. For, whatever place Baba Rabbah came to he would enter the Synagogue on Sabbath eve and would not depart from it until the conclusion of the Sabbath.

3 Now the plan of the Judaeans was to attack the righteous King Baba Rabbah and all his men on the Sabbath eve; for at that time the Samaritan Israelite community would be unable to take up arms. They would then attack them inside the Synagogue while they were standing in prayer, and destroy them there.

4 But the Lord, may His name be blessed, did not want them to achieve their purpose, for in His wisdom He disclosed their secret plot on the fifth day of the week, before the arrival of King Baba Rabbah to the town of Nemarah, which was on the (eve of the) seventh day of the week. The Lord, sanctified be His name, disclosed the secret plot of the Judaean community on the fifth day of the week to the community of Samaritan Israelites.

5 Its revelation took place in this manner: A Judaean woman had a friend among the Samaritan Israelite women. Because of the great love that existed between the Israelite woman and the Judaean woman, on the fifth day of that week the Judaean woman said to her sister, the Israelite,
'My sister, I beg of you not to go on Sabbath eve to the Synagogue.'

7 The Israelite woman replied thus to her Judaean sister: 'Why, my sister, would you hold me back from attending the Synagogue? What is your motive?'

8 The Judaean woman replied, 'Why do you urge me to tell you the reason now? I am greatly afraid, for as soon as I reveal to you the reason, you will disclose all that I have uttered, and I will bring great suffering and punishment upon myself.'

9 The Israelite woman answered thus: 'If you will tell me the reason, I will not disclose it to anyone, as you command, my sister.'

10 So the Judaean woman spoke up, saying, 'Be aware, my sister, that the Judaeans have plotted to strike King Baba Rabbah and all his men on the eve of the Sabbath. While they are standing in prayer they will come upon them stealthily and smite them there. Now that I have told you, I beg you to keep it a secret and not to speak of it.'

11 Now when the Israelite woman of the Samaritan Israelite community heard this report from her Judaean friend, her face became tense with zeal.

12 She went quickly to the righteous King Baba Rabbah and told him of the matter. She did not mention, however, the name of the Judaean woman, as she had promised her.
When the righteous King Baba Rabbah heard these things he was most angry with the Judaean community. He had it disclosed to them that he would spend the night of the Sabbath in the Synagogue, from Friday. In the evening King Baba Rabbah arrived at the Synagogue, dressed in linen garments. When, at sunset, it grew dark, the righteous King Baba Rabbah took off the linen garments which were the dress for the holy Sabbath, and slipped out of the Synagogue without anyone knowing that he had left.

At sunrise, an innumerable crowd of Judaens assembled and came to the Synagogue. They searched thoroughly there for the righteous King Baba Rabbah, for he was the one they wanted. They shut the doors and set it on fire, for they were sure that the King Baba Rabbah was in the Synagogue.

When the King Baba Rabbah, may the favour of the Lord and His forgiveness be upon him, Amen, observed this deed of the Judaens, he cried out against them in a loud voice. All his men also cried out in unison, 'What have you been up to, and what is your intention?'

The Judaens were terrified at the sound of their shouting, for it was very great; fear and trembling overcame them; they were in trepidation; terror overtook them and all their hearts melted.
They threw away their weapons from their hands and fled before the righteous King Baba Rabbah and his men. Baba Rabbah and his men went out. His men pursued them, overtook them and brought them back to the righteous king, the Priest Baba Rabbah. Some of the men drew near and, falling before him to the ground, they addressed him thus:

'We beg you, our lord, let us be your servants. We have sinned against the Lord your God and against you in seeking your life, though you did us no evil; only good you have done for us. Indeed, you are the cause of the removal of the iron yoke from upon us, which was imposed by the foreign kings.'

The righteous King Baba Rabbah issued a command to his men, and they seized them all. He said to them, 'Why have you requited good with evil? Did you not know that my sole intention was to strengthen the faith of the religion of Israel and to remove the violence of all the kings from upon you — those with whom you have waged many wars. Now the Lord has given them all into my hands and I have taken all the tribes of Israel from beneath their grasp, so that they might manifest the faith of Israel, sing praises and songs to the Lord their God, pray and read in the book of the Holy Law of Moses in a loud voice, with none to prevent them, having been hitherto
unable to do so. Notwithstanding this, you have come against me to shed my blood and to burn me and all my brethren in fire. Woe to you; woe to you. Did you not know that the Lord would give you into my hand? Now you shall have no deliverance.'

King Baba Rabbah issued the command and they removed the Judaeans from his presence and put them under guard until after the Sabbath. They then set them before him so that he might pass a just sentence upon them.

Baba Rabbah said, 'I have no obligation to spare you alive after you have sought my life and the lives of my men, to kill us on the night of the holy Sabbath when we were standing in prayer, singing praises, magnifying and extolling the Lord our God and the God of our fathers.'

Thereupon he slew them and burned them in fire, doing just as the Lord had commanded in His holy Law, (as it says), "And you shall do unto him as he had intended to do to his brother." He also confiscated from the Judaeans the hill opposite the tower. He slew the inhabitants of it. No one remained, neither man or woman, except the woman who had disclosed the matter to her Israelite friend. For she had sought the protection of her Israelite friend and entered the Samaritan Israelite community. For she feared for her life from the Judaean community. The righteous king, the Priest Baba Rabbah, sent a message to her friend, summoning that woman, and he dealt well with her.
After this, all the Judaean heard what the righteous King Baba Rabbah had done to their Judaean brethren inhabitants of the town of Namarah. Some of them went and burned all the crops of the Samaritan Israelites' fields. When King Baba Rabbah heard, he went out after them with all his men and smote them, leaving but a small remnant of them.

When King Gordianus heard of the action that they had taken against the Samaritan Israelite community and against the Priest Baba Rabbah, he issued an edict that their Temple should be built in the city of Jerusalem. He sought, thereby, to foster enmity between the Judaean and the Samaritan Israelite communities, so that strife should exist between them.

Now the righteous King Baba Rabbah had not prevented the Judaean from building their Temple in the city of Jerusalem; but when the Judaean community assembled together all the materials of the house that were required for the building, at the very moment that they wanted to begin it, the Lord produced a great sign from heaven. This was the sign: a very great whirlwind carried away all that the Judaean had prepared and gathered together, and scattered it over the surface of the whole land. The Judaean community consequently ceased to build their Temple. Afterwards, (the site of) this house left the possession of the Judaean, until this day, so that they were unable to build it.
Then Baba Rabbah and the Samaritan Israelites
sang this song to the Lord: 'To You, Lord, do we
lift up our hands. In You we trust, O our God
therefore let us not be ashamed, neither let
our enemies exult over us. Those that wait for
You shall not be rent, but those that deal
treacherously with us shall be rent. Make known
to us Your ways, O our God. Make us to understand
Your paths. Guide us by Your truth and teach us,
for You are the God of our salvation. Your mercy
and lovingkindness are of old; the rememberance of
them is with us now. Turn not to our stubbornness
and wickedness; for the sake of Your goodness, O
Lord, remember us according to Your lovingkindness.
You are righteous and upright, but we are perpetrators
of sin. All the ways of the Lord are lovingkindness
and truth for those who observe His statutes and
commandments. For the sake of the holiness of Your
holy name, O Lord, make expiation for our iniquity.
Who is that man who fears the Lord? He will guide
him to the way of His choosing. His soul shall abide
in goodness and his seed shall inherit the earth.
The Lord's counsel is with them that fear Him, and
His covenant is with them that preserve the truth
and declare His holiness.
Sing unto the Lord, you who are the Lord's
children. Ascribe glory and strength to the Lord,
our God; ascribe greatness to the Lord our God.
21 Worship the Lord on Mount Gerizim, his holy Mountain. To any other than it you may not turn.
22 The Lord will grant strength to His Samaritan people with peace.
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1 When the hand of the Edomite kings came down heavily against the righteous Priest Baba Rabbah, may the favour of the Lord and His forgiveness be upon Him, Amen, he summoned to him all the elders of his people, members of the Samaritan Israelite community, and spoke to them thus:

2 'I have well determined to do this thing which I shall now tell you, that it may be well. It is my desire to send Levi, the son of my brother, to the cities of the Romans, to work among them. He should present himself as one of them, and acquaint himself with every custom of their Faith. Let him repair to some place and pose as an Elder — since they know not his origin nor what he is about. The purpose of this is that he might ascend Mount Gerizim Beth-El, the Chosen Place, and direct all his effort to breaking down the bird that is situated there. If he does so, we will be able to go up to Mount Gerizim Beth-El and seek the Lord our God, whose name is sanctified upon it. Perhaps He
will accept us and deliver our enemies into our hands'. (For there was situated on that holy
Mountain, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, a bird, like a
dove, used for the performance of divination and
sorcery by the Roman sorcerers. That bird was
made of brass, but to any Israelite coming up to
Mount Gerizim Beth-El the bird which they had made
would call out 'IbMVca. When the Romans used to
hear the call of this bird they would arise, search
for the Israelite person until they apprehended
him with a view to slaying him, which they
invariably did. For this reason the Samaritan
Israelite community was unable to ascend Mount
Gerizim Beth-El.)

Now when the Elders of the people and its
officers heard this from the righteous king, the
Priest Baba Rabbah, they replied together, 'Our
lord, do according to what is right in your sight;
for whatever you command us we will hear and obey.'

Baba Rabbah answered them thus, 'If you desire
to do this thing, deliver to me the signatures of
your hand, so that after the son of my brother is
brought back from there, you will not deal
abhorrantly by refusing to accept him back to the
religion which he has today.' They did as he
commanded them, and gave him the signature of their
hands.
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10 after this, Baba Rabbah had Levi, the son of his brother, brought to him. He assembled all the Elders of the people, its leaders and officers, commanding the son of his brother in their presence, in these words: 'Nephew, know that it is necessary for us to send you to the cities of the Romans, those heretical Baal worshippers and perpetrators of abominations, who walk on the evil path. Be on your guard lest you be ensnared into following them; and direct your mind to studying every single aspect of their belief.

11 Nephew, take heed to observe the practice of your own Faith, and do not deviate from this good way, that through it you may live out your full life and your after-life.

12 Nephew, take heed lest you neglect the regular daily and nightly reading of the holy Law. Nephew, rouse yourself to observe all the statutes and commandments of this Law. Nephew, be on your guard lest that which proceeds from your own desire entices you. At all times remember all that the Lord your God created you for, and the abundant goodness that you receive thereby throughout your life and after-life. May the Lord, His name be sanctified, be your support in all the deeds that we will require you to perform'.

17 He then disclosed to him what he must do there and Baba Rabbah sent away his nephew Levi and many
elders of the people. They returned to their places, and Levi set out, making for the city of Constantina.

Now Levi was a man of perception and wise knowledge, a righteous spokesman among his contemporaries. Whatever he undertook the Lord made to prosper. It was for that reason that his uncle, the righteous King Baba Rabbah, sent him to the country of the Edomites, the land of the Romans, with no one to accompany him. Levi was seventeen years old at the time that he left for the city of Constantina.

On arrival at that city he concealed his identity, applied himself to study and directed all his energy to learning all Roman customs. He attained his objective within ten years, so much so that he became unique among the Romans. There was not to be found among them any man as knowledgeable as he in the practices and general affairs of the Romans. His rank gradually rose among them until he attained the highest rank. They accorded him a high station, waited upon him, invoked him for a blessing, kissed his hand at all times and, because of the volume of wisdom he revealed to them, they called his name 'Great Skopos'. He was given the highest rank, so that not one Roman king could ascend his royal throne except on his authority. It was he who invested them with their kingly crown and robes.
1 Thirteen years after Levi had departed — he was now thirty years of age — he said to the chief Roman king, 'It is my desire to go to the land of Palestine, to the city of Shechem which is in that country, in order to see the Synagogues there.'

2 The king thereupon directed all the soldiers in the province of Constantina to accompany Levi. He set out, leaving the province of Constantina. There went with him all the leaders of the Roman people, their officers, some of the kings and all the army, in order to wait upon him and do whatever he would command them.

3 He set out with an innumerable entourage. When Levi and all who were with him approached the holy city of Shechem, the senior king who was with him issued an order to all nations, saying, 'Arise and come forth, all of you, to meet the great 'Skopos' who is with me.'

4 When the righteous King Baba Rabbah heard this he was very afraid and distressed. He summoned to him all the Elders of the Samaritan Israelite community, and all their heads and officers, and spoke to them thus: 'We did not act sensibly in sending Levi, my nephew, to the land of the Edomites; for, during these thirteen years, since he left until this day, we have heard no report of him or what he has been doing in that land. Will not my heart fail if that nephew of
mine dies in the Edomite land? Furthermore, I have heard a report of this 'Skopos' that he is a man of violence, and that he has come to our land in order to slay us all. We have no alternative now but to go out and meet him. We must fear for our lives because of him, lest he becomes angry with us. With such a large number of Roman soldiers around him, if he orders them to strike us they will smite the lot of us. Moreover, what can we do about him, seeing that we are unprepared for battle or for any offensive action, having no weapons with which to smite the enemy or defend ourselves against them? Furthermore, with such a large force at his disposal, if he gives the command to smite us, they will smite us until we are completely destroyed, for they are unnumerable.'

When all the Elders, leaders and officers heard this, they feared greatly, and spoke thus to the righteous King Baba Rabbah: 'We trust in the Lord our God, may His name be sanctified. He will cleave to us and support us, and deliver us from these wicked people.'

Then Levi, Baba Rabbah's nephew, who was called 'Skopos', arrived at the gate of the holy city of Shechen. All the Samaritan community went out to meet him, with the righteous king, the Priest Baba Rabbah, leading them. When they approached him he looked closely and saw that it was his uncle, the
Priest Baba Rabbah, with all the Israelite community with him. Fear was visible on their faces and, with Phylacteries between their eyes, they were crying out and addressing goodly greetings to him in a very loud voice. When he heard the sound of their cries, he had compassion for them.

The righteous King Baba Rabbah and all his people did not recognize him, though he recognized them. For, when he had departed from them for the land of the Edomites, he was a lad whose face was hairless and unworn. Having settled there, he was now thirty years of age, with a very long beard and dressed in garments all of black. Quite apart from this, he became invested with the highest rank, a rank which no member of his community ever expected him to attain.

Levi turned to the king who was accompanying him and spoke thus: 'Who are these men, the like of whom I have not seen before in all my travels?' The king answered, saying, 'My lord, these are a rebellious people, who call themselves Samaritan Israelites. Those are the representatives of the Samaritan community.'

He asked further, 'Whom do they worship?' The answer was given, 'They serve a God whom no man can see. Regarding Him, they assert that He is the God of gods, Lord of lords, God of heaven and earth and all created things.'

The 'Skopos' then demanded, 'Why do they not worship
the idols and Baals and forsake their own belief which we have not authorised?'

19 The king answered, 'indeed, my lord, we have already spoken to you at great length about this matter. Regularly, up to the present day, we have demanded that they do this, but they have not listened to us, neither have they worshipped the Baals or idols. They have not desisted from calling upon their own God as the supreme God and Lord, Creator of all beings.'

20 The 'Skopos' answered the king thus: 'If they will not listen to us or do as we command them, and if they will not forsake their own faith and serve the Baals as we do, none of them shall remain alive.'

21 (This statement, concerning the Samaritan Israelite community, was heard by all — it being about them that the 'Skopos' had made his statement.)

22 Then the 'Skopos' — who was Levi, nephew of the righteous King Baba Rabbah — made his way to the Chosen Place, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, accompanied by the king's ministers. As they approached the top of the mountain, the brazen bird, the object used for divination; cried out 'Ibriyos', as he always did whenever a member of the Israelite community chanced to be on that mountain. (This cry of 'Ibriyos' is translated into the holy language as 'Ibhri bi 'adoni' ('There is a Hebrew around me, my lord'))
The great 'Skopos', that is Levi, said, 'What is this?' They answered, 'This bird is of copper; it is an object of divination which our brethren, the Roman chiefs, have left in this place, on account of the Samaritan Israelite community. For whenever anyone of them comes on to this mountain, it cries out 'Ibriyos!'. The Skopos' replied, 'I see now that it is not ceasing its cries. Go, look out and search the whole of this mountain, and if you find a member of the Samaritan Israelite community, strike him down so that we may have some rest from the noise of the cries of this bird.'

They sent many men to search out the whole mount for any Samaritan Israelites. They went and searched every corner of that mountain but found no Hebrew there. They came back and told the king and his men, 'We have searched the whole mountain and found no Hebrew on it.'

The 'Skopos' then came to the Synagogue on top of the mountain and sat down there, with all the elders and leaders standing before him. Still, the brazen bird was crying out 'Ibriyos' in a loud and raucous voice. It did not cease its crying for one moment during the whole of that night, until the morning. Levi turned to the servants who had searched the whole mountain and said, 'Have you searched every corner of this mountain and really not discovered any Samaritan Hebrew there?'
They answered, 'By God, we have searched every corner of the mountain, as you commanded us, and we have discovered no Hebrew child or adult of the Samaritan Israelite community.'

Levi replied, 'Surely this bird has gone mad because its master is missing. It can no longer serve any purpose other than to depress our spirit and give us a headache from the noise of its cries. Yesterday we were deprived of sleep.' The king said to him, 'My lord, what do you wish us to do with it?' 'Break it up,' he replied, 'and throw it away.'

They hurriedly broke up the bird and threw it away, as he had commanded.

This happened on the night of the seventh New Moon.

Around the (first) third of the night, about four hours after the beginning of night, all the officers, elders and leaders, as well as the king and the men who were with him, all fell asleep; for he had made them drunk with wine and strong drink. He (Levi) had, in fact, urged them to drink so much that they had become drunk and had fallen asleep.

When Levi saw that the drinking had taken control of them, so much so that none of them could distinguish right from left, and that when he commanded them either to lie down or rise up, they remained lying down in a very deep sleep, he immediately rose up, sword in hand, and went down from Mount Gerizim Beth-Si, to seek out his uncle, the righteous king, the Priest
Baba Rabbah at the town of 'Amartah, for he knew that his uncle's residence was there.

When the righteous King Baba Rabbah got to hear of the instruction issued by the 'Great Skopos', his nephew, Levi, he assembled all the heads and elders of the Samaritan Israelite community at the town of 'Amartah. They were all faint-hearted, fearful and confused, not knowing how they should act towards this man, the 'Skopos', so that he might desist from attacking them and find a way to obtain his sympathy, and thereby escape his punishment.

In the moment of their confusion over this matter, Levi stood at the door and knocked lightly. Their fear increased and their trembling became so intense that not one of them was able to open the door in order to see who was knocking.

The righteous King Baba Rabbah himself rose up, whereupon all the princes rose with him, and they went to see who was at the door. When they opened the door they took fright, for the 'Great Skopos' himself was standing at the door. They were unable to talk to hi, so terrified were they the moment they saw him. Levi hurried, however, and fell at the feet of his uncle, the righteous king, the Priest Baba Rabbah, and kissed them. He took his hands in his own and kissed them; and, falling about his neck, he wept, saying, in the holy language of the Hebrew
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tongue, 'Now I can die, having seen you again, that you are still alive.' The righteous King Baba Rabbah was now sure that the 'Great Skopos' was Levi, his nephew.

At that time there was the sound of great celebration in that place, among Baba Rabbah and all those assembled there of the Samaritan Israelite community. Baba Rabbah then took his nephew's hand and led him into an inner place. Seating him at his right hand, Baba Rabbah started to ask his nephew about all that he had done during the period of his exile in the land of the Romans. Levi, the 'great Skopos,' related to Baba Rabbah all the things which he had done, in the hearing of all who were gathered there. Their rejoicing knew no bounds, and they sang praises and songs of thanksgiving in a great and loud voice to the Lord who had delivered them from every disaster and retribution.

When Levi had finished addressing his uncle Baba Rabbah, he added the following: 'Tomorrow night, in the middle of the night, mobilise sword-bearing men. Let them stay close to me and observe my orders. For, when the enemy falls asleep, I will quickly rise up and strike their necks with the sword, in revenge for the Lord, may His name be sanctified. We will smite them, destroy them and blot out their name from under the heaven. May help from the Lord our God attend us, and may He deliver us from their evil.'
Thus it happened that Levi rose up and ascended the mountain quickly, discovering all the Romans asleep and quite unaware that he had ever left the mountain or returned to its summit. (Now this took place on the night of the termination of the festival of the seventh month, or, to be more exact, the night of the termination of the festival of the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly.)

The righteous King Baba Rabbah then sent a message to all the cities round about him, wherein men of the community of Samaritan Israelites lived, in which he said, 'Be equipped and armed for war, and be ready at midnight. When you see the flame of fire on the top of the hill which is on top of the Chosen Place, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, then smite the leaders and officials appointed over you by the Romans. Leave no remnant of them, but destroy every one of their officials, as well as all those who might prevent you from consolidating your Faith. Smite with the sword all those around you until they are destroyed, so that you may reach your brethren and assemble, all of you together, in the plain of Moreh, which is next to the Chosen Place, Mount Gerizim Beth-El.'

So it was that about midnight the whole army of the righteous King Baba Rabbah, may the favour and forgiveness of God be upon him, assembled in their hosts. They all ascended the holy Mountain,
Mount Gerizim Beth-El, with the righteous King, the Priest Baba Rabbah leading them. There was but a spear's throw between them and the summit of the Mount of Blessing, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, when Levi realised how close they were to him. He rose up with great zeal, sword in hand, armed with divine aid, sanctified be His name, and he pierced with his sword the king, his men and all the Elders who were to be found on that mountain.

Then Levi cried out in a loud voice: 'The Lord is mighty in war; Lord is His name.' When the Samaritan Israelite community heard their cries, they also cried out in unison, 'The Lord is mighty in war; Lord is His name.'

The whole earth trembled at the sound of their shouting. At that moment not a beast in the field remained crouching in its lair. On hearing the noise of the people, they all fled at the sound, saying, 'Such sounds we have never ever heard before.'

After that, Levi and his uncle, the righteous King Baba Rabbah, and all the men who were with him, arose and kindled a fire on the top of the hill which was the summit of the Mountain of Inheritance, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, so that the whole community of Samaritan Israelites, who dwelt in the cities, might see it, and do all that the
63 righteous King Baba Rabbah had commanded them. When all the people living in the cities, the settlements and other places saw the flames of fire, they arose and smote all the leaders and officers who had been appointed over them by the Roman community, allowing none to remain.

64 The Israelite community arose that night and overthrew all the Roman meeting-houses and all their posts, blotting out their name from the Mountain of the Divine Presence, Mount Gerizim Beth-El.

65 From the day the Samaritan Israelite community did this to the Romans, Samaritan children have set fire to the wood of their Succah-booths on the night of the termination of the festival of the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly, which concludes the festivals of the Lord. This episode has thus remained a memorial among them unto this day.

66 Then the righteous King Baba Rabbah and all the Elders of the people sang this song:

67 'The Lord our God is our shepherd, we shall not want. To the Lord is the earth and the fullness thereof, the Divine Presence and all that dwell therein. For He founded it upon the seas and established it upon the rivers. To You, O Lord our God, will we lift up our face; in You we have trusted, and You did not let us down. Therefore our enemies have not derided us. All who wait for You
will suffer no violence; but they that deal treacherously without cause will suffer violence. The Lord is our salvation, whom shall we fear? In the Lord's hand is the life of our souls, of what shall we be afraid? For when the wicked approached to devour our flesh, our adversaries and enemies all stumbled and fell. Though a great host should encamp against us, our heart will not fear. Though war should arise against us, we will not tremble; for He is our deliverer. One request of the Lord we have — that will we seek after: that we may dwell in His place, the Mountain of Blessing, the Mount of Holiness, the Mount of Inheritance and Divine Presence, the Chosen Place, Mount Gerizim Beth-El. May our heads be raised high above our enemies around us, may His will be efficacious and may His habitation be disclosed to us, that we may offer our sacrifices upon His altar. Then will we see it established, though not yet; then we will behold it, though not soon. A star shall come forth out of Jacob, a comet shall arise from Israel. He shall smite the heads of Moab and beat down all the sons of strife. Edom shall be his conquest, after which Israel will do valiant deeds. Blessed be our God forever, and blessed be His name forever and ever."
After these events, when the Roman inhabitants of the cities that had been saved got to hear of all that the Samaritan Israelite community had perpetrated against their men, they became inflamed with a great fury. They assembled together innumerable men to seek out the righteous King Baba Rabbah and all his Samaritan people. When Baba Rabbah was informed about them he did not flee from his place until they had reached the neighbourhood of the holy city of Shechem. Then Baba Rabbah made haste and went to meet them at that place, engaging them in war. The Lord gave them into his hand, and he smote many of their men. The rest fled before him. He pursued after them a day's journey before returning to his place, singing and praising the Lord his God, may His name be blessed forever and ever.

When this was later related to the king of Rome and to all his people, the Roman inhabitants of the cities which were saved, they waged war against the righteous King Baba Rabbah. The latter, and all his people defeated them, and those that were left fled before them. They pursued after them a day's journey, and they could not count how many Romans they slew, for there were so many. When the Roman king got to hear of it, and what the righteous King Baba Rabbah and his people had done
to the men who had been saved, he grew very furious and full of rage. He sent word that an innumerable body of men be gathered together and he sent them into battle against the righteous King Baba Rabbah and his Samaritan people.

When Baba Rabbah heard of their coming, he went out to meet them and war broke out between them. He prayed to the Lord thus:

'Lord God, as You have previously dealt with me, so now, give these wicked men into my hands.'

And the Lord accepted his entreaty and gave them over into his hand. The war between the army of the righteous King Baba Rabbah and the Roman army took place in the city of 'Askor. The Lord gave them over into the power of the Samaritan army and they trounced them, only a small number being spared.

These hastily fled before the Samaritan Israelite community and went straight to their own kings, telling them all that the righteous King Baba Rabbah and his Samaritan people had done to them. They said to them, 'They gave us a good trouncing, but we saw no one slain among them.'

The Roman kings were enraged against the righteous king, the Priest Baba Rabbah and against all his Samaritan people. They hastily assembled a vast army, so vast that it could not be numbered. It was reported to the King Baba Rabbah thus: 'Know that a vast army of Roman kings is marching against you in their
thousands and tens of thousands. King Baba Rabbah assembled all the Elders, heads and leaders of his people and disclosed this to them. They wrote letters which they issued to all the cities of the Samaritan Israelite community, telling them of the approach of a Roman army of innumerable proportions to fight against the Samaritan Israelite community. They therefore sent all their warriors to them, and they all assembled in the city of King Baba Rabbah, the city of 'Amartah. They numbered ten thousand men, all bearing arms, between twenty and forty years of age. Baba Rabbah billeted them in the cities around the city of 'Amartah.

A herald then came and told King Baba Rabbah: 'Know that your enemies are upon you in innumerable strength.' The righteous King Baba Rabbah was frightened and sorely distressed. He entreated the Lord in this prayer, facing the Chosen Place, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, saying:

'O Lord God, in You we have trusted; fail us not, but in Your righteousness deliver us. 0 Existing One, deliver me speedily from this oppression, and be to me and to all my congregation as a Rock. Deliver them and deliver me, for You are my Rock, my proud sword and my shield. Lead me in the counsel
of Your holy name and guide me. O my God, extricate me and all my people from the net which our enemies have laid for us. For You are a Rock, and into Your hand do we commit our spirits. You have redeemed us, O God, compassionate and gracious, long-suffering, abundantly constant and true, our God, from our enemies who observe what is sheer vanity. But we have trusted in You; we rejoice in your constancy. For You take notice of our lowliness, and do not surrender us into the hand of an enemy. You, who have established us, take pity on us. Take pity on us, You who have established us. For we are in distress, for the days of our life, and that of our fathers before us, have ended in grief. By reason of our sins our strength has failed and our bones melt away. We have become a reproach to all our enemies. We are forgotten out of mind, like the dead, and have become like a worthless vessel. Yet in You do we put our trust, for You are our God and the God of our fathers. In Your hand is our spirit; O deliver us from the hand of our enemies and persecutors. Cause Your face to shine towards us and save us with kindness. O Lord, we will not be ashamed, for we have prayed to You, and, according to Your will, our enemies shall lie down in Sheol. O how great is Your goodness, Lord, which You have stored up for those that fear You. This You will do
§20 - §21

to confirm Your salvation. You will hide them in Your secret place; You will hide them from the wrath of the wicked, even in booths, from the enmity of sinners. Blessed is the Lord, who has made us pre-eminent over all peoples. Love the Lord, you sons of His loved ones, the faithful whom the Lord preserves because they walked in His ways. Let your hearts be strong and courageous, all you who walk on the path of His laws.'

§21

1 When King Baba Rabbah had completed his prayer and his convocation, he went to a spot near the battlefield — knowing that the battle between him and his enemies would be there — and he concealed there some of his soldiers in some tombs. He commanded them thus, 'When you see war break out between us and our enemies at the site of the battle, and I cry out to you in a loud voice, saying, 'O you who dwell in the tombs, they have routed me and are close on my trail,' then you shall emerge from the tombs and say, 'Do not fear, we have come to your aid; do not fear.' Then

2 use your swords on all the enemy.' The number of men whom Baba Rabbah had concealed in the tombs was five thousand.
§21

4 When King Baba Rabbah and the men of his army approached the enemy, the priests blew on the trumpets and all the people raised their voices and cried out in unison, with a loud voice, 'The Lord is mighty in war; Lord is His name.' The earth shook at the noise of their cry, and the battle broke out between them and their enemies. It was a great battle on that day, the like of which had never taken place in those times. Then King Baba Rabbah cried out in a loud voice from the thick of the battle, saying, 'O you who dwell in the tombs, they have routed me and are close on my trail.' The Romans fell silent at the sound of the shouting. The men whom he had hidden among the tombs hurriedly emerged and said in a loud voice, 'Do not fear Baba Rabbah, we have come to your aid, all of us. Do not fear Baba Rabbah, for all the dead will follow us from every side!'

8 When the men of the Roman army saw this, they thought that it was real. Fear and dread befall them, and they trembled and fled before King Baba Rabbah and before the men of his army who were with him. The Lord gave them over on that day into the hand of King Baba Rabbah and he smote them and pursued them as far as the border of the territory of the Samaritan Israelite community.
These battles, to which we have previously referred, as well as this present battle, took place after Levi, nephew of King Baba Rabbah, had returned from the Roman cities. There were no battles between the Samaritan Israelite community and the kings of the Romans prior to Levi's departure to the Roman cities. For Baba Rabbah had sent his nephew Levi to the Roman cities before his purpose was made known. For it was that Levi who broke down the brazen bird, brought into being by sorcery, as a result of which no Samaritan Israelite was able to ascend to the summit of Mount Gerizim Beth-El, Mountain of Blessing, Chosen Place. For that bird was perched on the top of that mountain, and if it detected any Samaritan within the border of the mountain, the bird would cry out 'Ibrivos.

All the battles between Baba Rabbah and the Roman kings were as a result of the deeds of the righteous King Baba Rabbah and his nephew Levi. For they demolished the Roman meeting-house which was at the summit of the Holy Mountain, the Mountain of Blessing, the Chosen Place, Mount Gerizim Beth-El. They smote all the Elders who were there, and all the Roman leaders who were lording it over the Samaritan Israelite community, as well as the king who came with Levi from the city of Constantina.
......... by the hand of the faithful one of his house, the Master of the Prophets, Moses son of 'Amram, peace be unto him forever. So that all the Roman kings knew that the King Baba Rabbah would prevail in war against them, being strong-hearted and courageous, ready for any battle and unperturbed by their confederacy. For many years he had waged wars against them, and the Lord had given them all into his hand.

§22

After these events, the king of Costantina saw fit to sue for peace with the righteous King Baba Rabbah. He besought him to come to him to the city of Costantina, his royal city. This policy conformed to a plan of the Roman king of the city of Costantina and all the men of his kingdom. It had three aims: first, they sought to ascertain the strength of King Baba Rabbah, whether he possessed the ability to wage greater wars than this (they, themselves, were weary because of him, and, furthermore, they had heard how he had driven out the Arab Ishmaelites, pursued them and taken spoil of all they possessed — their sheep, cattle, camels, asses, silver, gold and innumerable flocks), or
was he, indeed, unable to wage any more war because he was also tired out? Secondly, they wanted to terminate the enmity between themselves and the righteous King Baba Rabbah and his people, the Samaritan Israelites; for they could no longer muster men for war at any time against King Baba Rabbah, for they had many enemies quite apart from the Samaritan community. Thirdly, they said, 'Perhaps we may have dominion over King Baba Rabbah, who is the cause of all these wars taking place, and the killing of many men in the ranks of the battle, men who are sent against him.'

The name of the king of Costantina at that time was Philip. He and all his men wrote to King Baba Rabbah and sent emissaries from among the leaders of his kingdom, carrying in their hands a letter in the King Philip's handwriting. This is what he wrote in that letter: 'Peace be unto you, my lord, King Baba Rabbah. I request my lord, the great and honourable King Baba Rabbah, to grant the request of his servant, the king of Costantina, at this time, and do him the honour of coming to him to that city to stay with us for a while that we might see his glory, after which he may return in peace to his place.'

When King Philip's letter, and the heads appointed by the king, arrived, they delivered it into the hand of King Baba Rabbah. He read
the letter and was cognisant of all those things.

10 King Baba Rabbah then said to the emissaries of King Philip, 'I am well able to wage war against the king of Costantina for the whole duration of my life. Also my Samaritan Israelite people are innumerable and the men of the army at my disposal are stout-hearted.' The emissaries were afraid at what they saw of Baba Rabbah's achievements.

11 Then Baba Rabbah assembled all the Elders and heads of his people, also his father, his son and all his family, and read before them the letter of the king of Costantina. He related to them his plan, saying, 'It is my intention to go to King Philip, the king of Costantina.'

12 His father, the High Priest Nethan'el, the Elders of the people, its heads and leaders and all who were assembled replied, 'For what reason do you intend to do this? How can you wish to go at this time, leaving your people behind, like tender children whose father has left them and forsaken them in a state of confusion, not knowing what to do; particularly since the Lord, may His name be sanctified, has made us prosper through you?'

13 The Elders of the people and its leaders approached and said to him, 'Our master, we
beseech you honour no to do this thing which you have told us, for we are afraid that after your going we will revert to our former lowly estate, our oppression, weariness, poverty, distress and incapacitation. For you know that the enmity and hatred between us and the Romans is now very keen because of the wars in which we have engaged with you, and because of the defeat of their men. We beseech you, our lord, to stay and not to go far from us or to cause yourself to leave and abandon us, lest our enemies mock us?'

King Baba Rabbah answered thus, 'No. Listen to me, for I must go now to the city of Costantina. You know full well that I fulfil my obligations to the Lord alone, may His name be sanctified. Perhaps my journey to the king of Costantina will be instrumental in removing the hatred that exists between us and these nations, so that the fire that has raged between them and us unto this day may be quenched. Now, therefore, do I wish to go to King Philip to make peace with him and to enter into an alliance. My brethren, do not be oblivious of the fact that this matter has been a protracted one for us and we are left with no strength to wage any further war against our enemies; and that, though the great kings are weary of
these wars, we, quite apart from our small number, are unable to withstand these wars. By the will of God, may His name be blessed, I will soon return to you. If, however, it transpires that something unforeseen happens to me, or they sentence me in order to prevent my return to my home and my land, or they slay me, I will therefore now give you instructions concerning my son, Levi.' (This refers to Levi, his own son, as distinct from his nephew, Levi.)

'If you desire now to go to the city of Costantina, as you have said, take with you some men from among the people to minister to you and serve you in the land of your enemy, so that they may know your glory and honour your high status.'

King Baba Rabbah answered the leaders of the people thus, 'I will not do so, for I fear to do something without us knowing whether its outcome for us will be happy. Rather that I should alone be involved than many men of our people.

Now, therefore, I give you a command in order that you may rejoice greatly in this world and live forever in the next world: You shall observe the commandments of the Lord, sanctified be His name, that are in His holy Law, and shall not cease reading His holy Law at any time, but shall teach it to your sons and daughters and to your children's children. Furthermore do I command you that if you
§22 – §23

will be courageous and strong, and will not fear, be dismayed or frightened, then the Lord your God, sanctified be His name, will not forsake you, fail you or rebuke you, neither will He break the covenant which He made with your forefathers and with your great Prophet Moses, son of 'Amram, peace be unto him forever. Also, be on your guard lest your hearts turn aside from His ways and from observing His statutes and commandments. Know that all that the Lord does to His people, the Samaritan Israelites, is but a trial by Him, in order to give them a happy outcome. Happy is he that observes, and woe to the one who departs from the way of truth.'

§23

When the righteous King Baba Rabbah had finished commanding his Samaritan people, he took hold of the hand of Levi, his son — with tears rolling down his cheeks like rain — and brought him right up to his father, the High Priest Nathan'el. He kissed the hantis of his father, saying, 'If it please you, my lord, here is my son Levi; receive him from my hands, for I give you charge of him.' He fell again before him and kissed his feet, saying, 'I pray you, sir, you whom the Lord, sanctified be His name, has
made the cause of my very being, lock after my son, the fruit of my body, and be favourable to him at all times.'

He then turned to his brother, the priest 'Aqbon, and said to him, 'My brother, I command you this day concerning my son Levi; teach him the upright way.' He then turned to all the Elders of the people and said to them, 'Look after this, my son, until good fortune will attend you.' His statement to them was along the lines referred to above.

The righteous King Baba Rabbah rose early and went with the emissaries of King Philip, the king of Costantina. All his brothers, cousins, relatives, members of his family, Elders of the people, its leaders and chiefs, as well as a large number of the people, rose and went to the outskirts of the city to send him on his way, before returning to their place. His son Levi and his brothers, the Priest 'Aqbon and the Priest Pinhas, wept. They then sent him on his way, returning to the city broken-hearted.

The righteous King Baba Rabbah travelled until he reached the border of the environs of the city of Costantina. One of the emissaries ran hastily and told King Philip of the arrival of the righteous king, the king of the Samaritan Israelites, Baba Rabbah. King Philip issued a command, which they announced publicly among the Roman people: that they
should all come out together to meet the King

Baba Rabbah. Shortly afterwards there assembled
all the men of the king's army and all the leaders
of the people, all the Elders and all the people,
carrying crucifixes and Baals in their hands.
They came out to meet King Baba Rabbah to the
outskirts of the city, singing their prayers.

At that time, all the Roman kings who were his
subjects were present in the city of Costantina.
They all went out with King Philip to meet
King Baba Rabbah. Now, when they saw King Baba
Rabbah they all alighted from their chariots,
so that not one rider remained in his chariot,
apart from King Baba Rabbah. When he made to do
as they had done, and descended from his chariot,
they prevented him, saying, 'No, my lord, we are
your servants. We have done this in order to
honour you, for it is fitting that we do so.'

That day, of the arrival of the righteous King
Baba Rabbah to the city of Costantina, was a
great day for the Romans, the like of which none
of the Roman kings had ever experienced.

Now, when King Baba Rabbah entered the city of
Costantina, having passed the hill, King Philip
said to the heads of his realm, 'Now King Baba Rabbah is in our hands and under our rule, advise me please what we should do.' Those men were divided into two groups. One group said, 'Let us set upon him and kill him.' The other group said, 'That is not a good plan; we should not smite him.' The latter approached the king, saying, 'You know that Baba Rabbah is a great king. Before he came to you you knew this, and you also knew all that he had done, how he had smitten many times the men of our army. Notwithstanding all this, we swore to him that we would do him no harm. Indeed, he could have succeeded us. He was not incapable of withstanding us in battle, but trusted in our firm promises to him, and therefore did not attack us. He would not have let himself fall into our hand if he had not known that no mishap would befall him because of us. Now that he has trusted in our promise and entered under the aegis of our protection, it is not good that we should kill him. If the king treats him wrongly, it will be a reproach to the king and all his people. Men will relate this throughout every generation and will record it in their histories. It will thus remain a bad reproach unto us for all time. However, if the king commands it, let us have him to remain with us all the days of his life, never to leave this city. There is no
difference between killing him and shutting him up for the rest of his life in this city, until the day of his death. The king will not be unmindful of the fact that King Baba Rabbah would prefer us to set upon him and kill him rather than that he should remain imprisoned among us in this city.'

This plan pleased King Philip, and he summoned the righteous King Baba Rabbah, may the Divine favour and forgiveness be upon him, Amen, and spoke kindly to him. He gave him silver and gold, vessels of silver and vessels of gold, vessels of brass and many robes. Then he said to him, 'My lord Baba Rabbah, all my people will wait upon your every word.'

King Philip gave these instructions to all who were in charge of the gates of the city: 'If King Baba Rabbah seeks to go outside the city, you shall restrain him and tell him that no one can go outside the city except with King Philip's permission.' There were officers over the gates of the city of Costantina, and no one could enter or leave that city unless by the authority of the king's men.

After a long time, the righteous King Baba Rabbah approached King Philip saying, 'I heartily desire to return to my land and birthplace. I
therefore now beseech the king to grant that I may return to my land and my father's house; for I pine greatly for my father, who is awaiting my return to him and to my brothers, my son and all my relatives.'

15 King Philip answered the righteous King Baba Rabbah, saying, 'You will remain with us all the days of your life.' The righteous King Baba Rabbah then realised that King Philip was indeed imprisoning him, and that he would subsequently be unable to leave the city of Constantina. The righteous King Baba Rabbah held his peace and spoke no more of this matter to the king.

16 When the High Priest Nethan'el got to know that King Philip had imprisoned his son, the righteous Baba Rabbah, in the city of Constantina, he sent for his son 'Aqbon and said to him, 'Give your daughter, Rebecca, in marriage to Levi, your brother Baba Rabbah's son.' He gave her to him in marriage, as his father had commanded, and he made a festivity in his honour for seven days, according to the practice of Israelite bridegrooms.

3 After this, the High Priest Nethan'el died and was gathered unto his people at a ripe old age. May the favour and forgiveness of the Lord be upon him, Amen.
After the death of the High Priest Nathan'el, Levi, the son of the righteous King Baba Rabbah, pined for his father. So he went to the city of Costantina and lived with his father for a few days. At that time, the righteous King Baba Rabbah contracted a serious illness. Baba Rabbah realised that his death was approaching. Now he had a friend, a Jew from among the Jewish community. So the righteous King Baba Rabbah sent for him and said to him, 'My brother, place your hand under my thigh; for I adjure you by the God of heaven and earth, that you take this, my son, back to my land and birthplace, and hand him over to his relatives; and that you will not suffer him to become polluted through uncleanness.'

His Jewish friend placed his hand under the thigh of the righteous King Baba Rabbah and swore to him about this matter. Then Baba Rabbah took the hand of his son Levi, and handed him into the care of his Jewish friend, saying, 'My friend, take care not to depart from my instructions which I have commanded you. His Jewish friend replied, I will act according to all the instructions which you have given me.' The righteous King Baba Rabbah then responded, 'God is witness between me and you.'
11 After this, the righteous King Biba Rabbah died and was gathered unto his people, may the favour of the Lord and His forgiveness be upon him, Amen. His son Levi and his friend, the Jewish man, arose and bathed him, after the law of the Israelites, and clothed him in shrouds — white garments. The righteous king died in the city of Costantina, and the day of his death was a special occasion for the inhabitants of the city of Costantina. The king of Costantina and all his people wept for him, and they went, young and old, after him to bury him. They treated him on that day exactly as they had done on the day of his arrival at the city of Costantina. They buried him in a spacious and fine sepulchre, and the Romans later built a Synagogue over his grave.
Note:
Phrases followed by an asterisk (after the colon) are from the H2 text.
1. **The employment of this verb, as well as H2's נָשָׁא, to denote the begetting of children (in contradistinction to the Niph'al יָלַד) is significant. These verbs are especially employed when it is a divine bestowal of offspring that is being emphasized. As examples we may cite Gn 4:25 (חָוה זֶרַע) and Gn 17:16 (נְתָן בֵּן), where the transitive verbs with divine subject connote the formal conferment of an offspring that is to serve a special divine purpose. (The birth of Seth is stated to be as compensation for the slain Abel, and that of Isaac in order 'to establish my covenant with him, an everlasting covenant, and to his seed after him.') The employment of these verbs, to describe the gift of three sons to Neta'el, thus assumes an added significance, serving to highlight the specially ordained destiny to which God was calling them as restorers of Samaritan fortunes.**

2. **This syntactical order, wherein the name of the person follows the defining noun, or the 'noun of nearer definition' (C.K.§131g), is extremely rare in B.H., and then 'only in certain combinations' (Ibnag), e.g. ha-meletter יְלָדְךָ; ha-melekh דַּבְּגוּ.**

2. **The fem. demonstrative pronoun (וּתוּ) is preferred for general use, with both mas. and fem., sing. and pl., nouns (see on 22:22). With mas. nouns it invariably precedes the noun.**

2. **'The first' (H1: הָאֵל). The form הָאֵל occurs frequently as the ordinal number. B.H. added to this basic form the termination ‡ם. The vowel dissimilation which followed the addition of the termination, resulting in the form רִיִּים, was preserved in S.H. as רִיְיוֹן (see 9:8*). The ordinal employed by H1 - הָאֵל -
is rare in B.H. In such cases as Gn 1:5, 2:11, the meaning of first is derived solely from the context (G.K. §98a).

The semantic development of the name 'Āqūbān is clearly delineated in the genealogical lists of the Tolidah. The primitive form of the name appears in a list of twelve princes who accompanied one Ḡaddiq ben Tobhīyyah when he fled to 'Aqrabith after an Arab raid on Mount Gerizim (To.1 ed. Neubauer, 400). The name of the prince was 'Qb, which is probably a hypocoristicon (for a discussion of biblical hypocoristica, see M. Noth, Personennamen, 36-41) for Ya'āqūbān.

The form 'Qb, appearing there for the first time in Samaritan records, is expanded, about a century later, into the name 'Āqūbāh (b.'Amram), whose son was called — by further theophoric expansion — 'Āqabhyāh. The latter is said (To.1, 401) to have been taken captive to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar; and it is not without significance that the name 'Āqūbāh appears for the first time in Judaist biblical sources only in the post-exilic period, being restricted to the books of Ezra (2:42), Nehemiah (7:45, 8:7, 11:19) and Chronicles (1 Chr.3:24, 9:17). It is tempting, therefore, to detect Samaritan influence here, in the adoption of the name 'Āqūbāh by the Judaean community. The same may be said for the name 'Āqabhyāh: This 6th cent. B.C. Samaritan name does not occur in Judaistic sources until rabbinic times, with 'Āqabhyāh b. Mahālal'āl, a contemporary of Jesus.

The name 'Āqūbān, which appears for the first time as the name of a 2nd cent. A.D. Sam. High Priest (Neubauer, op. cit., 403), is a variation of 'Āqabhyāh,
the theophoric termination being replaced by the common nominal termination ָּם. The choice of this termination was possibly conditioned by its diminutive function (see G.K. 86g), suggesting an underlying meaning of 'little heel' (עַבְּבִּה). This termination is represented in Syriac as ָּם, thus providing a vocalization of either ָּם or ָּם. From the first appearance of this name it completely displaced the earlier forms and remained one of the most popular Samaritan priestly names for many centuries. No fewer than eleven High Priests in the genealogical lists of the Toldoth (Neubauer, 403-417) bear the name ָּם.

הנני: Our Netan'el is the third High Priest to bear this name (Tol. 401, 402, 403). It appears predominantly as a post-lexical levitical or priestly name (see B.D.B. Lexicon, 682).

הנני: He was the father of Levi, who features prominently in our Chronicle as the saviour of the community (see §18-19). Nothing of any significance is reported, however, about Phinehas.


.. הנני יִתְנִל רָּאוּ: Used here not in biblical sense of 'adjoining,' but rather 'in the region of.' The geographical identification is omitted in Abu'l Fath.

§ 4. הנני נזק: Delete נָּּמ as attestation.

רוּדָּּד שְׁמָּר: A.F.: 'A man of awe (חֶּּחַד) and authority.'

עָּמֶּר: בן תשעים שנה: Gn 39:2,3.

§ 5. הנני רְחַד: Common idiom, especially in book of Judges (3:10, 11:29, 14:6, 19, 15:14 et al.), for imparting warlike energy, and executive and administ-


H2 adopts a more militant attitude toward (and other) enemies of the community. This sentiment is not represented in H1.

7. סוז.orange: 'Enemies of His Faith, deniers.' The word is also found in Sam. Theology as the name of an evil spirit or demon, together with 생성, and Efliyya'at (see Ben Zevi, *Sepher Ha-Somronim*, 142; Bowman, *Samaritanische Probleme*, 52. This usage is not found, however, in the Midrashic literature. B.Z. Luria (Beth Miqra' (1970-1), 47, 494) connects the noun gir'āh with חרה.

8. חרות: 'Inyan and Yosar are popular in Marqah's vocabulary of psychological terms; the former meaning 'idea,' 'imagination', the latter meaning 'desire,' 'inclination,' 'thought.'
'He cogitated.' The verb הָסָר occurs in this sense in Syriac. The word יָהְשֹׁב (Is 10:7) is rendered סָר in the Syr. version.

'Intelligence,' 'mind.' Abstract noun endings in סָר are a particular characteristic of H2.

9. דוגמה: Sam. mas. form (מַהְשָׁבָה)

The translation 'because he revealed' follows the H2 rendering. Alternately we may understand the phrase as, '(his plan) to reveal.' A characteristic of the Samaritan style of the Chronicle is to substitute the infinitive of intention, or obligation (G.K., 114 1), by a simple imperfect (cf. 8:26, 17:4, 19:1 et al.).

'Appearing, or presenting oneself, before God' for pilgrimage is expressed in B.H. (at least according to the masoretic vocalization) through the niph'al conjugation (Ex 23:17, 34:23). Construing our phrase as a niph'al would provide the sense of a personal intention on Baba's part to 'appear before the Lord.' The context, however, suggests a much wider, national mission, as reflected in the Arabic (A1) rendering: 'Causimg the presence of God to be seen (sensed).'' We may therefore regard our infinitive as Hiph'IL rather than niph'al, and render as A1.

10. דוגמה: A1: 'And he showed that (zeal) first.'

The verse is omitted in A.F.

'Dutiful to him.' (lit. 'with him.') Verb unattested in B.H. in Hithpa'el conjugation.

11. הָסָר תֵּבְרֵי: Cf. Dt 32:1,2.

 Cf. Nu 5:14,30.
12. Possibly a contraction of the noun מִגְלָ֑רֶת (10:10), or read as פַּאֵל Inf. מִגְלַ֑א. We might conjecture that the מִגְלַ֑א might be an example of the 'emphatic lamedh,' known to us from Ugaritic, and attested to in B.H.

However: An alternate translation might also be proposed: 'that all their heresies be blotted out.' This rendering construes the Daleth of מִגְלַ֑א as a relative particle, and the form הָלָ֑א as derived from the noun מִגְלַ֑א, 'dung' (B.D.B., Lexicon, 165) — a derogatory play on the noun מִגְלַ֑א, 'idol.'

A.F. renders, 'For infidelity has prevailed (לִפְעָלָ֑א). The verb ?לָ֑א is unattested in B.H., in Pi'el conjugation, in sense of 'to weaken.' Render: 'For denial has weakened it (sc. the observance of the law).

Tal.Ar: קָ֑וָ֑רָה.

'And seeks to annul it.' In B.H. the vb. is intransitive, appearing only in Qal.

— A term of gnostic significance.

A.F: 'And solid truth has become annulled, namely the memory of the body ('corpus', מָרָ֑ו) of sincere doctrine. Did A.F. confuse the meaning of the Heb. text before him, construing our verb as the noun מָרָ֑ו, a 'body?'

13. Aphei בְּאֵ֑ו, 'look attentively at.' However, the proposition בְּאֵ֑ו is required for this meaning (see Cowley,11 (Glos.), 1111). The mark of the accusative (eth) rather suggests the sense of 'to muster. Indeed, for the M.T's מַ֑וְּדַ֑אֱ֑ו, 'And he mustered his trained men,' (Gn 14:14) the S.P. has מַ֑וְּדַ֑אֱ֑ו (as Akk.,diku,
to call up troops).

In B.H. the term יָשֶׂר generally has a pejorative sense. Only twice (1 Chr. 29:18; Is 26:3) does it occur in a sense favourable to man. The Sam. usage is clearly in the latter category. Its particular nuance of 'determination, resoluteness' is also found in the D.S.S. הַדַּנְדַּn

14. הנך קָרֵֽו: Vb gr, in sense of 'calling to,' normally takes the preposition 'אֶל.

בֵּעִיו:* Arabic עַדָּהוּ, 'to convey a message.' However, the appearance of this root in a Zinjerii inscription, in the sense of 'inciting, 'urging,' 'instigating' (a sense which B.D.B. regards as underlying Ex 35:29, יָשֶׂר הַדַּבַּב הָעַבָּד — 'whose heart impelled them'), provides an excellent meaning for our phrase: 'And he roused his companions.' This sense of הַדַּבַּב also occurs in Mandaeic (see Drower and Macuch, A Mandaeic Dictionary, 290) and in Jewish-Aramaic (Jastrow, Dictionary, 877).

15. אֵלֵּי בָּנֶית הַדוֹעֵר כְּבָּשׁ אָדָם: This gloss was probably inserted into H2 (it does not appear in H1) in order to clarify the sense in which the term הַדְּאָרֵל ( 'the uncircumcised') is being used. Since the word is also employed in the sense of 'uncircumcised of heart' (Lv 26:41), which would also suit our context, it might have appeared necessary to add this clarification.

אֵלֵּי בָּנֶית הַדוֹעֵר כְּבָּשׁ אָדָם: This phrase is omitted in H2, in conformity with its general tendency to economy in religious terminology and sentiment.

'וֹאָרֵד לִחְוָרָה לָרָדָה כְּ: There is no doubt that this Qal ptc./paragus is here employed in the sense of 'to show hostility
toward' (Arabic slaught, B.D.B. ᵃⁿᵃʳ III), rather than 'besiege,' 'confine.' There is no occurrence of this sense of sūr (in Qal) in Jewish Aramaic. The preposition ㏀ is on analogy of sūr (employed by H2), though also with sūr in Mandaic (e.g. hbar anaśia garna, 'I show hostility to people,' Brower and Macuch, 388).

Possibly Pōlēl / sūr; see previous note.

Exodus terminology (Ex 1:14); see on v.6 above.

16. נַעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: Nu 14:27.
    נִבְנְאֵרְךָ נְבְנַאֵרְךָ: Dt 32:27.
    נַעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: Ex 10:7

17. נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: Nu 11:2
    נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: Vb mm' usually takes preposition min'; but see
    נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: Ps 84:12.
    נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: Infinitive replaced by imperfect; see on
    נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: v 9 above.
    נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: B.H. takes simple accusative with vb.
    נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: Gloss, or misplaced from before lātān.
    נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: Confusion with mm', as in next verse.

18. נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: This verse, not represented in H2, might serve
    the purpose of clarifying, or emphasizing, the
    most acute of the restrictions imposed by the enemy.

20. נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: Cf.Gn 23:6
    נְעַרְתַּתְךָ נְעַרְתָּ: Sing. vb with pl. subject; perhaps
    in partitive sense, though generally a stylistic
    characteristic of the Chronicle.
This additional demonstrative perhaps conveys the nuance of 'at this particular time.' The form hāzēnū is close to the common Mandaic rem. demonstrative, bā'zēn (the ū termination being a contraction of hā) and the Ta' Arum. hādēn (though the latter is a masculine pronoun). This is the sole occurrence of this form in our section of the Chronicle.

*From achieving their desire.* Perhaps metathesis of /P'l/ (lit. 'doing what they desired'). The biblical /P'l/ has the sense of 'swelling up,' (Arabic jāz, 'tumour') as in the noun 'ōphei, 'a mound' (II Kings 5:24). As a vb the root occurs but once in the O.T. (Hb 2:4), with the suggested meaning of 'puffed up with pride.' Its usage here may also be related to this basic sense of rising, reaching toward, attaining (their desire). The vb is found again, in the perfect tense, in 10:22.

*The object (lāhem) suggests that the Pi'el is here being employed, with the causative sense of 'to make (or bring) low.'

21. מְדִינַ֣ת נַעֲרֵ֣י: Dt 32:36

בְּאוֹרָוָ֣מָה: Lv 26:37

וְ֠אִתְרָעֲאֲר: Common 1a1om, 'before' (= 1iphnē); or. bēn yādāyy (3:6*), 'before him;' min bēn ye'dō (10:20*), 'from before' (= milliphnē).
1. כֶּ֣רֶם: Gloss (not in H2); for clarification that Israel here refers to Jacob, not generically to his offspring.

אֵ֖רֶץ: Motive phrase, borrowed from context of zeal of Phinehas (Nu 25:13), here apparently with apologetic motive, in order to mitigate, if not idealize the action of the two sons of Jacob.

אָדָּ֣ם: Orthographic variant of בֶּֽתְזִ֖רְסָה. The second vowel is not to be confused with a plural form. It is merely an orthographic representation of the long vowel אָ, which is closely related, in Samaritan, to the vowel ב (or ב). The long א was apparently pronounced in a manner corresponding the sound of the vowel י, which would explain the orthography of the singular noun תִּרְסַה, with 3rd person possessive suffix, as תִּרְסָה. To give out one example of this: in the Sam. lexicon, ha-mëlis, which gives the Samaritan Hebrew word followed by the Arabic and Aramaic equivalent, we have the singular noun, 'our body' (we know that the singular is intended because of the form of the Arabic and Aramaic equivalents) written אָנָנִיתָא. Ben Hayyim, in his edition (L.O.T.W. II, 440), comments that the pronunciation of this word was clearly gîyûtînū.

2. דְּרָקֹן אֵ֥לֶּה בְּנוֹי יִשְׂרָאֵל: Gn 34:25, 26
B.T: hâr-gû

*Vb used in H2 with special meaning of 'preparing for battle'(cf. 11:9).

נִשְׂמַ֣ה אֶלֽוֹ: *Gn 34:9
נַחֲרָ֥ה בְּדָוֵ֖ד: * Gn 34:25

4. רוֹאֵ֧י צְבָ֣יִים: Ex 32:26
The accursed Calf,' "cum A 1.

A comparison of the renderings of H1 and H2 on this verse discloses the secularist bent of the latter, which has no reference to God as the bestower of the blessing.

Employed here in a simple relative sense; the equivalent of ka'asher.

Idiomatically equivalent to yirdin (see on 1:21).

Gn 49:3

Common Sam. designation of God; also occurs in biblical Aramaic, vocalized יָדִּים.

'Without (the help of) his people.' In B.H., however, the negative bal is never joined to a noun (see G.K. 152 (f)). The occurrence of the phrase bal 'itti ('before my time') in a Phoenician inscription (see B.D.B., sub ивают) provides, however, a precedent for our expression. It is possible, however, that we should read bēn, "cum H1.

Nu 25:11

Waw omitted by haplography from previous word לָלִּיָּהַו.

This verse is omitted in A.F. It appears to have been transposed from after v.2.

'Terror', Jb 6:21 (hapax in absolute form, though construct occurs in Gn 35:5).

Aph'el ṣqāḥ (= ṣqāʾ), 'cause to sink, descend upon.'

**םָלְמ** : Equivalent of biblical preposition בּ (bāhem).

*See on 1:15.*

10. **מַרְבָּנֵי** : Either abstract noun gōmēmīth, or construct form of gōmēmiyyāh.

**םָלְמ** : Dt 7:6


**הוּנְנֵי** : A.F: 'To resort to His gate in Prayer.' The vb. קָלָּל is frequently associated, in Samaritan and Rabbinic literature, with the connotation of spiritual endeavour, to express intensity of activity. Cf. אֶהֶלְרָּה 'אֲתָּה 'אֲמָּל (Abot, 6:4).

**זָנְנֵי** : This noun has a gnostic flavour. Seventy six of the Piyutin published by Cowley commence with the word בּגָּדָּלָה. It is used in the sense of a creative (or created) force, akin to Shekhinah or the Rescuing Power or Soter, Saviour, a central figure in gnosticism. Cf. מְרָה 'אֲתָּה 'אֲמָּל (Abot, 6:4).

**הוּנְנֵי** : Variant of גָּמַם. The ג sound developed through the influence of the extension of media waw verbs to media 'ayin forms, in order to preserve the consonantal character. Forms like qūm and sūr thus became qā'ēm and sā'ēr. Samaritan ג and ג being mere variants, the form si'an evolved naturally, though the word was probably pronounced geyyam. (See Z.Ben Hayyim, "A Samaritan Piyut from Amoraic Times," E.I., 4 (1956), 119, where the word dy'n, from /דָּנָה, is transliterated 'Deyyan').
12. Noteworthy:

Niphal dbq unattested in B.H.

Note: 'So that,' 'in order that.' Frequently employed in our Chronicle to introduce a purpose clause, though unattested in B.H. in this function.

Vav Imperfect:* 'Trevail over (?)' Arabic ʿiṣṣu to be strong.' Unattested in B.H. in this conjugation.

Metathesis:* Metathesis for ʾitḥālāthā.

13. Note:

Equivalent of ha-ṣabḥām; for relationship of ʾā and ʾā vowels in Sam. Hebrew, see on v 11.

14. Note: A lacuna has occurred here after dīlā. Either read ḍōmālayhā (as our translation), or add H2's continuation '(banners of) truth which have been erased.' The latter is supported by A.F. (ḏōʿ mā). For degel in symbolic sense of prestige, cf. Ct 5:10.

15. Note:

Read ṭōniḏāʾāsāh.

The base (basis) of the Faith.' While such a sense may be derived from the phrase, it is likely that the reading owes its form to a scribal misunderstanding of the term ʾarkhōnā in H2 (see below).

We will bolster (lit. 'plaster'); cf. Dt 27:2, 4. This follows the reading ṭōnāṣād. More probably we should read ṭōnāṣād, the /ṣād being a derivative of the Ar. šdy, šdā, 'to lay a foundation.' Targumic rendering of ʾāl yārāh (Jb 38:6) is man ṣādā.'

Note: The authority of the law.' Gr. Ἀρχὴ τῆς Ἑξέλεξις

Note: Unusual construct noun before relative pronoun. Perhaps orthog. error for lidrāgīm.
§2

16. וַיָּכוֹל בֵּית מַשׁוֹאֵל נַכְּרֵי עִבְרֵי... possibly a proverbial expression: 'We shall return in repentance, with no going back (to our former ways).

Masorah: Ex 17:7

17. Passive form for active participle; common in Aramaic.

Masorah: Masc. termination for usual יָגֹוןָתָה (see previous verse). The masc. termination serves to substantiate the forms יָגֹונֵיַּקְחָה (Ez 23:18), יָגוֹנוֹנָה (Is 64:6) et al., which have been impugned by some scholars (see C. Siegfried and B. Stade, Hebräisches Wörterbuch, 87).

18. אֵלֶּה: Aramaic extended the semantic reach of the biblical עֻג, 'to grow numb,' to encompass the idea of faintness, lethargy, refraining. The noun עֻגָּה is very common among Karaite authors, in the sense of 'doubt,' with a vb hithpûgâg (see J. Gottlober, Bikkoret Le-Toledot Ha-Keraim, 216).

Masorah: Sam. variant of נַעֲגָּה; see Cowley, II, lxiii.

Masorah: Dt 28:53, 55, 57

Masorah: Read: עֵבֶּה קָחָה הַמַּשֶּׁלֶה... 'And by His strength, the Prosperer will answer us.'

19. A.F., in line with H2, condenses vv. 18-19: 'He will help us and give us success, to defeat those uncircumcised and impure ones.'

Masorah: Dt 15:8

Masorah: Elyptical for עֵלֹה הַמַּשֶּׁלֶה.
§2 - §3

A philosophical term for the non-existence before Creation. See Macdonald, The Theology of the Samaritans, and especially our discussion of this phrase, p. 437 above.

Construct noun with definite article! Perhaps intended as in appositional relationship.

'Their leaders shall remain banished.' Lack of agreement between verb (yətišā'ēr) and masculine subject (rō's). Perhaps read yəyišā'ēr. The singular subject (rō's) is possibly construed collectively, hence pl. mithnadhīm.

Eschatological term for hereafter, future life, nether world.

Our translation follows the A1 rendering: 'Their heads shall be bowed.' /qdh = /qdd. The eschatological context would favour a reference here to (Hell-)burning, from /yqd. Render: 'where their chiefs shall be consumed in fire.'

Scribal error for bānay.

Read nirdōph, cum H2

Unattested Pi'el usage of verb.

'Then,' as Arabic āša (cf. Ho 6:7, Dt 33:21).

Sing. participle with plural subject, cf. 17:5*, 22:17

1. 'Leaders,' as supervisors of the community, Pa'ēl /yn, 'to watch over,' Arabic ḫāʾ, 'appoint.'

Unattested preposition with Hiph'īl /ykkh.
2. **Read rūḥāṣ**. Ritual washing of hands, face and feet before Prayer recalls Islamic prescription. A.P. ʿād.

3. **Ex 34:28. Sinaitic Revelation terminology.**

4. **Gn 24:21.**

5. **Ex 19:2**

6. **Ex 32:11. The attributes of God, enumerated in this verse, — ʿābād, gādal and kābhōd — all have gnostic significance, and figure in Marqan thought very prominently.**

7. **Cf. Ex 34:9.**

8. **An explanatory gloss.**

9. **See on ֶש ָם (2:12).**

10. **חָפֵּה** = hāʾ: pronounced א by the Samaritans.

**Infinitive Absolute /מג, 'to exist' (cf. 15:10*). The detachment of the relative pronoun ד, after min, has been noted as a characteristic of very early texts (E.Munk, *Dea Samaritanorum Marqah.*
Erzahlung über den Tod Moses, 1890, 40); it is, indeed, a characteristic of our Chronicle (see the continuation of our verse, also 4:19 et al.).

The Prime Mover; a philosophic doctrine which, according to Maimonides, was rejected by the Muslim Mutakallemim thinkers. In the course of his critique of the "twelve propositions common to all Mutakallemim" (Guide for the Perplexed, Friedlander ed. (1904), 120) he observes that 'most of the Mutakallemim believed that it must never be said that one thing is the cause of another' (p. 125).

The term nà'la ha-nà'îth, 'Mover of all movement,' would approximate, therefore, to the views of the Asha'arists, who assumed that 'when a pen is set in motion God creates four accidents: man's will to move it; man's power to do so; the motion of the hand; the motion of the pen, none of which is the cause of any of the rest' (ibid.).

And made to be still that which is still.' This rendering presents an opposite contrast to the previous phrase, nà'la ha-nà'îth.

Dv 7:6. The reference to the 'Chosen People' is missing in H2 and in Arabic MSS.

'To return to.' Cf. Mi 5:2; Ne 4:6.

The first 'Aliph does not represent the def. art., which would be anomalous with suffix, but rather the trace of the helping vowel which the Sams. append to the beginning of words commencing with sounded 'è va'. The simple form hÈtÈ‰ (Masoretic hatÈ‰) would necessitate this.

Dt 7:9, 12.
Alternate rendering: 'And delivers those who know him out of the intensity of their poverty.' This understands the noun as abstract dāllūth, rather than the Sam. form of the dālāthā (from deleth, 'door'). The adoption of this rendering would provide a subtle play on the words dālāthā (phrase preceding) and dāllūthā.

* Cowley (T.S.L.,II, liii) explains cleave in the sense of 'help;' likewise Ben Hayyim, in his "Pīyyut Shōmerōni Miymey Hā-'amōrā'im" (B.I. 4), consistently renders /dbq in the sense of 'help.' It is obvious, however, that in our context such a sense would provide a totally irrelevant sentiment — 'O Thou who helpest them that help Thee.' It is clear, therefore, that /dbq is here, quite literally, 'to cleave.' Render: 'O Thou who cleavest to them that cleave to thee.'


In anticipation of the nouns rahāmeeykhā and hássādeeykhā, kabhod is treated as (or vocalized, at least, as) a plural.

In an anticipation of the nouns rahāmeeykhā and hássādeeykhā, kabhod is treated as (or vocalized, at least, as) a plural.


12. כי הברה והוּנַה : Ps 3:2. The quotations from the Psalms, when singular in form, are converted into the plural to give them a communal relevance.

Play on words by metathesis.

'Who have denied the report of You.' Alternate rendering: 'Who have denied Your name.' The 'ayin would then represent the sounded e according to Samaritan pronunciation.
Alternately, 'Who have desisted from observing,' reading Ḥāškhâ.

Possibly an anti-Christian polemic, denouncing the elevation of Jesus in place of Moses, and the rejection of the Old Testament (kêthâbkhâ) in favour of the New.

Here he refers back to the pagan rulers who preceded the era of Christian ascendancy in the reign of Constantine.

The Psalm verses that follow are omitted by A.F. and other Arabic versions, as they are by H2. Only significant variations from the B.T. are referred to in the notes that follow.

Cf. Ps 4:2.

Cf. Ps 4:3.

Cf. Ps 4:3. Abstract noun. For the phrase tphē Tôrâh, see Je 2:8.

Cf. 3:32. Mab=mabh.


Cf. Ps 5:3.

Cf. Ps 5:5.

Condemnatory gloss.

Used here in the unusual sense of 'rather than.'

Dative incommodi.
19. 'Make inaccessible,' 'cut off,' 'block.' Only in Imperfect tense in B.H.

The Psalm verses may also have been employed to smooth over a lacuna in H2 between vv. 19-22.


25. Cf. Ps 7:3.


27. Cf. Ps 7:5.


27. בְּכֵהוּ דֶּר: Dt 4:30.
     הנָתָן אוֹסְרָה: Ibid. v 29.


29. מי' טעְלָהֵי: Ibid. v 3.

     ли'נְבָּרְצָיִים יַדוֹרְזָרָה מְסִכָּה: B.T: לֶמַּאֲן גֹּרְעֵיָקְהָא לֹהָשִׁיתְה
     'םִיִּבְּבָה umithnaqqem.

     בגיאְ: B.T: 'סָגְעֵיָהtheykba.
     שְּנָבֵי: Ibid. v 5.

     ושֶׁ: Explanatory gloss.
     This Psalm is employed by the Chronicler in a
     spirit the very opposite of that intended by
     the Psalmist. The latter expressed it in the
     form of a tribute to human worth, whereas the
     Chronicler extracts from its a damnation of
     the wicked foes of the community.

     כִּי יטָשֵׁל: Ibid. v 7.

     אֶלֶּה נְעָנְסָיו: B.T: לֶמַּאֲשָׁי yădeykhā. See above, where the
     Chronicler rendered the B.H. 'fingers' by 'pride'
     (גָּאָּשְׂיָקָה). Here he renders the B.H.'hands' in
     the same way.

     קְרַבְּהוּ: Read v^nithpā'ār.
     וּרְשָׂעְוָה שְּנִיָּה שְׁמֶך: Ibid. v 3.
     וּרְשָׂעְוָה: Ibid. v 4.

32. הכּו' וּרְשָׂעְוָה: Ibid. v 6.
     כּו' וּרְשָׂעְוָה: Gloss.
     וּרְשָׂעְוָה: Gloss.
     וּרְשָׂעְוָה: Ibid. v 10.
33. "כְּכָל־אֵל־רָדוֹתֵךְ שָׁמָּךְ" נְהַעֲסֵה: Cf. Ps 9:11

34. Cowley (T.S.L., II, lxv) renders בַּעַמָּל, "for the sake of" (but see on 2:11). Possibly עָמָל is intended to convey the notion of intercession (lit. 'toiling' on behalf of the rights and needs of others).

נְהַעֲסֵה יַעֲקֹב: Render: 'Now help us in accordance with our resolve (to walk) zealously before before You.' The vb. 'to walk' (= 'to be') is either understood or omitted in transmission. Arabic versions understand H2's gin'āh in the sense of 'Unity,' cum 'לע' (A.F: 'זָואָה').


36. תָּעָאֵלְתָה: Unusual preposition with ג' ל.

37. דְּまとִת עָלֵי בָּלֵר: Text dubious.

38. דִּרְצָר: 'Distress'.


בִּשֵּׂם בָּהּ וְיִשָּׁם: Cf. Ex 15:4.


תמר תמר: 'You made them to possess.' Transitive sense suggests a Pi'el form of vb. Elsewhere only Dt 28:42 (יָיִרְשָׁא).

---

§4

1. לכידי...: Tendency to place preposition before vb.; cf. לֹהֶ יָסָפְרוּ (11:19), 'אלֹיֶ יִשְׁבָּ'ו (11:8).

بوتבי:* See on 3:1. Always in construct form. The parallel with נָדָע (H1) suggests that מְתַיְּנָא is to be understood in the very broadest sense of leadership, encompassing influential men in all areas of religious, social and military endeavour. This is further underlined in 20:19 where מְתַיְּנָא is paralleled in H1 by צְינָאֶ vְרָא'גֶּ vְסָיְרָא 'אְמָא.


יתוך מַדַּאְאָמקֶהֶ: The significance of this phrase is underlined by a passage in Marqah which speaks of knowledge as a 'light that shines in the heart'
(Memar Margah, I, 136; II, 222). 'Heart' and Madāt are, of course, related terms (see previous note).

3. חֶסְדֵּי חַדִּישֵׁי: Ex 24:7. This verse places the role of Baba, and his relationship to his community, as parallel with that of Moses as instruments of divine redemption (see on 1:6, 3:34).

מָצוּר: Unattested noun מְשַׁאֵב; perhaps read misvātīkhā.

לְדוּרֵי: Sole example of Waw Consecutive in H2; perhaps read וֹשַׂאַה.

4. לִבְּאֶ דָּבָר אֲחַד פִּי: Dt 1:26, 43; 9:13; Josh 1:18.

לִבְּאֶ דָּבָר לְכָל יוֹבָל: Unattested usage of 'זב with preposition ָּו in the sense of 'forsaking.'

6. נַחֲצָה לְבוֹשׁ: Vb /gvh usually take Direct Object with eth.

7. נַשָּׁוֵעַ: 'Obedient.' Passive in form; active in meaning.

נַשָּׁוֵעַ: Note masculine termination; but in V 10 רֹעֲשֶׁת. Such variation is not uncommon in our Chronicle (e.g. גֹּלַלְיָם and גֹּלַלְתָּו; 1:20; nimṣā'61th and nimṣā'61m, 3:10).

8. נַשָּׁוֵעַ לְכָל יוֹבָל: Pregnant construction; perhaps for eth kol gōl misvātīkhā.

9. נַשָּׁוֵעַ לְכָל יוֹבָל: In cases of a single subject with extra subjects appended with waw copula, H1 anticipates by employing a plural verb (vayysūlīkhū), whereas H2 maintains the initial singular requirement (yāṣā').

משוּר: Masc. construct occurs only once in B.H., Ez 34:13.
For the use of $1^s$ to introduce object of
\( /sgr \), see Amos 1:9.

\( /sgr \) in Pi'el conjugation occurs only in book
of Samuel (— and then not in partciple!),
where its sense is 'to surrender up', not
'to close.'

10. 'This first act is in accordance with
the priority given to Torah in Baba's programme
of reform (see 1:18, 15:18).

Nu 16:22, 27:16.

As a designation of God — 'God of the battle
array of Israel' — this is not a Pentateuchal
phrase. It would be a mistake, however, to
conclude that it has precisely the same sense
as in the later books of the Bible. Bearing in
mind the view of Ben Zevi (S.H., 24) that
\( \text{š} \text{ar ha-šābhā'} \) was the title given to Baba Rabbah,
as well as the covert allusion to this title
in a 4th cent. amulet — as suggested by
J. Caplan ("A Second Samaritan Amulet from Tel
Aviv", E.I., 10, 255-257) — it is possible
that the sense of the phrase 'el š'ébha'oth,
in our passage, is 'God of Baba's hosts.'

Unusual plural form when referring
to the earth. Cf. v 11 where we have the
usual phraseology, 'šēlōhā ha-šāmayim vēhā'āresāq.
The plural termination $6^s$ probably entered
under the influence of the many plural nouns
which follow, in succession to each other, in
the verse.
The term *zēdīm* occurs in the *Amīdāh* (daily liturgical) composition of the Jewish Synagogue: *vāna-zēdīm* thēaqēr uthēsābēr. A variant of the word *vāna-zēdīm*, found in other rites, is *malkhūth zēdōn* — the term *malkhūth* being, in rabbinic literature, a specific appellation of the Roman dominion. Significantly, both Jewish and Samaritan Palestinian tradition employed the term *zēdīm* (or *zēdōnīm*) to describe the hated conqueror.

The poor syntax created by the insertion of this numeral into the context suggests that it was a later gloss, disclosing the number of *Simmūrē* ha-Tōrāh whom Baba managed to summon. It is not to be dismissed, however, on that score, since it appears again in 5:1, where it is endemic to the context. H1, rather surprisingly, does not include this important piece of information in its version.

H2 consistently omits this epithet from Baba's title, in consonance with its general tendency to economy in religious terminology or personal attributes; see on 1:15.

Omitted in H2, which, unlike H1, does not model itself on biblical style or terminology.

The noun *mēod* (Dt 6:5, 'might') is employed in the Chronicle in the sense of 'full attention,' 'mind,' 'concentration.'

A total programme of school, as well as adult, education is here envisaged, with no discrimination between the sexes. The intensity
of the course instituted by Baba is referred to in v 20.

Orthographic variant of migrā'ath (see next verse). The shorter form occurs again in v 20.

A secular nuance of the verb qdš, in the Hithpa'él conjugation, with the sense of 'devoting attention.' A1: 'And expend the utmost of your effort.'

 Cf. Gn 2:21, 15:12.
 Cf. Ps 101:2; Prov 11:20.

Uncertain phrase. Arabic ّألاص, 'to be light.' Perhaps: 'Do not be lethargic (= H1's, vDš tipplu bDš tarmac) in the pursuit of perfection (= H1's, derekh Dš mumah).

Ex 10:11.

Dt 1:11.

Dt 33:29.

Ibid.

'I may rule faithfully.' Either read 'ōmen (in ) faithfulness' (cf. Is 25:1), or as adverb, 'āmen ('truly,' Dt 27:15-26).

Omission of relative pronoun.

Infinitive Absolute (cf. Dt 3:16), or read 'akkeh (cf. H1), or hakkâ (Imperative).

Dt 11:27.

The exacting standards of proficiency in the reading of the Law, and the mastery of the scholarly writings demanded by Baba, were clearly resented at first by
the people. This is reflected in the use of such terms as tirḥān and 'aqāḥ.

Text corrupt? Possibly parenthetical ('For he was their father'), with 'ābhām a contraction of 'ābhīhem, though comparison with H1 suggests that a verb has dropped out.


Orthog. variant of 'ithbāṣrū', 'to receive good tidings.' A.F: ניבק רע.

§5

The general import of this section is fully analyzed in our chapter eleven, "The Administrative Reforms of Baba Rabbah."

1. illustrative: — Another Moses motif.

Ex 18:21.

Ibid.

B.T: yirjē.

2. See our discussion of this term, pp.419-423.

3. שלושת מַצְחֵי מֶסְכָּנְי... To this day the Samaritans maintain a tri-partite tribal division into the tribes of Levi, Menasseh and Ephraim.

Delete as gloss.

5. תכשיטות: [H2: סִּ֣כְרְתִם]. On these two versions and titles, see pp. 418-422.

6.וְקָרָאָה: Used here in the sense of 'to deprive of,' 'withdraw (a title). The required, causative sense suggests either Pi'el (see Gn 41:14) or Hiph'îl (see Gn 31:41); in both instances, the biblical usage suggests the sense of 'exchange,' 'substitute,' rather than merely 'withdraw.'

7. דַּמְּפַל לִיְבְרָךְ: For detailed discussion of the succeeding episode, see pp. 423-426.

8. "Stretching from the stream Jabbok (thus including northern Gilead) northward to Hermon, between Gennesaret (Ŵ) and the mountains of Hauran (E)," (B.D.B., 143). In the Onomasticon of Eusebius (ed. Klostermann, 112) there is a reference to a Samaritan community in Bashan (Eus: 'Batanaia'). See M. Aviyonah, "'Al Mēriaoth Ha-Somronim Bêbiza'ntium," E. I., 4 (1950), 129.

Pi'el usage.

With reference to geographical location such as Bashan, the H2 rendering, mēdinah seems far more accurate. The reference in the Onomasticon of Eusebius (see previous note) to the Samaritan settlement of a place.
in Bashan called Tarsila (Tasīl), provides us with the likeliest identification. (On the question of its identification, see E.Z. Melamed, "The Onomasticon of Eusebius," Tarbiz, 3, 250 note 107.)

**Double relative!**

**Read bā′ā, cum H2.**

"They came to greet him." Unattested in this sense in B.H. The Hiph'āl occurs, with the preposition 'el, in Josh 11:19, in the sense of 'to submit to.' It occurs in this sense in Arabic, form IV: 'to submit oneself,' esp. to God (whence participle Musiam, and Infinitive ʿislām). It occurs again, in 25:8, in the related sense of 'to hand over, 'entrust to the care of.'

**Dt 15:10.**

**Both words have the technical meaning of 'rank,' 'position,' 'seniority' (see 5:21, 22, 31). See, further, on v. 17.**

**Subject pronoun following verb, perhaps for additional emphasis (cf. ḫayyū ĥēm, 5:11).**

**Prefixe lammea; variation of biblical construction el mihṣāq lē (Lv 6:4, 10:4).**

**Past frequentative action is expressed by finite verb in imperfect with auxiliary verb 'to be' in perfect tense. See, however, on v. 12.**

"Circumcision;" Noun derived from Niph'āl formation. H2's nāmālān appears to be a hybrid of Niph'āl and Hiph'āl forms.
Hiph'il /מִתְלַ? Only one occurrence of Hiph'il, in Ps 118:10.

12. Frequentative action in the future is expressed by employing the imperfect of הָיָה with participial form of main verb.

14. Read הָעֵנֶנֶנֶי. The H1 version, 'neither a sage nor a scholar,' is more refined than that of H2.

15. Delete רָע as dittography from first word of sentence.

The statement made here, that only the names of the priests were preserved in a genealogical list (תֹלְדָאָה), is founded on the tradition that during the Bar Cochba revolt the Romans destroyed all the literature of the community. The latter succeeded in rescuing only the scroll of the Torah and a scroll giving the genealogical chain of the priests (Ben Zevi, S.H., 22).


17. This phrase is remarkably close to the rabbinic adage that a scholar is one — הַמַּקְּר 'eth mִקְּמֹד — 'who knows his own rank' ( — and, in consequence, refers to seniority). See Aboth 6:6.

19. The root נָגַג does not appear in B.H. It is also rare in Sam. Hebrew. H2 has the more common מְדִי.

20. Lit. 'drop dew,' Cowley, 11, 1711.
The elucidation of the name, provided by H1, is not given by H2. There are many such indications that H1 is a polished version of H2.

Alternately ʾabḥtāh or ḥabṭāh (חַבְטָה), 'the second priest, usually at Damascus (Cowley, II, iv).

21. Chronicle Adler renders ḥad yiḥṭeh, sōḥār rūāḥ bēn yādāyv; translated: 'Il devint le premier secrétaire devant le grand-prêtre.' The Pater seems to have been a rather more senior administrator, however, than that conveyed by Adler's 'secrétaire.' One feels that Adler's literal rendering of sōḥār has misled him here. The title sōḥār, in Judaistic tradition, has a far more comprehensive and juridical significance than is conveyed by the literal sense of the title. Indeed, it was the title assumed by the early Pharisaic legislators themselves!

The term Pater occurs among the titles of communal officers in the ancient Synagogue of Rome, as, for example, the Pater Synagogae (U. Kaploun, The Synagogue, Popular Judaica Library, 4).

23. Adler renders: ʾelō ha-qērāʾāh ha-yēnāṯ; translated: 'C'était le second lecteur.'

The term migrāʾāh, we suggest, refers to the specific duty or function of acting as precentor for the reading of the Law, or of teaching the correct method of reading. Verse 19 points out that an important part of Baba's hierarchic
reform was the appointment of people to act as guardians of the neglected traditions appertaining to the correct method of Scripture reading. The latter would then have been the "expounder" of Scripture, as opposed to the teacher of the skill of reading the law, a function referred to by the term mīqrāʾāḥ.

The Chronicler would then be asserting that P̄rūbaʿî (v 20) was the Chief Expounder, followed by ʿAmram (v 26). Third and fourth in the rank of Expounders are not preserved. The fifth Expounder was Yisrāʾēl (thereby accounting for the fact that he is placed fifth in the arbitrary order). The sixth in rank is not preserved. The lowest in the order of seniority was Yoqîbî (v 22).

The term māqôm, used in the context of this list, refers exclusively to geographic situation, or administrative area, in relation to Mount Gerizim, not to rank (even though the term does also have this connotation; see on 5:17). This is made clear in v 21, where the leader whose administrative area was in closest proximity is described as having the first māqôm, and also in v 22, where Yoqîbî, although last in the rank of Expounders, yet occupies the second māqôm. The town of Yislāh (Sīlāh), associated with him, is a mere 12 km. N.W. of Mt. Gerizim, which would suit the designation māqôm ha-šēnî, in geo-administrative terms.
27. "Amram Darah is referred again in 9:12. Bearing in mind the great contribution of this man, it is surprising that the Chronicles are the only source of information, or tradition, regarding his date and activity. As a contemporary of Baba Kabbah, and a member of his hierarchic 'inner circle,' we may assume that the main stimulation and encouragement 'Amram (and his son, Marqah) required to foster their pioneering literary activity, came from Baba, and the hopes he raised for a comprehensive Samaritan renaissance.

On the slender basis of a reference to 'Amram as Kahânân rabbâh 'amrām dārān, in a Vatican Ms. of a piyyut, Ben Hayyim (L.O.P.S., III, pt.2, 12) opined that 'Amram was a High Priest. It is obvious that, from the sittz im leben of our Chronicle, wherein Nethan'el is the High Priest, Baba the effective leader of the community, and 'Amram but one of the seven members of the ruling praesidium (no more than sixth in the list of such leaders, and occupying only the second Migra'āh), that Ben Hayyim's contention cannot be substantiated.

 אפֶל /alp.

Aphel /alp.

לִיט. 'Stanzas or (strung) pearls.' Arabic .ةَذِةَ. Hebrew poetry of the Jews also adopted this metaphor, by employing the term harûz for 'rhyming verse.'

28. קָרֵא מַגָּה: Read bâttî marqāh, the final Mem intruding by ditography (in anticipation of the first letter of marqāh).

'Appointment,' 'rank.' Rare noun, related to /mnh, 'to appoint.' Tal. Aram. m̀mûneh, 'superintendent.'
1. The noun usually employed is מְשָׁבְח (see v.9) or מְשָׁבָּח (ibid.*). The Hebrew form occurs in 5:31, מְשָׁבָחַּה.

2. 'Discipline them,' (H2: שֵטֶקָה.) This is a slight semantic shift from the shade of meaning that the הָשָׁה suggests in B.H., viz. 'to spare,' 'hold back.'

3. I.e., 'You shall be a face (front) to,' i.e., 'go before.'


5. לַאֵטיֶנְדֶר טַפְּרֶה...ךָלֵאראָס-חה: Dt 23:22.

6. Curious intrusion of ה' after preposition.

7. For a full discussion of the identity and role of the Miṣpahath Haššibhām, as described in this section, see chapter 12.
1. The H2 rendering is complex, and it is probable that some lacuna has occurred. The term יִשְׂרָאֵל הַשְּׁמָרִים may refer to the Samarians (as opposed to 'Samaritans'); and the import of the verse is that among the Israelite Samarians were some who called themselves (reading שְׂמָה for 'אםָה) Samaritans.

2. פֶּ֔לֶג al form of /yeh here used in transitive sense, 'to appoint,' 'set up.' Indeed M. Dahood, commenting on the phrase וַיהֵתָה כָּסָף הַשְּׁמָרִים (Ps 122:5), concludes, amid evidence from Ugaritic usage, 'that the verb yasabh can govern the accusative case' (M. Dahood, The Anchor Bible, Psalms III, 206).

3. 북ו: H1, characteristically, simplifies the rare word מֵהָ֖קֹּרְתְּהֶם in H2.

םָבָ֣ה אַלְּכָּה הַשְּׁמָרִים: Noun מֵהָ֖קֹּרְתָּה, only in Ezekiel (Ez 16:3, 21:35, 29:14). It has the sense of 'origin' (lit. place of digging out. See B.D.B. sub 11 ח). Bara's inability to dislodge the הָ֔שְׂהֵמִן Haššiphōnim from their position of influence and autonomous independence is explained by the term מֵהָ֖קֹּרְתְּהֶם. They were well 'dug in'; their forebears having been associated with those areas from earliest times.

4. 보기: Sing. pronoun with plural subject. Perhaps used collectively.

4. בכְּלָ֖יָה: The plural הָאָ֖זֶה הָֽזֶרֶזִּים actually qualifies 'the seven sages', mentioned at the beginning of the verse. The intervening phrase might be a gloss (but see on v 2 above).
Di'el. B.H. has only Qal form. It is conceivable, however, that we have here a plural form of the *hadak legomenon* mis‘ād (I Kings 10:12), 'support.' The sense of the phrase would then be, 'These seventy were supporters of (lit. 'supports with') the priest Baba Rabbah.'

Josh. 7:21. The vagueness of this term is removed in H1 by use of the term mašbir.

Irregular form of the noun sebah, 'grain' (On 42:1). In B.H. the term mašbir means 'the seiler of grain.'

Lit. 'they overtook him with,' i.e. 'to lavish upon.' Clarified by H1's vayyitnū lō.

Curious expression. Aram./phr, 'to hollow out, scrape' (= hphr). The parallel with ṭēmûnîm (lit.'buried,' 'concealed') is inescapable, suggesting that paḥârōth may have the sense of 'rare.' Alternately, the Aramaic noun paḥra' means 'earthenware,' and the phrase may mean that they gave 'earthenware gifts' to Baba. According to one report, Samaritans only ate and drank from earthen vessels on the Sabbath, not from metal ones. If a metal vessel became unclean, one might inadvertently purify it on the Sabbath. To prevent this, earthen vessels — which cannot be purified — were used (see K.Kohler, "Dositheus, the Samaritan Heresiarch," AJTH, xv (1911), 413-14.). Does this suggest a Dosithean identity for the Miṣpahath Haḥābîthîm?

It is unlikely that paḥârōth means merely, 'beautiful!' (/phr being an orthog. variant of /p‘r/).
Qal or Niph'al. If Qal, in an active sense ('whom he had appointed') we have the problem of a singular suffix qualifying a plural subject (ha-ḥākhāmīm). This is solved by reading vayyipḥeqāḏēm, the 3rd pers. pl. suffix being supported by H2's rendering, yēṣayveh 'ōthām.

A Niph'al sense (reading vayyipqāḏū) would be doubtful, however, since the basic structure and import of the sentence is active in sense, with Baba as subject.

Hapax in B.H. (I Kings 6:6), where it is used in the unequivocal sense of 'ledge, recess'. Here it is synonymous with ʾēgāgōth, in the sense of 'deficiencies.'

Noun ḥephṣāh unattested in B.H.

Baba's emphasis on the importance of Torah reading was certainly a reaction to the lengthy period when such public readings were proscribed by the Romans, with serious consequences for religious knowledge and observance (see 1:18).

'Scrupulously,' lit. 'out of whole(heartedness).' 'According to the reading of the ten.'

This abstruse phrase might suggest an attempt by Baba to introduce the prerequisite of a quorum of ten for the reading of the Law, as in Jewish tradition. We would accordingly render the phrase as 'in the assembly of ten'. Cf. migrāʾ qōdes (a holy convocation'), Ex 12:16.

Alternately, the reference in H2 to hāʾēsrōth hāʾ-iqqārîm, 'the ten principles' might point to some system of cantillation or accentuation signs, on the Judaistic pattern of nēgānāth. Coincidentally, the invention of these signs is attributed to the first half of the 4th cent. (Encyc. Jud., 1b, 1413).
A gloss, clarifying that by ha-dabhar ha-ro's Baba meant 'the chief matter,' rather than the first topic.'

The prescription to make a zikkarôn 'between you and between the teachers' suggests more than merely 'reminding them.' It appears to call for a regular (ba'khōl 'ēth) revision course (zikkarôn) in which the appointed leaders are to instruct and 'refresh the memories' of the teachers.

It is possible that a scribal error has occurred here, and we should read talmîdîm, 'disciples.' The nouns talmûn and talmîd are, occasionally, interchanged in Samaritan literature (see Cowley, II, 11x). The verse would then call upon the scholars to conduct regular 'tests of the students' (for nassoth, 'tests,' see 9:4).

For a discussion of Baba's Miqven, and especially the expression in our verse, 'ittōth ko'ī tōth, see our chapter on "The Administrative Reforms of Baba Rabbah," espec. pp. 4.43-4.53.

This verse has the hallmark of being a gloss.

Adler: kōnišah.

'The Franks.' The singular is used in a collective sense.

'Place of Worship.'
A curious nomenclature for the Franks (H1). It might be connected with the name ṭiphath (Gn 10:3), son of Gomer, firstborn of Japhet. B.D.B. (Lexicon, 937) quotes Josephus' identification of Riphath with Paphlagonians.

More probably, however, our Riphtim is a transliteration of 'Ripuarians,' one of the three main branches of the Franks. The Ripuarians were the most successful of the Frankish tribes, reaching their zenith in the Rhine land conquests of the 5th cent. H2 preserves a tradition that the Riphtim sent officials to prevent the Samaritans from observing their religion (see 11:1, 4).

-Benz: 'Dimension.' B.H: mad, mémad, middāh.

Boqra in Edam. The name 'Albāṣraḥ appears in the Asatir (ed. Ben Hayyim, ch.2, 1.21) as a city built by Tubal Cain as a centre for his tool-making industry. The original name was sêkhîphāḥ, or, according to another version, sêkhîphās. This is suggestive of the name Scopus, and, conceivably, it was for that reason that it was identified with Albāṣraḥ the Citadel.

We cannot rule out the possibility that Boqra is identical with Bostra, the birthplace of Philip the Arab, who figures prominently in our Chronicle. Bostra is identified with Philippopolis in the Trachonitis (Victor, De Caesaribus, 28, 1). For discussion of this name, see I. Sonne, "Historical Sources," J.Q.R. (N.S.), 26, 150-1; S. Lieberman, "The Martyrs of Caesarea," op. cit., 249-251.
8. Scribe notes his own error by dotting the last letter of mē'ābhnīm. Read mē'abhnē.


10. Adler and H2 have 'eight Synagogues.' The H1 version was undoubtedly motivated by the uncertainty surrounding the eighth Synagogue (see v. 18).

Vv. 11-19 are treated in detail in our chapter, "The Location of Baba's Synagogues According to the Account of the Chronicler."

2. We have here a classical example of H1's predilection for pious attributions, as contrasted with H2's simple reference to ha-hār ha-kōdeš.

3. Arabic 'Alima, 'to make known,' or, perhaps, read vēya'ālā, 'he shall submit (his request).'


5. B.H. employs only the construct case of gālāl with prefixed bē, as in biglāl.

Note detached relative pronoun (cf. 4:19); also singular verb after plural subject (cf. 12:1*, 14:3*).

Pious epithets of H1 omitted in H2.

Verb תֵּחָו or תֵּחַו occurs in Sam. Aramaic in sense of 'to pay attention to,' 'consider,' 'think;' see on 1:8, also Ben Hayyim, L.O.T.S., II, 507.

Read מוֹדְּה (construct), 'existing things,' 'affairs.' Syr. מַכְוֹ (pa.) 'accustom;' מַכְוֹ 'usage.'

Contraction of וּחַּוֹדְּהּ.

This cannot mean that Baba appointed priests over the people 'whom he had found,' which would give no sense. We suggest that this phrase has become transposed, and that it should qualify 'the priests.' The verb מַג is here used in the sense of 'gather together, assemble' (cf. עָמָסָה lāhem // יָסֵפֵה lāhem, Nu 11:22).

The sense of the phrase would then be that 'Baba allotted the priests, whom he had assembled, over his people.' This interpretation is also supported by the use of this verb in 10:1*.

The noun כֹּהֵן occurs in the Ha-mēliṣ, the Hebrew/Arabic/Sam.Aramaic lexicon, as the equivalent of the Heb. מִשְׂפָּת, 'family.' The sense of our passage would then be: 'Who were appointed over the religious and pious families.'
H1 always employs the term רְנֵפָּה, 'head,' in place of H2's ordinal רְיָשׁון. (cf. 8:2).

Identified with Bethel in Bible (Gn 28:19), and with Mount Gerizim — and especially with a spot east of the lower ridge — in Samaritan tradition. It is there, at an area still called Luz by the Samaritans, that Passover is celebrated (J. Bowman, "Pilgrimage to Mount Gerizim," E.I., VII, 17). In the Tolidah it is again mentioned: לְצָה 'אָשֶר הִי' שּׁומְרִון (ed. Bowman, 12x).

The continuation — 'אָשֶר 'al ha-וַּמ — supports the H2 reading, 'el ha-gigal. The reference is clearly to Gilgal, by the brook of Kânah (Josh 16:8), on the Sharon plain. See Josh 12:23.

Adler supports the H2 reading, נָחְנָה (perhaps Gr. neanis).

The variation in geographical identification of boundaries between H1 and H2, coupled with the H1 corrective gloss (וֹהָהָהָה), indicates a confused tradition. On 'Askör, see Montgomery, 20.

This was the medieval orthography for Tiberias (Ben Zevi, 117).

A lacuna has occurred; read, 'אָבָזָת (nahalāh mi-)mahānayim.

Tolidah: tēhōm (— a common priestly name; see Tolidah, ed. Bowman, 12x, 13a). A.F: nēhān.

Probably identified with kēfar qallāl, well-known Samaritan agricultural village, 3 kls. N.W. of Ma'ābharthāh.
Also called bēth šōphēt. A.F. (translating, rather than transliterating, the name) renders בֵּית שׁוֹפֵת. It is identified by Conder with the Talmudic kophar šōbhthi in lower Galilee (see Ber. Rabb. 65, 7).

Read לְבֶהֶשׁ.

This name, of Marqah's grandfather, is variously transmitted. A.F. renders בֵּית (133) and סֶרֹר (130). The latter is possibly an error for סָרֹר (see Ben Hayyim, "Piyyuṭ Šōmrōni miyem hē-'āmōrā'īm," E.I., 4, 119, n.11).

Probably originates in Roman name Titus.

Chronicle Adler adds supplementary detail regarding Marqah: 'Ce fut le pere de Marca, le grand savant, qui était instruit dans toutes les sciences. Il avait fait un commentaire sur le Pentateuque, dont il nous reste un fragment sur les miracles que Dieu fit en Egypte, un fragment sur le cantique de Moïse et un autre sur le second cantique de Moïse.' Adler makes the identification of our 'Amram with 'Amram, father of Marqah, a certainty —as does H2's comment: vēhu bēqōṣēt. H1 is more reserved, however, in its judgment, stating it merely as a tradition.

H2's reading Šimetē'imāh is supported by Adler. The name is omitted, however, in A.F. It should be noted that the letters י and ת are easily confused in Samaritan script. The name is curious, and might mean, "pleasant name."

Read, with H2, mīghbūl yām dēn.

15. Caesarea was an important Samaritan centre from the 1st to the 6th cents. A.D. (see Ben Zevi, 99-100).

16. Adler and A.F. read 'ahārōn ben 'ōhar. The latter form may have originated through the influence of the name 'ahārōn, which the scribe had just written.

17. Adler reads zā'el. The name la'el is known from Nu 3:24, which is rendered by the LXX as Δαύλ. This may explain the Adler version.

A.F.'s rendering helps us to identify this site. He reads mā'ārōth. The town of Meroth, in Upper Galilee, is listed by Josephus as having been fortified by him in the year 66 A.D. (Vita, 188; Wars, 2, 573). It is probably to be identified with the well-known town of Meron, burial-place of R. Simeon bar Yohai (see J.Aharoni, Hitnahaluth Shivte Yisrael ba-Qalil ha-Elyon (1957), 95ff.).
The rendering of the Tolidah, כפר מרון, supports this identification.

18.

The identification is suggested by reference to the other boundary, Sidon. Clearly we are dealing here with the area of Mt.Hermon, the larger part of which belongs to Lebanon. Nahal Litān is probably the Litani (Leontes) Valley, to the West of the mountain.

19.

H2, com Tolidah and Adler, renders סירא'ן. The fact that this leader's possession stretched as far as Lebanon prompts the suggestion that there may be a connection between his name and Siryon, mentioned together with Lebanon in Ps 29:6. It is thus conceivable that this leader inherited (or was confirmed in) his family holding by Baba Rabbah.


2. Both H1 and H2 are characterized by a looseness in gender agreement between adjectives and nouns, especially in the case where numerals are employed (cf. סיקס' המארש, ' Lehāq 'eleph (v 4) and
'ahath 'eleph (v 5).

This is clearly a correction of H2's erroneous version which states that Baba appeared one thousand, eight hundred and sixty-six years after the entry into Canaan. The date of the entry into Canaan is consistently given in Samaritan sources as 2794 A.M. If Baba appeared, as stated, in the year 4600 A.M., then this must have been 1806 years after the entry into Canaan, in accordance with the H1 version.

Vv.4-5 are omitted in H2, whose chronology, as we have noted above, seems to have suffered in textual transmission.

4. לְבוֹנֵג הַתַּהַלְמוֹת בֵּית חֲדָשׁ: The date of Solomon's Temple, according to Sam. tradition, was 3274 A.M., which accords with the statement that Baba appeared 1326 years after that event, viz. in 4600 A.M.

A characteristic of H1 is its employment of the preposition 'eth with subject clause. It occurs again later in this verse, in the phrase, 'd[er qānāh 'eth 'abhîv. See J. MacCownaia, "The Particle 'eth in Classical Hebrew: Some New Data on its Use with the Nominative," V.T., XIV, 3 (1956), 264-275.

5. אלְוֹז הַדִּמְיוֹן הוֹשָה לְבֵילוֹת: The first exile, according to Samaritan tradition, was in the year 3550 A.M. (lower chronology).

כָּהָנִים הבו', וּנְבָדוֹלָא שְׁעָמִי: See the chronological list of High Priests, conveniently arranged by J. MacCownaia (The Samaritan Chronicle No.11, Appendix V, 222).
The first Return, according to the Samaritan tradition, was in the year 3595 A.M.

**nash** occurs in Dt 28:63 in the sense of being 'torn away from one's land;' hence the development of a nominal form, nashāh, denoting 'exile.'

Both versions are erroneous as regards this statement; for the exile of Nebuchadnezzar was, of course, the second exile, not, as stated herein, the first. The same error occurs in Chronicle Adler. The reference in H1 to the Pontificate of the High Priest Seriah is, however, correct. He ministered at the return from the first Exile (see Macdonald, loc cit.).

The second Exile is popularly referred to in Samaritan sources as the 'Greek Exile,' possibly because of the dominating personality of Alexander the Great, and the traditions concerning his relationship with the community and their Temple (see Montgomery, 68), as opposed to the obscure period until the fall of the Persian empire.

It was probably this popular, though chronologically confusing, tradition that was responsible for the erroneous identification of the first Exile with Nebuchadnezzar.

'Restitution,' 'rebuilding;' Arabic ḥusnā.

The expression leqālith, which is omitted in H1, is erroneous, having crept in as a result of the many previous references to
'Exiles.' There was, of course, no Exile by Alexander.

The Samaritans were eager to dissociate themselves from any complicity in the death of Jesus, and, at the same time, to throw the guilt squarely upon the Judaean. The discourtesy shown by the Samaritans to Jesus (see Montgomery, 157-164), and the latter's apparent contempt for their beliefs (op. cit., 161-2), may have thrown some degree of suspicion upon the community. This is indeed confirmed when we read the section of our Chronicle which covers the period of Jesus activity. The apologetic note which characterizes the account is most marked, as the following passage will illustrate:

Now Jesus the Nazarene did not consult the community of the Samaritan-Israelites at any time in his life. He did not stand in their way, nor did they stand in his. They did not impose upon him, nor he on them in any way. He was, however, the subject of vengeance on the part of his own people, his own community, from whom he rose, that is, the Judaist community. They hated him wholeheartedly; so much so that they were the cause of his execution, his crucifixion (J. MacDonald and A. J. B. Higgins, "The Beginnings of Christianity According to the Samaritans," N.T.S., 17, 11. See especially, sections 81 - 85.).
Vv. 11-20 appear to have come from a separate source. It is a self-contained unit, which fits uneasily into the context and seems to be more like a summary of Baba's achievements rather than a personal history. Its original purpose might have been to trace the origin of the הַעֲטָבָיו priests of Damascus. (Do we have here a clue to the original provenance of the Chronicle?)

11. נָוַס הֶסֶרְבּוּ ת: Read הַבָּטַהַמ הַהֹתָבֹּהָמ.

משנה כנף: Read בֵּינֵי יָרֵאֵן קִנְאָן.

وصف: The context suggests the meaning 'period,' /sphr 'to count.' In Mishna Nazir vii, 3 there occurs the phrase יֵּמָּה סָפָהָרָה, 'the period of his counting.' Our noun would then be סָפָהָר.

12. נָוַס הָאֱהַדְדָה: There is no basis for the claim that the Judaean community was under Baba's authority. Individual Jews, inhabiting border areas, or villages with a preponderance of Samaritans, might, however, have regarded it as politic to acknowledge him.

משנה כנף: Underlying this statement is an unmistakable polemical claim for the accuracy of the Samaritan transmitted text. The Judaists also made the same claim; and to this day, in the Jewish Synagogue, the verse, 'And this is the Law which Moses placed before the Children of Israel, according to the word of the Lord, by the hand of Moses,' is recited as the scroll is raised aloft after reading. For the Samaritans to have made such a claim, in this context, is understandable, bearing in mind that Baba's
reform regarding accurate reading of the Law followed on after a period of acute neglect, prevention of such reading and observance, execution of the religious leaders and teachers, and destruction of the Torah scrolls, during the persecution of Severus. It was thus imperative for the Samaritans to stress that they, nonetheless, still possessed an authentic tradition going back to the seventy Elders who disseminated the Law in the time of Moses.

* From the H1 version, ُّش/ה-אֶבֵּזֵיִם, it would seem that the word ُّש/ה-אֶבֵּזֵיִם has been omitted from H2. Moses is most commonly described as ُّש/ה-אֶבֵּזֵיִם. This would, however, be rather mystifying, since it would provide us with a rendering: 'in the days of the Master of the Former and Later Prophets.' We know, however, that the Samaritans have never accepted any prophets other than Moses, and would certainly take no recognition of the Judaistic distinction between Former and Later Prophets.

It is therefore conceivable that the original version of H2 was not ُّש/ה-אֶבֵּזֵיִם, but ُّש/ה-אֶבֵּזֵיִם, 'generations,' thereby providing the rendering, '(from the priests who functioned) in the early and later generations.'

The word ُّש/ה-אֶבֵּזֵיִם occurs earlier in the verse, and might well have been repeated. Alternately, ُّש/ה-אֶבֵּזֵיִם might mean 'lord of the first-mentioned' (sc. in this verse) — namely, the Elders — 'and the last-mentioned' — namely, the priests. Such a sentiment, upholding Moses' authority even over the priests
(notwithstanding the influence of Aaron), would most likely have emanated from a 'Moses-Dosithean' tradition.

15. **וּבָדָי**:
Old Levitical name; see I Chr 6:29, II Chr 29:12, Ezr 10:26. Also in Nabatean Palm.
(see Cook, North Semitic Inscriptions, 87.).

16. **כִּבְרֶה לְיָרָה יְרוּשָׁלֶם**: Ex 1:7.

17. **חֵשֵׁרִים לְיָרָה יְרוּשָׁלֶם**: Dt 31:6.

18. **כָּתוֹבָהּ הַרְמָאוֹן**: Dt 11:25.

19. **הֲגָנָה בְּגָנָה**: sgl only in nominal form in B.H., as segullah, 'a possession.' Perhaps derived here as
denominative.

20. **זֶהָבְנֵי יְרוּשָׁלֶם**: The Aliph in the definite article serves a
similar purpose to that of Aliph Tawila in Arabic. Here, especially, to avoid the
sharp sound of the Masoretic dagesh in the Nun.

Definite article with a noun in construct case!


/ pl 'to swell up,' 'surge forward,' see on 1:20.
The H2 rendering, 'aphlû...bîsmâhôth, elucidates the sense of 'swelling, or erupting, with joy.'

1. See on 8:7.

2. 'Equipped themselves for war,' cf. Nu 32:21. It may also carry the sense of 'plundered them (sc. the enemy),' denominative of hâlînâh (II Sam 2:21). See B.D.B., Lexicon, 322, col. I I.

It is occasionally construed as masculine (see B.D.B., Lexicon, 773).

3. For a full discussion of the practice referred to in this verse, see pp. 338-345 below.
'Occupation,' variation of noun 'iddān.

Apparently a variation of noun daph, 'board, timber.'

3. Apparently a variation of noun £aph, min = yabh'îru še, 'to burn in fire,' cf. Nu 11:1, 3.

The exhortation contained in this verse, to observe the custom of the burning the Succah boards,'at the right time; fathers, sons, and little ones, according to the correct procedure of the community,' has a polemical ring, suggesting that the ritual was, in fact, in danger of falling into desuetude, probably as a result of its origin and significance having been long forgotten. Hence the need to prop its importance by means of the solemn exhortation contained in the verse.

'Who walk upon the path (lit. boards) of their faith.' A play on the word taph is detectable. Perhaps burning the boards of the Succah booths was to be construed, in a figurative sense, as walking the board, or path, of faith.

Alternately, the phrase 'al taph may be idiomatic for 'eagerly,' /taphāph, 'to take a quick step.' Render: 'Who walk eagerly in their faith.'

Orthog. variant of ripḥîm (11:1).

In B.H. the /tphē takes the preposition še.

/of ṣārîn in the sense of 'to seize people' is an extension of the biblical usage, 'to take a handful (of flour),' Lv 2:2, 5:12, Nu 5:26.
6. חתניי:*

7. בור רבר:
   'In an evil condition,' cf. Ex 32:12.
   Preposition ב as באתו essential.
  _Delete as dittography.
   הקטיפה: Cf. Ex 1:8.
   "Intense," variant of ‘אַדִּפָה’.

8. יתתアウト:*'
   Lit. 'would flow (in abundance) from'
   = 'result from' = 'be the consequence of.'

9. רבלראז:*
   Adj. רָבְלָא (N.H. רַגִל), 'acquainted.'
   מִיחֲרִישָׁי: B.H. בֵּחֲמַתִים (Ex 13:18, Nu 32:17), 'in battle array.'
   מִלֵּךְ הַחֲרִישִים:* Perhaps, 'idolatrous kings' (see Gn 31:19, 34:35), but more likely metathesis for לִפְחָים (see v 4 above).

10. ובוגר תודעה בעבורה נביה: Dt 4:34.


12. דֶּלֶה אוֹלָֽה: In Akkadian, 'to fill a mountain with corpses' is a common idiom.

13. יִשָּׁדֶֽה: In B.H. /khâ' is always intransitive.

14. Note the succession of Hithpa'el forms in this sentence. An extreme example of H2's predilection in this direction.
   'They quaked with fear,' Cf. Is 24:19, 'to split.' Arabic 'ב' to shake.'
Synonym of previous verb. /ḥūl, /ḥîl, 'to writhe in anguish,' Dt 2:25. There is no Hithpa'el form in B.H.

**15. רִיצְת:** Assimilation of Aliph; read vayye'ĕsōph.

**I. אַלְפִּיסְטִים דּוּבְדָבָה:** Idealistic hyperbole.

**עָטְפָהוֹד:** 'Troops,' 'camp.' Arabic ٍكَشَةَ.

The verses which follow, until the end of the section, have suffered much in textual transmission.

**17. לָא:** Read pē'āh.

**נַהֲרָהטיוו:** Read behārābham.

**הָבָרְמְהוֹי:** Read ìbhirmāhîm.

**בְּבַבְרִים:** Read nēkhōnim.

**חֵשְׁבּוֹשְׁק:** Orthog. variant of šephath, representing the peculiar Samaritan pronunciation of the patah vowel.

**18. הַקְּרָת:** Read ha-gābha'.

**19. רַעֲכֵר שֵׁנְעַל:** Text corrupt; read, vayyêgāres ʿeth kāl.

**כִּי רָבָעִים . . .:** A verb has been omitted after ha-šêmārim; probably hāyāh.

**20. הַב:** Read bā'.

**זֶוָּה:** This phrase should be deleted as a textual intrusion, probably from 12:1.

**בָּעֵל:** The context requires the sense of 'fled.' This, indeed, provides confirmation of the reliability of the M.T.'s reading nāṣū.
(— hapax. "nā'ā) in Lam. 4:15. B.D.B. (Lexicon, 663, col. I) observes that 'the text is very dubious;' and suggests the meaning of 'to fly (?).'

Our text clarifies the exact nuance in which this verb was employed in Palestine, namely, 'to flee (= nūṣ). It is more likely, then, that the root is nūṣ, rather than B.D.B.'s nāṣah. Nūṣ would then be a rare variant of nūṣ, possibly conveying a more urgent sense of (flight in) panic.

The translation, 'he quartered,' is based upon a reading vayyidgōr (cf. Jer 17:11). Alternately, read vayyidgōd, a denominative of gōd, 'troop,' in the same meaning, as 'to station troops.'

The second yodh is merely an orthographic representation of the sārē vowel in a lengthened form.

Read sābhāh.

'Who had quickly come to him.' Alternately, 'whom he had assembled,' reading hīqhilu (for defective spelling of Hiph'il, see Nu 20:10). In pronunciation, the soft breathing of the second hey is barely audible, which would explain its omission here.

Lacuna. Restore with, 1ōmalkhē 'edôm. 21. Yēhaw'ēn lē

For the lacuna, insert qōl. Cf. 23:10. 22. Yēhāw'ēn

Read mōsām.
..."תות: Read mithpaqq dém, 'commanded,' on basis of 19:55*.

23. וירבד: Elyptic for vayyikhrōth bērith.
��ה ... 3 יכ: Read lēmin ha-yôm ha-zeh.
וקו: For lgh in sense of 'donate,' see Ex 25:2.
לזר: Read lāssāḇhā'.

24. ...ירבד: Read ha-saddiq bábbhā'.
ˋי ... הנה ... בדה: Read dēnigērû bábbh. 'ʾadōn...
שרתי: 'Ancestors.' The noun is a contraction of the words 'al rēś, 'in the beginning.'

26. תורמאית: Syr. ḫēm 'to indwell,' 'inhabit,' 'colonize.'
Also found in Ethtaph. form ḥēmāl, 'to be made to dwell, to be settled (Payne Smith, Syriac-English Dictionary, p.418).

---

2. עז הב טעה: Gn 41:49.
The lacunae in this verse were originally filled by quotations from Ps 10:1-14.

)...לא: Read 'al tirḥaq; cf. Ps 10:1
)...לא תעליך: Ibid.

4. ...בֹּבֵא: Read bēgā'ēvath; cf. Ps 10:2
5. Read ḥāyithā; Ibid.


7. Ps 10:16.

8. Gloss, not in B.T.


7. Ps 12:2.


* B.H. always has the ṣīth-termination for the plural of ʾāphār.
לברת די ' : Delete as ditto.
ハウス : Read מִנֹּסַתְּם, cum S.P.

התניא : B.T: עֶבֶרֶךְ.

13. וירבד : Departure from Biblical sense of 'sprinkling blood (of sacrifice). Here, 'to shed' — in a purely secular sense.

וְיִדְּוָא : Single occurrence of Waw-Consecutive in H2; possibly under influence of biblical quotation in previous verse.

שָׂמִיבָא : 'Gave them release (refreshment)'. Syr. שָׂמִיבָא , 'refresh.' In B.H. only in Niphal.

כָּהָה : Read הָאָשָּׁפָה.

14. הַמַּשְׁמַשׂ דִּבְרֵךְ : H2 attributes a different commemorative appellation to the place — ‘אֶבֶן הֶา-תָּעָמֶה’.
The noun ‘אֶבֶן might refer to the city of Shechem itself, which is known by the name ‘אֶבֶן, after the stone of Jacob; see 8:18, and pp.49% below.

§13

The present section, comprising the Thanksgiving Prayer of Baba Rabbah, is an almost verbatim rendering of the Judaistic Song of David, found in both Ps 18 and II Sam ch.22. The main difference is that the Chronicler converts expressions into the plural in order for the song to represent a communal
vehicle of expression.

It is beyond doubt that the Chronicler was basing himself upon the version contained in the Psalter, not that of II Samuel. Evidence is marshalled in the notes which follow to prove this point (— a point whose ramifications are analyzed in our chapter entitled, "Judaistic Psalm-Verses in a Samaritan Chronicle," pp.320-324), by drawing attention to many instances of differences between the Samuel and Psalms versions, where that of the Chronicler coincides with the latter.

A characteristic of the Chronicler's treatment of his material is that of simplifying biblical phraseology which is difficult or unfamiliar (see on vv.11, 14, 18 and 19).

2. A variation of Ps 18:3 (II Sam 22:2,3).


Since this ptc.(Pu'al) qualifies 'God,' the conversion into the plural is unnecessary.

B.T. omits 'jeth.'


B.T: 'צֶפָּה פֵסַלְתִּי.

With Ps 18. The Samuel version has מִיִּבְרֶה māveth.


The full form of /sabbaḥh accords with the Psalms version. The Samuel version has sabbūnî.

Deriv: B.T: qidmūnī.

Under the influence of the Psalm version our Chronicler varies the verb in this stich. (The Psalmist actually employs the verb /šv'v/. The version of II Samuel, however, merely repeats 'eqrā'.


With Ps 18. The Samuel version has mōsdōth.


Explanatory gloss; /yqā being more common in Samaritan literature than /qāh.


With Ps 18. The Samuel version has no Waw Copula.


With Ps 18. The Samuel version has lō.
   ב.ת: gebher (II Sam: gibbôr).
   The Chronicler has here simplified the biblical version, which has *nim nabhär
tibhârâr (II Sam: tittâbûrâr).

   וְרוּם: With Ps 18. Samuel version has *al râmîm.

13. בֵּי בר: Cf. Ps 18:30 (II Sam 22:30).
   בָּנָה: With Ps 18. The Samuel version has *khâh.

   והקַמָּה: The B.T. construes derekh as masculine:
     *hâlî tâmîm darkô.
   הָרִיק: Simplification of B.T: *rûphâh.
   הָבָנסים: Simplification of B.T: ha-hôsim.


   נִרְדָּף: Read nirdôph.
17. יִצְבָּק רָאֵי נָמ' ַו: Cf. Ps 18:42 (II Sam 22:42).

With Psalm version. The Samuel version has יִצְבָּק.

Cf Ps 18:43 (II Sam 22:43).

With Psalm version. The Samuel version has קָדָּפָר יְרֵשׁ.

'Like a (broken) potsherd,' see Lv 6:21, Nu 5:17. B.T: קָדָּפָר יְרֵשׁ.

בְּלִי: Simplification of יֵּּדְּעֹן (Ps), יֵּּדְּעֹן (Sam).


תַּעְלָהוֹן: With Psalm version. II Sam. has תַּעְלָהוֹן.

שְׁלִילוּאֵי לַעֲלַיִם: B.T: לַעֲלַיִם.

בְּלִי: B.T: 'עַמּ לַעֲלַיִם.

19. This entire verse follows the version of Ps 18. The Samuel version transposes the two stichoi.

כְּהַז: With Ps 18. The Samuel version has יִתְחַהֲשֵׁי.

בְּנָה: Cf Ps 18:46 (II Sam 22:46). B.T: בְּנָה

נָצַּב: B.T: יִבְּבֶלֶּי.

מִימְּרֵיהּ: B.T: מִמְּרֵיהּ.


'כ': Not in B.T.

יִדְּמָה לְיִשְׁעָן: With Psalm version. The Samuel version repeats גּוֹר before final word.

~ תָּ֖הֶלְכָּלָ֑ו רָ֖חְבָּה בְּכָלֶ֑לוּבָּה

וְרָ֖חְבָּה: An intrusion from Dt 33:29.

22. Cf. Ps 18:49 (II Sam 22:49). This phrase follows the Psalm version. II Sam. has umֹסַיִ'ָיִי מֹֽדַּיִּיִי.

סַיִּיִּי מֹֽדַּיִּי: Read מֹֽדַּיִּיִי.

סַיִּיִּי מֹֽדַּיִּי: B.T: tašîlēni.


בּוּרָ֖ה בְּכָלֶ֑לְכָּלָ֑ו בּוּרָ֖ה

בּוּרָ֖ה: Not in B.T.


בּוּרָ֖ה בְּכָלֶ֑לְכָּלָ֑ו בּוּרָ֖ה

בּוּרָ֖ה: With Psalm version. II Sam. has magăh. בּוּרָ֖ה

בּוּרָ֖ה: B.T: malkô.

לְבָ֖נֶצַּנָּה בּוּרָ֖ה: B.T: limăsiḥô. The latter two adjustments to the biblical text would have been made by the Chronicler in order to remove the personal (and theological) reference to King David before employing it as a communal song of thanksgiving.

רverts: * Cf 4:10.

 לפעורט: * 'It was intensified' (lit. 'lifted up'), see 14:1.
1. קס עם: Lit. 'It arose before,' i.e. 'It occurred to.'
   ביבליות: Delete; superfluous gloss.
   들נה:* Preposition omitted after /ibm.
   דלות:* /ibm taking direct object (see previous note).
   דת:* Dialectal variation of minnêh, or read mimmenu, the first letter having been omitted by haplography from previous he'târîm.
   הרתפת:* See on 13:24.

2. עיר (הראניין): The town of Dîr (or Dîr), S. of Carmel, on the Mediterranean, is mentioned in the Bible (Josh 12:23, 17:11; Ju 1:27). This town was inhabited by Samaritans in the 4th cent. A.D. (see Ben Zevi, S.H., 99, and M. Avi-Yonah, G.R.P., 52).

   H2's omission of the name of any particular town plundered by these marauding Arabs seems to suggest that this was a general invasion of 'the cities of Canaan,' or at least of the area of Samaria.


4. עירת הקיבוץ:* The term 'ârâbhâh is regularly applied in the Bible to the Jordan-Valley, 'either W. of River + adjacent plain; near forâ (opp. Jericho),' or, 'to the Jordan Valley, E. of the River' (B.D.B., Lexicon, 787).

   H2's designation is most suitable in this context, pointing out, as it does, the direction in which the Arabs would have taken flight in order to reach their homes.

   It is also conceivable that metathesis has occurred here, and we should read 'êbher ha-yardên (= 'êbher ha-yardên).

יָרֵי תֶּםֶּשׁ

Read without **waw copula**, cum Gn 49:17.

מִמְשָׁלְמָה: Mamšal constructed as fem., but possibly read memšaltām.

7. **Non elision of definite article with preposition b**

• cf. b⁰ḥā'am (10:20).

**ןֵד:***

Contraction of mālḥ (= mah d'ieḥ), following the same semantic development as N.H: māmōn.

8. **Vocabulary from the Song of the Sea (Ex 15), serving to cast Baba in the role of a second Moses (see on 1:6, 7).**

9. **Dative tacked on to the verb, without the (biblical) preposition ל**.

וְצִיד רָאוֹדֵת: Ex 15:2.

**Ibid.** The form 'ănvehýkhā represents the appendage of the object pronoun to the full form of the verb with final radical hey.

The same phenomenon occurs in our Chronicle in the case of nouns (ending in eh) with pronominal suffixes; hence the forms qāsehkhū (21:14), qāsehnū (17:13), miqvāhyv (22:15).

These are due to the appending of the suffix to the absolute form, rather than to the construct ending eh.

10. **This is the reading of the S.P. The M.T. has gibbōr milhāmāh.**

11. **Cf. Ps 21:2. M.T. b⁰ףָזֶקֶקֶה**

לָאָיֶר בְּשָׁזִּיָּרָה לְאָיוֹד: M.T. ubbhîšârָּאָת הָּדֶקֶּה mah yēgāl n⁰'ōd.

      M.T. va'arešeth saphathay. Chronicler
      simplifies uncommon vocabulary. See
      introductory note to §13.

      זֶרֶת חודש: M.T. 'aterešeth pāz.

      נַאֲדֶרִי בנךְ: Cum S.P. The M.T. has ne'dar.
      נַשְּׁאָה אֲפָלָה: Cum S.P. The M.T. has phele'.

16. גְדוֹלָה בֵּבְלֶד: Cf. Ps 21:6
      נַשְּׁתֵ תעֵי: Chronicler simplifies biblical teshaveh.

      לְאֵי יַמוֹן: M.T. bal yamūt.

      מַרְעָז לְכֵלָם: M.T. timšā', sohneykhā.


21. לְעֶקֶר: Defective orthography.

22. מִנָּה: Probably Inf. Absolute, nōthōn.
      עֵלִיָּה: Unusual preposition with /ḏq. The H2.
version, ḥēṭîb — suggests that the context requires a causative meaning, 'to show justice towards.' Perhaps, therefore, we should read hisdîq 'ālēnû. In Talmudic literature, the phrase hisdîq 'ālāyv 'jeth ḫa-dîn ('He vindicated divine justice') is very common. Viewed in this light, we have an explanation for our, otherwise problematic, preposition.

Quasi-Infinitives, with ūth-termination, in verbal-noun sense.

23. This appears to be a noun, 'prosperity' (= H2's niṣṭěnû). Alternately, the Heb might have arisen through dittography from previous word zeq. Maqlishah would then be a participle: 'made us prosper.'

Possibly a euphemism for maqîn as a reference to the Deity — 'His Omnipresence' (as common in Rabbinic literature); or, perhaps, 'His steadfastness,' from the same basic meaning of /kûn.

25. Read vayyišlah.

In sense of preposition liphnēhem.

Ibid.
1. **The context suggests the sense of 'blessed them,' lit. 'He invoked goodness upon them.'**

2. **Ditto. Read 'attāh ʾekhû.**

   *No transposition before sibilant. See on 3:12, 15:2, 24:5.*

3. **Unusual word order, with preposition well before adjective.**

4. **'Villages.' Cf. Lv 25:31; Josh 19:8.**

   *Read ʾebal.*

   *Pu'al; 'be changed,' 'renewed.'

5. **A rather strong word to convey the sense of 'acceptable.' Assuming that /ḥsd/, in Palestinian tradition, also possessed this less benign connotation (than 'kindness'), might not the phrase ʾômēr ha-bēʾrīth ve-haḥāsesed (Dt 7:9, 12) mean, more plausibly, 'who keeps his covenant and agreement.'**

6. **Perhaps read sāʾīm, 'rejoicing.'**

   *Form /ṣzh = /ṣhr, 'joy,' (see Ben Hayyim, Tarbiz, 10, 354, n.6).*

7. **Explanatory gloss.**

8. **Delete Waw of ʾeḥkōl.**

   *Strange participial form, from noun ʾāsōn.*

   *This custom appears to be similar to the Judaean institutions of Miʾmārōth and Maʾāmādōth. Here, the priests went to Shechem while the laymen prayed in their own towns.*
See on v.7.

*Removed; lit. 'lost.'*

**10. We are not told which place bore his name.** If the reference is to Baba's Synagoge which remained standing until the 14th cent., it would be mystifying why it should have been kept closed at times other than when he was visiting. It might refer, however, to the specific residences assigned to him for use in each town, when paying a pastoral visit, as H2 especially seems to suggest. The fact that only priests were permitted to open it might have been merely a security measure in order to avoid defilement by impure persons.

The verse appears to have been transposed from another context. It fits ill into the present material.

**11. Delete as gloss.** The glossator seemed unaware that there was already a subject — 'fear' — of the sentence.

**12. Unusual as a relative of time.** H2: kad. See on 14:22.


This echoes the tradition that the Emperor Julian granted permission to the Judaeans to build their Temple. See J. Juster, Les Juifs dans L'empire Romain, II (1914), 247.

Vv.15-17 are not represented in H2. They constitute an extraneous tradition, and were probably inserted by the H1 compiler either for dramatic quality or to fill a lacuna in the original—a problem we frequently encounter with composite writing.


Characteristic employment of a succession of construct nouns.

16. Qal (Infinitive) in causative sense of 'to multiply.'

17. Adjective kas or kēs, 'covered,' hence 'secret.'

'They gave (their attention) to him ... to slay him.' Apparently elyptical nāthan lēbh.

Noun nekhel only in Nu 25:18.

Pi'el; ibid.

1. Aram. pērāt, 'singled out,' 'specification,' 'explicit' (Jastrow, Dictionary, 1224).
2. הָעֲלוֹת הַקָּרָה הֲם וּלְאַרְיָה: The custom of not moving out of one's residence on the Sabbath was based upon a literal understanding of Ex 16:29. The modern Samaritans 'stay strictly within doors on the Sabbath, except to go to the Synagogue (Montgomery, 33).

3. סברת: Read qātemām.

3a. נבון 롱: Gn 37:18.

3b. רָא: Variation of וֹלָה תְּחֵ'ת.

3c. יִלּוּל: כָּלָיָם מִשְׁמַּה יֵלֶל כְּלָיָם... If we understand šām in its usual sense of 'there,' the verse would appear to be suggesting a prohibition against wearing weapons in the Synagogue. However, šām also has the sense of 'then' in our Chronicle (see on 2:21; cf. 19:40), in which case, the emphasis would be on time rather than place, viz. 'At that time (sc. the Sabbath) they would be unable to take up arms.'

4. סברת דֶּשֶׁה: See 15:19. Here as abstract noun kassuth 'secrecy'.

4a. עֲנָבִי: Used here in the sense of liphnē, 'before' (in temporal sense). However, note the comment of B.D.B. (Lexicon, 818) on the form mippēnē:

'Frequently rendered before in A.V. R.V., and so confused with liphnē; but the min retains always its full force in the Heb.'

As far as Samaritan Hebrew is concerned, B.D.B. is incorrect, as the present sense of mippēne makes patently clear. If this Samaritan usage was current throughout Palestinian spoken tradition, then B.D.B. is incorrect in its limitation of the scope of this preposition.
The confusion over the exact day of Baba's arrival, and the revelation of the Judaean plan to him, is aggravated by H1's reference to 'the seventh day' (v 5), a reference which is itself contradicted in the same verse in the mention of the fifth day of the week. Mention of 'the fifth day of the week' is actually made in vv. 4, 5 and 6 of the H1 version, which suggests its legitimacy.

It is therefore the opening statement of v 5 ('Now it was on the seventh day of the week that the Lord...revealed the hidden plan..') that must be regarded as suspicious. We suggest that it actually qualifies the statement made at the end of v 4 — 'before the arrival of the King Baba Rabbah to the town of Nemarah.'

A glossator then inserted the note, 'it was on the seventh day of the week,' meaning the arrival of Baba Rabbah. Unfortunately, the glossators introductory word, hayaḥ, was ill-chosen as a conjunction (he should have written, with Waw Copula, vehu' hayah, 'and that was (to be) on the Seventh day.' The absence of the conjunction was responsible for the tacking on of the phrase to the following verse, with the attendant confusion that this causes.


6. חתמה על הכתובות ונשאמה: Detached relative pronoun; see on 9:5.

דיקמן: Ditto. Read minnakh('from you') cum H2.
Samaritan usage is semantically weaker than the Biblical sense of 'desire,' 'take pleasure in,' 'delight,' with strong emotional overtone. Here it simply means, 'request,' 'wish,' 'demand' (see 18:8, 19:1*).

8. רָאָז לאז: Rare use of רָאָז to introduce a relative clause of time, in the sense of 'when.' Perhaps רָאָז is used here for מָאָז (cf. Gn39:5, Ex 5:23).

לָזְן לָזְנֵי: Lit. 'You will disclose it upon my tongue.' Either, idiomatic for 'in my name' = 'as having emanated from my tongue,' or read 'al lָזְנֵי, 'You will disclose it upon your tongue.'

The phrase 'al pָּיkh (16:9) would appear to support our first suggestion, however.

לָזְנֵי לָזְנֵי: The context seems to require a transitive and causative sense, as 'to cast my soul down.' The problem is avoided if the verb naphal is here construed as Piel (lָאָז naphal), though this is unattested in B.H.

Alternately, the Qal usage may also be retained, with 'eth as introducing the subject (see on 10:4; also, 8:19, 13:1, 17:6) — a common characteristic in our Chronicle. The sense would then be, 'for my soul to fall....'


דָּתָן לאז:* Dt 23:24.

11. מעָז לאז: Delete as ditto.
Cf. Gn 43:30. Subject: סָּנַ֑אָתוּת ('hatred was intensified'). In this sense, see also 16:23; וָהָ֚אָתָּאָנְוֹ נִיקְחֶרֶת ('Our sins were intensified'). In B.H., it is rather employed in the sense of 'to grow warm and tender' (B.D.B., Lexicon, 485 col. 1).

'Will break in.' A semantic extension of the basic meaning 'to cut.' Here, 'to cut one's way in.'

Read יִיְקַקֵּרְתוּת ('That their memory should be destroyed').

12. 'that trembling does not feel me,' i.e., 'take hold of me.'

13. אֶרֶץ גִּיד הָֽאָמֶן וַעֲלֵיהָ: Adler reads qām gid ha-qin‘āh vayyakh bāh, 'ia veine au zèle se mit à battre en elle.' Our reading seems preferable.

The phrase qām gid ha-qin‘āh, to denote intense indignation, occurs in a Taṣqīl of a Torah scroll in the Gaster collection. Quoted by Ben Zevi, S.H., 291 n.57.

14. Lit. 'she did not remember to him.' A causative sense ('mention') seems to be rather required here, but Qal may also serve this purpose (see on v 8 above).

5rārāh is apparently a variant of 5rārāh.

15. Uncommon usage. H1's rendering yīḥar 'appō provides the clue to the sense in which it is employed, although the exact nuance is unclear.

Text corrupt, perhaps through lacuna. Read yiqqāh 5nāthō.
17. Adler adds: 'And he was dressed in his Sabbath clothes, white garments, with a Tallith over his head.'

The modern day priest wears a Tallith during the reading of the Law, though it contains no fringes (Montgomery, 32). The wearing of the Tallith during Prayer seems, however, to have been common practice in the medieval period, for laymen as well as priests. This is evident from a reference in Abu'l Fath (see quotation in Ben Zevi, pp.177-8) to the building of the Kinsa at Shechem by 'Aqbon b. Eliezer (V), who 'took his Tallith from off his head (See Adler's reference, above, to the Tallith being worn 'over his head.') and heaped earth from the pile beneath him into his Tallith' — building the edifice, thereby, with his own hands.

18. Read ha-šemàš lābhô', Gn 15:12.

* "Their eagerness, passionate desire," see on 1:20.

20. H2 omits all such epithets of praise and reverence.
Read 'mizzeh bā' them, cf. Gn 16:8.

Ex 15:16.
Ex 15:14.
Ex 15:15.

No transposition of taw and sibilant.

Their rib was broken.' See on 21:9*.

Dt 33:3.

Chronicle Adler attributes this confession to a small group of Judaeans who did not flee with the rest in panic and fear at their defeat, but who immediately surrendered and acknowledged their error. It is not clear from Adler whether the latter suffered the same violent end as their brethren who were brought back as prisoners after their abortive attempt to flee.

'Intensified,' see on 16:11.

Read və'ā'ēthā.

Orthographic variant; contracted form of vayyiqrē'ā. For an example of elision of the Aliph as final radical, cf. mēhātō (Gn 20:6) for mēhātē'ā.

mē'ălāyy.

Read, either 'ittī or 'ālay.

Infin. Absolute: hāšēr, 'to leave over.'

B.T. has verse in plural.
1. Apparently based upon the Masoretic קד"ת form תֹּבֹה צָה (Dt 33:16).

2. Common form of perfect יָסָר.

3/4. Read גֶּבְבֶּשֶׁא קֶלֶּשֶׁא הַשָּׁנֶּא.

4. Common Sam. verb, 'to begin.'

5. The legend of the whirlwind is related by the traveler Benjamin of Tudela (see M. Adler, "The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela," J.Q.R., xvii (1904), 148).

6. As in original form, Urusali'im.


8. The rest of this section, comprising Baba's Song of Thanksgiving at having frustrated the plan of the Judaeans to rebuild their Temple, is mainly based upon Psalm 25.

B.T: ṣeḇer ῶḇeḇrōdīm.
10. Aḥraiḵer hēḇerōm:
B.T: Jorḇōtheyḵha ḍāmānānā.
11. Ḥāḏerīmōn:
Cf. Ps 25:5.
12. Ṣeḇer:
13. Ḳal Ṣeḇer:
14. Ḳaddiṯ ḹēḇerōm:
15. Ḳel Ḫēḇōrāh:
.Serialize Ḫēḇōrāh tīmēțū ṭōḇh vēṭādōṭhāv.
16. Ḫīṭṭeṯ Ṣeḇer:
Cf. Ps 25:11.
17. Ḫeqme Ṣeḇer:
Cf. Ps 25:12.
18. Ḳeqme Ṣeḇer ṭēlêr ṣeḇer:
19. Ṣeḇer ṣeḇer:
.Serialize Ḫēḇōrāh ṣeḇer Ḫēḇōrāh ṭēlēr ṣeḇer:
B.T: ṭōḇh rēṭhō lēḥōdētām.
The Chronicler has here varied the biblical text in order to incorporate a specific reference to his community.
20. Ḳeḇer ṣeḇer:
Cf. Ps 96:1, 98:1 et. al.
 Serialize Ḫqām Čeḇer ṣeḇer:
B.T: ṭōḇh ṭēlēr ṣeḇer Ḫēḇōrāh lēḥōdētām.
 Serialize Ḫqām Ḫēḇōrāh ṣeḇer:
B.T: ṭōḇh rēṭhō lēḥōdētām.
The Chronicler has here varied the biblical text in order to incorporate a specific reference to his community.

21. Ḫeqām ṣeḇer Ḫēḇōrāh:
Ibid., with typical Samaritan insertion of reference to Gerizim.
For a full discussion of the episode of the talking bird on Mount Gerizim, as described in this section, see our chapter 5 (c): "The Legend of the Speaking Bird in the Light of Rabbinic Polemic."


This reference, to a Hebrew source underlying our Chronicle, is of crucial importance for countering any suggestion that our Chronicle may be a Hebrew translation of an Arabic original, such as were made, for example, of Abu'l Fath's Chronicle.

This introductory source-reference, totally unexpected in the middle of a Chronicle (and omitted in H1), might well indicate a different source for the material which follows. There are, indeed, minor variations in style and approach to the material (see on vv.7, 12).

'verse': (see v 8: b'khir ve'daskhem); perhaps originally designating specifically the Majuscle Script, b'khir in the sense of 'primary, major one.'
3. רדועה ליגוג: 'To some place,' cf. I Kings 2:36.

כֵּכָּה (טָּקִים) (טָּקִים):
Text dubious. The H1 rendering, 'such as qāṣî' is improbable, a place by that name not being known. A possible rendering is, 'he shall return as a qāṣî (= qāṣî, 'Elder'), though this does no justice to the high office of Episcopos attained by Levi, nor, had he been merely a Qāṣî, would he have been enabled to turn the table on the Romans in the manner he did.

The H2 rendering — bidêmûth gesem, 'as if by magic (lit. 'divination') is far more plausible. Levi's sudden appearance among the Romans could be construed as a miraculous act.

4. עלילותנו החר: The preposition 'el is omitted after Infinitive in both H1 and H2 (see also v 6). The verb 'ālāh is possibly construed in the sense of 'to go up to.'

 부분:* Niph'al; 'we will be enabled,' lit. 'left alone.' See on 15:13.

5. המערכה הממקסמה: Read v'ha-m'khašpīm (as in continuation: min khôšphâ).

6. הנה יבשות תחת ידך: Read bêt'h 'ōl yiqqâre'.

ים טפוש על 'Search for,' see on 16:18.

דיבוגו: Elision of hey of vayyaharguhu; see on 16:25.

משמע: Read m'rûmâh, 'formed;' Cowley (Gloss.), lxxii.


בָּטֵן: Ex 24:7, cum S.P. (The M.T. inverts the verbs; see on 4:3.)
This suggests that vv. 1-6 were quoted from an extraneous source, being the dibra' îôdâh referred to in v 1.

Uncharacteristic multiplication of complimentary attributes, more associated with the style of H1 than with H2.


Read nāḥaseh.

Cf. Lv 26:30.

Variation of hāmîn, /hâh, 'see, perceive.'

Delete one as ditto.

'His place.' Miqveh ("gathering place") and māqâm, are interchangeable in the Chronicle.

You should not make (unjust) demands (lit. requests, desires) of him.' See on 16:6.

The H2 rendering is, uncharacteristically, verbose.

Read ben Jâhîy.

'Accompanying,' 'gathering (together with);' cf. noun miqveh.

A common form of denunciation; see 1:15.

Cf. 2:17.

Ibid.

Cf. Dt 12:30.

15. Read 'eth 'ăše'er hālakhtā, or 'ēth 'āše'er 'attān hālōkh.

H2 avoids using the term 'āhārīth, and its description of 'the day when all creatures will receive the recompense for what their soul attained' neatly side-steps the crucial issue of whether this recompense will be in this world or in the future world (āhārīth).

18. 'Spokesman,' Gr. ἐφήσωπ, title of honour; a public speaker, pleader or orator.

19. Tal. Aram. mimmēlā', 'of itself,' 'for that reason alone' (see Jastrow, Dictionary, 773); exactly parallel to H1's Ḡēḇhīḡāl ha-dāḇhār ha-zeh.

20. Contraction of lĕ'alqōstanṭînāh.

Loosening of gender-agreement, especially in numerals, cf. 10:2, 3; 18:21.


Lacuna after ḥā'ēdāh (?). We propose ʾenāš kēvvāṭēh, 'a man like him.'

23. Gr. Ṣkopos, 'leader' (Supervisor). The verb /ṣqph occurs frequently in the sense of 'being high,' whence ṣqphāh, 'The Most High (God). The noun ḥasqōph occurs only once, however, in Cowley (— and was overlooked in his Glossary) in a hymn of Pinḥas b. Isaac, the father of the scribe of our Chronicle (see Cowley, I, 109).

The noun Ṣqupa occurs in Mandaic. Drower and Macuch conjecture 'smiter? entangler? (A Mandaic Dictionary, 335) in the phrase qramṭ h Ṣqupa q-ʾl dīlan hambaga huā (Das Johannisbuch der Mandaer, ed. M. Hidzbarski, 143:12) — 'I covered (entangled?) the entangler? (or smiter?) who was our enemy.'

Is it not possible, though, that Ṣqupa is also a derivative (like ḥasqōph) of the Greek Ṣkopos, and the meaning of the above crux would then be, simply, 'I trapped the the commander ( or 'leader', Ṣkopos) who was our enemy.'

'Rank, position,' cf. 5:6; also in Yadin, War Scroll, pp.4b-7.
1. 'It is my desire to go.' Imperfect replaces infinitive; cf. 17:4.

Read נרהוֹת.

Abstract noun, מַהֲאֵלָה הָעֵדֹות.

See on 16:6.

Almost certainly: H2, understandably, alters this to the inoffensive verb 'to see.' Levi would hardly have disclosed to the Romans his spiritual affinity and reverence for the synagogues!

2. See on 11:15.

3. Read חָנֵנָה הָפְּלִקָה; used here rather loosely in the sense of 'leaders,' prps. religious leaders.

See 1®עַרְתָּן.

4. ... See מְדִכָּב: Read 1®חֲשֻׁנִי לָקֶם.

Non-elision of definite article after preposition ל; cf. 10:20, 14:7.

These were, clearly, military attendants or knights of the king's retinue. See J. Macdonald, "The Status and Role of the Na'ar in Israeliite Society," J.N.S.S., 35 (3), 14/1-17/0.

5. See 32:8.

6. 'Report, i.e.,' cf. 5:19.

Masoretic variant: Wttsog. of way; read מַגְגֵּד ָוָד.

7. Orthographic variant of לְחָקָדְתֵּנוּ, see v 8 (לְחָקָדוֹת).

8. The noun **kēlîm** is here construed as fem. See H2's **kēlîm** הֶמִימָה.


   **mātāt hašîr**: Read **hā'ērsaîm**.

   **mātāt hašîr**: Double demonstrative; cf. on **hāzēnā** (1:20).

   **māzā'î**: Noun, 'fear.' Orthographic variant of **viyvā** (= **vīyāh**).

   **hēbî**: 'The Giver,' / hitch. designation of Deity.

10. **hārām**: Read haram; see v 7.

   **liyā yārâ**: Preposition **'lî** with noun bearing **locative** hey.

11. This rendering is far from revealing. It cannot mean that the Samaritans appeared wearing their Phylacteries, since the Samaritans do not observe this ritual (Montgomery, 32; Ben Zevi, 148), and interpret the biblical injunction in a figurative sense. They did, however, at one time, wear **qāme'ās** (qē'mātîm) or amulets containing **qē'tāphîm**, or brief digests of Torah passages. See J. Bowman, "Phylacteries," Tr. G.U.O.S., XV (1953-4), 170.

   It is apparent that the H1 chronicler has made an attempt here to correct, or at least make some sense of, a most abstruse expression, **ubhē'ēn lēnîyv**.
tōṭāph ha-yirʾāh mērōṭāphōph, which seems to mean 'fear flowed between their eyes.'

It is, however, strange that H1 should have used such a Pentateuchal expression, referring to the divine word being as vivid as 'frontlets between the eyes,' to convey the idea of visible fear on the faces of the Samaritans. (As he, indeed, suggesting that on this particular occasion, if not in common practice, they actually donned tōṭāphōth, by which he meant the Samaritan equivalent of the Judaistic phylacteries, namely the qēmāṭāh? It would not be inconceivable that, in a life and death situation, they would have resorted to the wearing of amulets to ward off the impending disaster.


A noun tōṭāph occurs in a poem published by Ben Hayyim, "Tiyyūt Šōmrōnî lišmāḥōth," Tarbiz, 10 (1938-9), 351: Tōṭāph rad min sidqāṭhōn. On the basis of Ben Hayyim’s conclusion that this phrase means 'bounty came down because of their righteousness,' we may understand our problematic rendering of H2 as, 'an abundance of fear was manifested between their eyes.'


13. On /krn, see Ben Hayyim, Tarbiz, 10, 366.
14. Lit. 'They did not see;' used here in the sense of 'expect'('For they had not expected that..'). A similar semantic development occurs with /saphän, 'to look' > 'expect'.

Abstract noun, mesiguth, 'attainment,'

Noun 'inyânâh, 'state'.

15. Read lammelekh 'âser.

18. Text problematic. Lacuna?

Always with masc. termination in B.H.

Ex 20:4.

Read hâ'ënâyîm, 'eyes.' The termination has been confused with that of 'ayyîn in the meaning of 'a well' (pl. 'ayânôth, Dt 8:7).


Cf. Lv 16:29.

20. 'Turned aside,' Dt 4:19, 30:17.

Cf. Dt 32:21.

22. Words transposed. Read ha-nêhôsêth hahû 'âser...

24. Read as one word, vêjith'âmâr.

26. Imperfect for Infinitive, see vv.1, 8, above.
28. ועודי הנה: Read $\text{מַלְיִית} \text{הָאֶרֶץ}^\text{הָאֶרֶץ}...

B.H. always construes מַלְיִית 'as masculine.

There is a preference for 'צֹּות as the demonstrative pronoun with both genders. However, it is generally only employed with masculine nouns when it precedes them in the sentence; see 1:20, 2:9, 19:9.

29. של הבשריים: See on v 4 above.

Noun 'גּות, cf. Ex 24:11 ('leaders').

Only in Is 41:9 does it have the sense of 'borders' as required here.


'_sleep' (B.H: שְּנָה, שֶּנָּה', שֶּנָּה?), cf. Lv 26:10, יָשָּׁן נֹשָן, but only in derived sense of 'inactive or stationary through age (= יָשָּׁן , to sleep).'

 Cf. Ecol.1:2, 2:11.

גזר לבראשית: Lit.'it will assail our heads,' /גûr, 'to stir up strife, attack.' It is possible, however, that we are dealing here with a noun, יָגָר (= mak'obh in H1). B.D.B. relates יָגָר , 'heap' (Gn 31:47) to a verb with a basic meaning of 'to throw (stones together).' This would provide a suitable semantic sense here to a noun יָגָר, presenting a (literal) rendering: 'an assailment for our heads.'

הצנתו דבר: 'The best (part) of our sleep.' Note the definite article with a noun with possessive suffix.
32. For 'eth read 'ōthō.

33. Read hā-'oph.

34. B.H. construes laylāh as masculine. Read v'rega... 'at the moment they had eaten.'

35. 'Prevailed over,' cf. Ex 9:17 (and below, 20:12).

36. The reference here is to the speech of Levi in v 20 above.

37. Lit. 'that he might be moved to pity in the matter of smiting them.'

Lit. 'how they might attain to his side.' Perhaps, however, read lophatōthō, 'to persuade him,' cf Ex 22:15.

'Their work, doing, fate,' noun ṣāḥād, Eccl.9:1.

40. See on 16:3.

41. Gn 45:3.

42. 'He knelt.' B.H., 'to bind,' whence 'to bind limbs together,' > 'to kneel.' Syr. ṣād, 'bend.'

43. H2 quoting verbatim a biblical verse.
47. "His exile," from ger, 'stranger.'
Alternately, 'his lodging,' of gēruth, Je 41:17.

48. תֵּבֹא נָעָר: Ex 29:27.
בְּכֵרוֹל גַּדֹּל רַם:
Read gādōl vārām.
לֹא לְבָנָה... מִדְרָה:
Cf. Dt 20:3.

50. "Near to" (B.H. qārōh je'l).
נִבְנָה חָבְבָה או פֶּתֶה תֶּמי:
Dt 9:14.
וְהָאָמְרָה צָרָא הָבֹכֶה:
Cf. Ez 21:34.

= hāmāsim, Ex 13:18.
לָא לְגַשָּׁם אֶל שִׁירֵר:
Nu 21:35.
משורר:
Contraction of taš'irū; see v 63.

55. דַּגְלֵי אֶתְמָנְתֵי הָאָדָם: 'Ensigns of the faith,' see 1:12.
The reference is probably to its fundamentals or outward signs.
כֵּן אֱלֹהֵי בָּנֵי תָּמִים:
Interesting usage of /kbs, 'to tread,' in sense of 'to tread down, subjugate.'
B.H. employs verb exclusively in the sense of 'to wash' (lit. 'tread the clothes in water').

56. "כְּגַלְתֵּי הָא: Orthog. variant of kāhāsōth.
דָּבָר:
Nu 31:7.

57. מצוּינִי בָּשָׁם:
Gn 21:16.
דָּבָרָם... מִדְרָה:
Near to' (H2: qārēhū min); see on v 50.

59. יִירָא" הָיָה בְּרָבָא יִרָא וּתְנֹא יִרָא, "Ex 15:3. The reading accords with the S.P. The M.T. reads ḫāš milhāmah.
This battle-cry was used on other occasions by Baba Rabbah (see 21:4), The verse was regarded as efficacious in warding off evil, and was, therefore, popular as an inscription on Samaritan amulets (see J.Kaplan, "A Second Samaritan Amulet from Tel Aviv," I.E.J., 25 (1975), 25.

61. נֵּחָ֣נָּה יְּדוֹתְךָ — Read 'ithrâhaqû ... 'They fled far off.' (H! : 'They fled at their voice.') This reaction of flight in the face of a terrifying experience is paralleled by Ex 20:15.

62. רָאוּסְךָ — Masculine form (?) of biqâh; see on 20:25.

64. מַעֲשֶׂה יְגָבֹּר — Unusual transposition of popular biblical idiom; cf. Gn 6:14; Ex 25:11.


69. אַל נְחַרֹת יְקִחוֹת — Cf. Ps 24:2.
70. 

Variation of Ps 25:1. B.T: naphšā 'essā'.

71. 

Allusions ב' ובב: Ps 25:2.


וְלַא תֵעָבְדוּ B.T: Simplification of M.T's 'al ya'alsū.

See introduction to §13; also v 74 below, for further examples of H1 simplifying uncommon words and phrases from the Bible (and also from H2).

72. 

כִּי כָל כְּצַי: Ps 25:3.

לֹא תֵעֵר B.T: lō' yēbhōsāh.

יִכְרְרוּ תְבִנָּה: B.T: yēbhōsā ha-bōgōdim ṭēqām.

73. 

'רָא B.T: Yahweh mā'oz ḥayyay.

74. 

כִּי קְרֵבִים וְשָׁמוֹנֵים: Cf. Ps 27:2. Simplification of B.T's, bīqorōb 'ālay mēretim.

75. 

cīt קְרֵבִים וְשָׁמוֹנֵים: Cf Ps 27:3. B.T: 'im tahāneh 'ālay mahāneh.

76. 

'אָהֳתָ בְּשָׂף 변경ו: Cf. Ps 27:4. B.T: 'ahath sa'alti....

A neat alteration of the B.T's šibḥtā bēthēth yahweh. The biblical /yēb/ is transformed into /ṣūb/, to conform with the Samaritan aspiration of returning to the sacred site.

77. 

78. "The cities which had been saved." However, the H2 rendering of be'asguväh, 'in Assyria,' coupled with the fact that the word ha-müšaš is bracketed — normally suggesting a place-name — both indicate that indeed müšaš is the name of a town. No town of this name, however, is preserved in Roman sources, though we do have a reference to a village, near Jerusalem, by the name of Mošah ('אֲמוֹשָׂה) which was established as a military colony by Vespasian (Mishnah Sukkah 4:5; M. Avi–Yonah, G.R.P., 82). Should this identification be correct, then the H1 reference would be far more plausible than H2's 'Assyria.' It would, indeed, have been far more likely for a local Roman garrison to have attempted to take revenge than for a far-off 'Assyrian' force.

79. "The cities which had been saved." However, the H2 rendering of be'asguväh, 'in Assyria,' coupled with the fact that the word ha-müšaš is bracketed — normally suggesting a place-name — both indicate that indeed müšaš is the name of a town. No town of this name, however, is preserved in Roman sources, though we do have a reference to a village, near Jerusalem, by the name of Mošah ('אֲמוֹשָׂה) which was established as a military colony by Vespasian (Mishnah Sukkah 4:5; M. Avi–Yonah, G.R.P., 82). Should this identification be correct, then the H1 reference would be far more plausible than H2's 'Assyria.' It would, indeed, have been far more likely for a local Roman garrison to have attempted to take revenge than for a far-off 'Assyrian' force.

2. על הפסר: Read 'al ha-mispār.


4. ודבר אוסונ: Lit. 'He broke their gathering,' noun Ḥoseph. Perhaps the sense here is that of splitting their military formation.

5. מברך תרבות: Lv 26:36.

6. עלות המהמר סירוב: Whether this represents an authentic tradition or not, we have no means of determining. The Passover sacrifice is, as we know, the only one offered by the community; and the H2 Chronicle, in referring to the 4th cent. period, makes no reference to any other sacrifice.

Is it conceivable that Baba was inspired by his victory to re-introduce the daily sacrifices, which had long passed into desuetude? The phrase τὸ λατρευτὸ (Ex 29:42) is too specific for it to be construed merely as a synonym for 'thanksgiving offering.' H1 wisely omitted this reference.

7. (הכרויות): H2 renders here 'Alexandria,' and on v 1 (where the identical phrase occurs), 'Assyria.'

10. המראים המברים בכתוב: * Cf. Ez 30:22, II Chr 32:21 (= 'to overthrow').

11. הנהוגים: Read ḥaskānāthkhā, 'As is Your wont,' see on 18:21.
Noun niq‘âh; metathesis for na‘aqâh.

 Cf. I Sam. 25:7.

16. והז畤 נכי הציל הס폼 כי אין מפור: Gn 41:49.
We propose the reading mithkâmî̂m, 'lying in wait (ambush), see Jastrow, Dictionary, 646 col.11.

18. зבּיִ נְרָאָשְׁתּ וְשָׁאֵרִי זְמֵר: Succession of nouns in construct.


22. אַחֲאֵמִים חַדֵּר כֶּרֶם שֶׁנָּאִיר:* Unusual example of abrupt intrusion of direct speech into a reported context. This occurs after לֹא, however, in Gn 21:30, 29:33.
Perhaps, 'oppressors,' Aram./'ität.
Jastrow quotes the phrase ma‘ika‘ m‘avv‘etha, 'a tyrannous king' (Dictionary, 1060).
It might, however, be related to Hebrew /‘ität, 'to give aid, help,' cf. Is 50:4 (see comment of B.D.B., Lexicon, 736 col II.). The Niph‘al would here provide a plausible sense of 'in league.'

24. וּרְאוּם וְרָצהֵר לַז: Gn 32:8.
The prayer which follows is an adaptation of Ps 31.
24. עליון בשמים ... כלים: Cf. Ps 31:1.
B.T: 'al ǝḇhōṣāh; see on 19:71.

25. תぜילובי רודה ... לזרעם: Cf. Ps 31:3.
מותא: Equivalent of B.H's bimhērāh. There is a tendency in the orthography of the Chronicle to omit the final āh from feminine nouns (cf. biqeqā, 19:61; ǝḥēm, 23:5; ǝṣmah, 25:2).
הנה: A simplification of B.T: kā qalṭi umāṣūdāṯāh ıʾattāh (Ps 31:4).

26. התצוגה ... שבורה פעמי: Cf. Ps 31:5.
וָדֶם כָּל שֵׁמֶה: Supplementation, for adapting the Psalm to the context of the community's particular struggle
בראש: B.T: zu ūmānā. Here the Chronicler renders biblical poetic vocabulary (zu) into a more colloquial idiom).
הנה: Simplification of B.T's kā ʾattāh māʾūzī.

27. התำם ... בריו: Cf. Ps 31:6.
אֵדֶר אָבָד: Read as one word, ʾādīʾthāmā.


29.جبירה ... יֶדֶרַע: Cf. Ps 31:8. B.T: ʾ̄ešer rāʾīthā
'eth 'ányā.
גבירה: Ps 31:9.

Cf. Ps 31:11.

31. Ibid.

32. Ps 31:12.

33. Ps 31:15.


35. Ps 31:17.

36. Ps 31:18.


38. רִחְנֶה: B.T: עוּלָּמָּה הָדָּוָּד בּוּקָה.

39. בָּרָּאְת: B.T: בָּאָסְרָה בּוּנִיָּה.

40. Simplification of B.T: מֵרָכְחִים מֵכָבָּת.
39. בְּבוּרֵד יִזְּרָנֵת † Ps 31:22.

40. וַאֲמִזְרָא: † Ps 31:24.

41. קְדֻקוֹר רָמאֶר: † Ps 31:25.

---

§21

2. יֵשִׁביִי הַכְּבֵרְוָה יָעֲרוּבָה: For 'igrûnî read 'izrûnî, cum H2; see also v 6. Kôph and zayyin are easily confused in Samaritan script.

בּעֲלַגַוֶת צַעִי: 'At the top of my voice.' Aram. noun têlâ', 'height,' cf. 23:14*.

4. דִּבְרִי: B.H. always construes this noun with fem. termination (cf. רֹחִים for רֹחֹות, 2:19) оворן

בּוֹחְזָר: Orthog. variant of ḥasoğrôth (cf. חַקְיָתנָו, 19:7).

לי: See on 19:59.

דְּבֵרָה הָאָרֶץ: See 19:61.


8. אֱוִ֖ית לְווֹק הָה: Cf. Ex 15:16.

תְּשָׁבַע: * No transposition of taw and sibilant; cf. 'ithâ'rikh (15:2).
8. "Their rib was broken" -- a striking idiom to denote the physical manifestation of intense emotional fear. This idiom occurs again in 16:21*. Cf. the English idiom, 'he was shattered (by what he saw).

9. wirn\n
10. 'War' (= H1's milhamoth). The noun is apparently a denominative of the verb naphal, which verb is used consistently by the Chronicler with milhamah to convey the sense of '(war) breaking out;' cf. 21:2, 5, 15.

12. Read ben jähiv.

13. Lacuna. We propose the reading jäser hayâh na'tâsâh.

14. Several examples occur in our Chronicle of the possessive suffix being appended to the full (absolute) form of a noun ending in hey. Cf. q¹enû (17:13), miqv¹hayv (22:15).

15. Both H1 and H2 refer here to one specific kinšâh which was destroyed by Baba. In the account of the battle (19:64), however, reference is made to 'all the Roman kinšâhs!'

The verb 'to smite' is construed as /mkh, rather than nkh. In B.H. there is no Hithpa'el form of this root.
16. Pregnant construction, for דָּהַרְעַֽה שֶׁלֶּה (cf. Ex 1:10), 'who behaved as taskmasters toward them.'

'His distress was intensified'. B.H. employs the noun 'אָסָן in the sense of 'mishap, evil, harm,' especially with /gr/ (ghr in Gn 44:29), 'to occur' (see B.D.B., Lexicon, 62 col.1). The context here suggests rather an emotion (or state of mind) which, in fact, approximates closer to the suggested Arabic root underlying the biblical noun 'אָסָן, namely, אָסָא, 'to be sorrowful, distressed.'

17. Read יַדְּעַ for יַדְּעַ. The rendering of A1 helps to elucidate this perplexing verse: 'And Baba Rabbah continued to labour as one who had sold his soul (= כָּמַן מָכַּחַר נָפָחָד) and the souls of his people for God.'

Significantly, the H1 Chronicler probably had difficulty in elucidating the Aramaic version before him, and therefore omitted the entire phrase.

'They realised' (lit. 'they knew the truth').

'in his intense distress' (see on previous verse).

Rare Hithpa'el. Derivative of מָכָּחַר, 'ready, prepared.'
1. דבש שלום: Dt 23:7.

It seemed agreeable, pleasing.' The noun hesed and the adjective hasid both have a non-pietistic sense in the Chronicle. See 15:5.

יריעים על

Arabic 'alima, 'to be strong,' hence here 'to pressurize,' 'forcefully persuade.'

2. מאמזים: 'Aims, objectives, reasons.' Noun mà'ām. In B.H. employed only as indefinite pronoun.

יריעים על

The sense of 'deceitful plan' occurs in Je 14:14, hâzon šegar (// tarmîth lîbbâm, 'craftiness of their intention.'

תרבויות:

'Persuasion(?)' The Hiph'il form of dbr (from which the noun appears to derive) occurs in the sense of 'to make submissive, persuade,' cf. Ps 18:48, 47:4; Jastrow, Dictionary, 278.

The noun has the general sense of '(religious) leader,' with no overtone of prophetic calling.

3. כי הוא עלי: Read kî hēm nilọţîm, sum H2.

העתי:

Interrogative particle (Arabic ˀî); cf. Dt. 32:6, hal yahweh tigmọţ zō̜'th, and B.D.B. note (Lexicon, 210).

4. בקעת תימן:

Abstract noun hammûth, 'heat of (anger).'

6.주는 מזון:

Lit. 'the men of his judgment,' viz. his advisers' (ךזJosh, Is 40:13).
8. יִתְנֶּהָ מעִי יִתְנֶּהָ: 'Will grant the request of.' Read סְלָלָת. For the construction nāthan סְלָלָת, cf. I Sam 1:17, 27.

9. הָזָּה הָזָּה בְּכוֹנָה מִן מִלְּךְ הָאָדָם: The expression בֶּקֶּהֶנַּת is perplexing. Either the sense is, 'this was (written) with humility,' in the ordinary sense of /קֶהֶנַּת, 'to be humble,' but postulating a noun קֶהֶנַּת ('humility'), or, alternately, we may render, 'this was (the letter) was (wrapped or folded) in a bundle,' cf. Je 10:17 (‘יספִּים מְאֶרֶשׁ קִינָתָהּ). The point of the comment would then be that it was sent as a confidential document (see v 12: רָאוֹ, 'its confidential import'), well-wrapped and sealed.

12. (קָטָן) (קָטָן): The place-name was clearly added by a glossator, as the construct relationship, created by the addition of a place-name, would not permit the addition of a definite article with the Nomen Regens.

See on 23:7.


סְלָלָת וּרְבָּכָה: Ex 4:26.
15. They will swiftly become confused.

/sphr/ is a denominative of sippor, 'a bird,' see Jastrow, Dictionary, 1298, col. II.

See on 3:10.

Abstract noun maskènûth; orthog. variant of miskènûth (Dt 3:9).

Variant of noun màsôr, which forms a common biblical couplet with màsôq (see previous note).

See on 21:14.

Read vrâhâqûthêkhâ.

We petition that you do not go away,

lit. 'the desisting from your going away.' The noun hòser (or ësèr or hâsâr) is employed as a negative particle (= 'bhîlî).

See also 22:17, 23 (hîsôn).

16. Variant of 'ùbhâh, 'enmity' (Dt 3:15.

Makkôth employed here as Infinitive Construct, according to Samaritan usage of /mkh for /nhk; see on 21:15.

17. Read mittpqâkh ('that you desist from going away'), /pûq.

Sing. verb with pl. subject; see on 2:21.

18. Either Int. Absolute (--which would be a stylistic rarity for H2) or read jôlêkh, sum H1.

נתן: Nu 11:2.

21. תקנת ההלכתה: Read אֵיהֶקָה. ענ'S: "That we may speedily make an alliance in security.' On גָּפֵר, see v 14.

22. ודינים יבר ימי: עונףᢘ יבר ימי... In contrast to the prose rendering of H1 on this verse, the H2 rendering is unusually descriptive and colourful: 'This situation would weary even kings in whose treasuries lie hidden and visible riches, and who are obeyed by many subjects.'

דרישת על פיה: Cf. Gn 41:40.

23. רְבּוֹת: The preposition גָּרְבּוֹת ('near') is here employed adverbially, in the sense of 'soon'. It is thus the equivalent of בְּגָרְבּוֹת. This is attested to by both H1 and H2 usage.

כְּסֶר הַרְבּוֹת: For הָכ֪רִיה as negative, see on v 15 above.

הָכ֪רִיה: Hebrew equivalent of Aram. idiom חֵידָנָא, 'this time, now.'

24. This verse, not represented in H2, is an elucidatory gloss, to avoid confusion over identity of Levi.

25. ויִשְׁרָיֵים: H1 has it that the request was for 'some of the people' to accompany Baba. H2, rather improbably states it as a request for the whole community to be permitted to accompany their leader into exile (כָּלְּלָנָא נַלְּקָה..)

דרישת על פיה: Read viyg. וְיִשְׁרָיֵים.
27. Cf. Dt 11:19. B.T. ... 'ḏōthān' 'eth ...


29. Cf. Dt 11:16; B.T. pen yiphteh


1. Infinitive Construct here replaced by simple noun, used in verbal sense (verbal noun), 'from the commanding (lit. 'commandment') of his Samaritan people.'
2. **My deposit.** Abstract noun pīqḏānāṯ.


5. **Read hārōmez, cum H1. The Sam. kōṭēl is a passive form. Heb. rāmūg, 'hinted at, referred to' (= hazzōkhīr).

6. **Lit. 'family order' (or 'arrangement'); perhaps in the sense of 'order of succession' (cf. Tal. Aram. kēṣīdrān). This meaning is supported by the family order as enumerated: '..his brothers, his cousins, his near relatives. and all the members of his family.' In 22:12 it is used, however, in the sense of the entire familial assembly.'

7. **In B.H. kimmāt has the sense of 'almost' (cf. Gn 26:10), 'hardly' (Ct.3:4). Here, however, the sense is 'shortly,' 'in a little while.' H2 makes this clear in its rendering bēregāt šābath. B.D.B.(Lexicon, 590), indeed, read this sense into II Chr 12:7 (vēnāḥattāh lāhem kimmāt liphlētāh), though this is not followed by modern translations (see N.E.B: 'I will let them barely escape').

For šābhāh'. The variation in the orthography of this particular word is surprising; cf. 11:20 (šābhāh), 24:3 (ṣēḇāṭēnū).
12. 'The command of' (p'qūdath; see on v 6).

13. 'His face (lit. 'form') was shining with brightness.' This description of Baba is omitted in H1. This is possibly another attempt to depict Baba in the image of Moses, 'the skin of whose face was shining' (Ex 34:29).

15. 'His thrones.' Arabic ʿršārā.

§24

1. רָאָא עַל-רָאָה : 'he came to the hill;' a ballast construction. "He was seen and not seen": Cf. Nu 24:14. Here in 'Aph'el, though no Hiph'il form in B.H.

שַׁמַּע בְּעַנַּס רַבִּים:* Read גְּרָה, 'Baba Rabbah is (lit. 'lies') in our power.

כְּבָמָת יִרְבָּיג:* 'In our grasp,' cf. Lv 2:2, 5:12. Fem. form of biblical qōmeq.

לְדָר חֹדִיד:* 'Fitting;' N.H: min hārāʿūy.

בֵּשָּׁשֵׁב:* Read as two words: naʿāseh bô.

2. עַבְדוּ יִרְעָה:* Read ubhô yēmithô, 'or to kill him.'

3. עַזְּרֵי עֲצֵיו: See on v 11 above.

עֵינֵר:* 'His glory,' Variant of pēʾērō.

עַבְדוּ דֵּרֶךְ עַבְדוּ דֵּרֶךְ: 'When he uprooted the troops with the sword,' cf. 1 Chr 12:35, 38 (ʿōdîr ha-maʿarakhah) for military association of ʿdîr. One meaning of the verb ʿdîr is
'to cast out, reject, banish.' In Tal. Aramaic it occurs, however, only in the derived conjugations.

4. דוע ודה רז: Colloquial idiom, 'quite apart from that.'

5. דוע וא היל צים תוייב: * 'Our attacks did not weary him.' Strange use of subject pronoun (hû') for object ทอด. This might have been under the influence of the opening word of the sentence, where v^hû' occupies a specially emphatic position.

6. ידוע ודה חת אל דדיתivar: 'Our oath was regarded as righteous (reliable).' B.H. changes the tav to a more emphatic ־ת after first radical שד in Hithpa'el, whence nișṭaddaq (Gn 44:16).


8. ידוע ודה חתivar: Read na'asrô очный, 'let us imprison him,' a reading supported by the continuation of our verse — ûbhên 'אָסָרֶה kol y^mê hayyâv — as well as by v 9, 'אָסָּר.
10. Read ותתתתתת, 'wrath was removed.'


12. Delete הָתֹ as ditto.

'That he should not fail.' It is strange that Philip should have needed to offer such a feeble excuse — or any excuse — in order to justify his actions to the guards! Significantly H1 omits this phrase.

13. An explanatory gloss, not in H2, describing the permanent guard which was stationed at all times around the walls of Constantinople, in order to control access to, and exit from, the city.


15. Cf. Gn 31:30. In quoting the biblical verse verbatim, the Chronicler omitted to adjust the person of the verb. Read: nikheaphtä.

16. 'Was imprisoning him,' cf. Lv 13:54 (where verb takes a direct object).

Read הָתֹ, 'to his own confines and tents.'

Cf. Dt 32:4.
1. גבר: * Usual Sam. variation of הֵוֹכ or הַוָּא (Tal. Aram.), 'to marry.

2. דִיִּשֵׁי לְךָ שָׁזָּה: 'They made for him a festivity.' Masc. form of שִׁמְחָה; see on 19:61, 20:25; 23:5, et al.

3. לגרות ... רָאָשׁ על צ👩ּוֹז וָדֶדֶן יָמוֹן: Cf. Gn 35:29.

4. חַיָּה: 'Illness' (H2: י'תמאֹהְי, 'he succumbed to illness'). B.H. invests this root with the more violent and militaristic connotation of 'smite through, wound, severely shatter' (B.D.B., lexicon, 563).

5. גברת רבּא: 'And Baba Rabbah sensed that his death was near.' A slight semantic shift occurs in the usage of /נת: 'to touch the mind = to realise, to sense.

6. The phraseology of this entire verse is culled from Gn 24:2-4.


10. אלָים גָּדוֹל בֵּינֵי וּבְיָמֵי: Gn 31:50.

11. בּוֹשָׁה ... בּוֹשָׁה:* A refined reference to dying; 'was removed into death.'

12. בגּוֹר לָוֹה ... אֶשָּׁי הָוֹדִידֵי: That only Baba's son, assisted by a non-member of the community, should have been delegated the sacred task of preparing the corpse for burial, is not to be construed as a slight to a beloved leader. Samaritan tradition recommends the avoidance of defilement through contact with the dead. Ben Zevi records that the modern Samaritans frequently leave to
outsiders the preparing of the corpse for burial, and any other contact with it (Ben Zevi, S.H., 149). Levi, being the next of kin, was the only exception in this instance, aided by an outsider, Baba's trusted Judaean friend.

14/15 ᶠנדה:* Used here as 'a gathering (of mourners).'
8. THE CHRONICLE:

(A) H1 AND H2 VERSIONS, AND THE PROBLEM OF DATING THE CHRONICLE.

(B) JUDAISTIC PSALM-VERSES IN A SAMARITAN CHRONICLE.

(C) THE LEGEND OF THE SPEAKING BIRD IN THE LIGHT OF RABBINIC POLSMIC.

(D) SAMARITAN FIRE-PRACTICES IN THE LIGHT OF A MISHNAIC ACCUSATION.

(E) LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF H1 AND H2.
(A) **H1 and H2 Versions, and the Problem of Dating**

The text which forms the basis of our study is a section of a Samaritan Chronicle, or *Sopher ha-Yamîm*. The Chronicle, in its H1 version, is MS.1142 in the Gaster collection of the John Rylands library, Manchester. Another version, H2, almost parallel, though employing a totally independent, Aramaic-orientated, literary style—as opposed to H1's usually pure classical Hebrew orientation—was found in the same collection, and is numbered MS. 1168. We have used the latter version as our major secondary source, and have reproduced it in the left-hand column of our text of the Baba Rabbah section of Chronicle II. We have also made constant reference to the other Hebrew Chronicles, to Abu'l Fath's Arabic Chronicle and to other, more modern Arabic versions, such as MSS.A1,2 (*at-Ta'rikh*), even though their contribution is inevitably circumscribed.

J.Macdonald, who also utilised H2 as a secondary text for his critical edition of the biblical texts,\(^1\) was inclined to the view that H2 was a later version of H1.\(^2\) He states that 'it seems likely that this Chronicle II version was possessed by a lesser known family, possibly not living in the Nablus area, but certainly under the influence of Arabic, though at a time when that language had not yet been totally assimilated by the Samaritans.\(^3\)

The present writer has been unable, however, to detect any traces at all of Arabic influence on H2, and, as a

\(^2\) Ibid. 10-11.
\(^3\) Ibid.
result of his researches under the guidance of Professor Macdonald, the latter has now expressed reservations regarding his previous conclusions relating to the comparative lateness of H2 and its dependence upon H1. There are, indeed, stronger indications that H1 might represent a later revision, or version, of the H2 genre, in a form based upon the classical Hebrew style of the Bible — even to the extent of employing jaw-consecutive — and interspersed with Biblical, even non-Hexateuchal, quotations.

A fuller discussion on the characteristics of the two versions is given below. At this point we would merely note the intriguing classical style of H1, and offer a speculative suggestion as to its motivation.

We must not forget that a move away from the Aramaic or Arabic vernacular and a return to pure Hebrew literary forms and structures would not be a phenomenon. A Hebrew renaissance along these lines took place in the ninth century A.D., in the case of the Midrashic literature of Palestine. A notable example is that of the Pesiqta Cycle, especially the Pesiqta Rabbati. 'The date of its compilation is stated in the book to be 345 C.E. It is distinguished especially by the use of Hebrew words and expressions instead of the Aramaic employed by the earlier Midrashim, by its poetic style... which shows an acquaintance with the school of neo-Hebrew poetry which began to flourish in Palestine in the seventh century'.

1 See pp. 349-367.
It is conceivable, therefore, that H1 is the residual legacy of a parallel movement among Samaritan writers. The fact that only one MS. is extant to testify to the existence of such a trend does not surprise us, knowing the great losses of Samaritan manuscripts sustained during the Middle Ages. On the other hand, H2, although replete with Aramaicisms, still contains a sufficient admixture of (non waw-consecutive) Hebrew for it to be assigned to the same provenance, as part of the same trend. Later in this chapter we will discuss the thorny problem of the appearance of Judaean Psalm-verses in a Samaritan Chronicle. If there was a medieval Samaritan renaissance of the Hebrew language it might explain their willingness to cast as wide a net as possible, from early — if not, in their opinion, Biblical — literature. The book of Psalms would have been an obvious choice as a literary and linguistic reservoir, since, apart from, and because of, its natural, devotional appeal, it had the unanimous acclaim of all discerning literati, so much so that both Karaites and Rabbanites united in regarding it as the most important source for liturgical creation. The Samaritans would not have been ignorant of this development going on around them, which indeed might have contributed to a Hebrew renaissance in their own community. Possibly the Samaritans, like the Jews,

1 See p. 471.
2 See p. 320.
smarted under the Karaite charge that they were using 'the language of Assyrians and Arameans, which is the shameful language of the men of the dispersion. For its sake the Hebrews have neglected their own tongue, and in it they laid down the fruits of their wisdom and thought in a jargon, which caused them to misunderstand Scripture, to weaken in its interpretation, and to abandon its ordinary meaning.'

If the above trends and attitudes did influence the Samaritans to essay a return to purer, Hebrew, expression, then our two versions of H1 and H2 might represent different stages in the development and perfection of such a Hebrew style. H2, with its evenly-balanced synthesis of Hebrew and Aramaic, would reflect an early stage of the literary renaissance, when the influence of the Defter, Marqah and other Aramaic sources was still dominant. H1, on the other hand, with its flowing, classical style — though still betraying signs of being an artificial Hebrew creation, with some Aramaic forms being retained — would represent a later stage of the process. This accords with our general view that H1 appears to be a later, revised and supplemented version of H2.

2 On the ancient opposition to vernacular Aramaic, see S. Pinsker, liqûtô Qadmônivyôth, 11, p.146.
Any attempt to assign a date to the composition of our Chronicle is a hazardous exercise. The colophon, which we shall discuss below, is no help in this instance. However, the mixture of Classical Hebrew together with Aramaic words and grammatical forms readily suggests a 14th century composition, the period in which the revival of Hebrew among the Samaritans found its most prominent expression.

Among the writers of that period the ones who became the most accomplished in developing this new literary style were Pinḥās ben Yusuf of Shechem and his two sons, Eleazar and Abiša. Their poems were widely incorporated into the liturgy. Significantly, they took as their model and exemplar the poetry of ḪAmram Darah and, especially, his son Marqah. Pinḥās ben Yusuf and Eleazar retained Aramaic in order to give an authentic flavour to the poetry they wrote in imitation of the style of Marqah. They regarded the "Verses of Marqah" as the purest expression of the spirit of Samaritanism; hence the appellation "the Samaritan Poet" when referring to Marqah.

This reverence for Marqah finds an unexpected echo in our Chronicle, in the list of the seven leaders appointed by Baba Rabbah to constitute his supreme council. The name of the sixth leader was ḪAmram. Having stated this fact, our Chronicler then refers to a tradition that this was none other than the famous ḪAmram, father of Marqah who was the master of scholars and scholarship;
There follows a reference to some compositions of 'Amram, which leads the Chronicler to a lengthy note on the liturgical poems of Marqah, the daily, Sabbath and festival services in which Marqah's poems are recited, and even a detailed note that 'where a fifth Sabbath occurs in the month, another of his compositions is recited before the Scriptural reading during the course of the Midday Service which replaces the Afternoon Service.'¹ This emphasis on the importance of Marqah and his compositions fits uneasily into the context of Baba's administrators, especially as no biographical details are given in the case of the other leaders, and, more to the point, the leader concerned was 'Amram, not Marqah!

The inference is that our Chronicler was here betraying a special admiration for the poet Marqah by creating an opportunity to make reference to him and to his special place in the liturgy. An admiration for Marqah, combined with the mixed Classical Hebrew and Aramaic style characteristic of the 14th century revivolist movement, would point toward the circle of Pinhas ben Yusuf of Shechem (1308-1367 A.D.) and his sons Eleazar and Abisha as a likely provenance for our Chronicle.

The influence of Marqah upon our Chronicler is also evident in the Moses-orientation which characterizes both works. There is a tradition that Marqah's real

¹ 5:28.
name was Moses, but that 'since his people refused him the right to use the name, Marqah was substituted as having the same gematriac value.' The Memar Margah exudes with glorification of Moses, even commencing its theological treatment of Israel's history with the account of the Commission of Moses at the Burning Bush, rather than with the Creation. There is nothing to equal Marqah's preoccupation with the uniqueness and greatness of Moses in either Samaritan or Judaistic literature.

This Moses-orientation clearly influenced our Chronicler who, in seeking to glorify Baba Rabbah, depicted him as a saviour repeating for his community the glorious deeds of salvation performed by Moses. The Chronicle depicts Baba as invoking 'the merit of Moses, the son of 'Amram' in his petition for deliverance. He sees the oppression of his community as a counterpart to the Egyptian oppression:

'Grant us a new redemption... for we are descended from Your righteous servants. As You dealt gloriously with our forefathers, the Israelites, deal with us in Your lovingkindness, and as You redeemed them, so redeem us.'

1 Montgomery, p.294.
2 See especially Memar Margah (Macdonald ed.) ii, sec.12.
3 See Macdonald's discussion of this point, Memar, i, p.xix.
4 3:34.
5 3:35-36.
The veneration of Moses appears in another passage which speaks of the heinous sin of the oppressors of the community in that 'they deny You and Your Prophet,' — a sentiment that breathes Marcan theology.

The relationship of the community towards Baba Kabbah is depicted as being similar to that existing between Moses and Israel. The oath of allegiance taken by the people is expressed in the words used by Israel when swearing allegiance to Moses — Kôl 'āšer tō'mar 'êlēnû nišma' v'na'āšen.²

To further underscore his point, the Chronicler employs vocabulary from the 'Call' of Moses in order to represent Baba as a second Moses-figure. The following parallels may especially be noted:

(Ex. 1:7) רָאָשׁ הָעָם רַבּוּ הָעָם רַבּוּ הָעָם
(Ex. 1:10) זַעְמֵיהוּ רָאָשׁ הָעָם רַבּוּ הָעָם
(H1, 1:6) זַעְמֵיהוּ רָאָשׁ הָעָם רַבּוּ הָעָם
(Ex. 2:11) רָאָשׁ הָעָם רַבּוּ הָעָם

The judicial relationship of Baba to his seven leaders is depicted as paralleling exactly the respective relationship of Moses towards his seventy Elders. This is most forcefully conveyed by Chronicle Adler,³ which appends to 6:3 the instruction given by Moses to the Elders:

...............  
1 3:12 (H2).  
3 P. 90.
'And any matter that is too hard for you, you shall submit to me and I shall consider it' (Dt.1:17).

Other parallels between Baba and Moses are reflected in the fact that Baba's activity is said to have lasted for forty years, as did the ministry of Moses. Also, the employment of the epithet 'king' (melekh) to describe Baba may have been inspired by Dt.33:5, where Moses is described as a 'king in Jeshurun'. Furthermore, as Moses retired to the seclusion of Sinai before receiving the Law, so Baba retires to the Chosen Mountain for a period of prayer and fasting before summoning his people to enter into a new spiritual covenant with God. Characteristically, when the Chronicler describes the joyous song of victory sung by Baba and his community, he introduces it with the formula of Exodus ch.15: יָזְזָר (ha-melekh ha-Ṣaddiq Baba Rabbah) יָזְזָר (ha-Ṣirah ha-zō'th).

This portrayal of Baba as a second Moses is, as we have observed above, in consonance with the outlook of Marqah, and might have found such clear expression in our Chronicle because of the influence of Marqah upon the 14th century circle of Pinḥās ben Yusuf of Shechem. It is conceivable, though we have no clear evidence, that the Moses motif was intended to be taken a stage further. Samaritan belief has it that, at the end of the present age, Moses will return in order to usher in the restoration of his people's fortunes and the kingdom of God on earth.2

1 10:11.
Furthermore, in the 14th century, with the union of the old priestly orthodox and the Dositheans, the new Defter which was created was permeated with a glorification of Moses — a doctrine directly inspired and influenced by the Memar Marqah. Moses becomes a messianic figure; his very name is sacred, like that of God. On Moses' account the world was brought into existence, and after his worldly existence he was taken up alive into heaven. J.Bowman has observed that 'there is no such doctrine of Moses, however, in the eleventh century writings of the priest Abu'l Hasan.'¹ This information might add some weight to our theory that our Chronicle emanates from the 14th century circle writing under the influence of Marqah's doctrine of Moses and, in consequence, casting Baba in the role of a second Moses.

The casting of Baba in that role throws up the possibility that the Chronicler conceived of Baba himself as a Taheb figure, the promised 'Prophet like unto Moses',² especially in terms of the eschatological role of Taheb which Moses fulfils in Samaritan thought. The Taheb inaugurates the period of Rabûtâ, when divine favour is restored to Israel. He is to be Prophet, Priest and King over the second kingdom. It is apparent that Baba's successes were interpreted by his contemporaries.

² Dt.18:15.
as a result of a new ḫabūṭā secured by Baba. This comes over clearly in the songs of praise contained in the Chronicle. Like the Taheb, Baba is also consistently described as priest and king.

We learn from Josephus¹ that the Samaritans of the 1st century A.D. were — like many other sects of the period — awaiting the arrival of their Taheb, and that one pretender to the office actually appeared during the period of Pilate's governorship. The yearning could only have increased over the succeeding two centuries; and the person of Baba must have been viewed as the fulfilment of the promise and the embodiment of the ideal. The parallels between Baba and Moses, however finely they are drawn by our Chronicler, might well have been influenced by that attitude, and enforced by the Moses-orientation of the 14th century provenance from which our Chronicle emerged.

Whether this Moses motif ought to be viewed against the backcloth of Dosithean polemic² is an open question, one which our present knowledge of that sect — notwithstanding the recent researches of J.Isser³ — still makes it difficult to decide. A.D.Crown⁴ has attempted to trace the development of a Dosithean group which, under the influence of the Patristic literature, glorified Joshua and, contrasting him favourably with Moses, attempted to play down the role of Moses and develop a kind of 'Joshua Messianism'.⁵

¹ Ant.xviii, iv, 1.
² For discussion on Baba's Dositheanism, see below, p.445ff.
Crown records a private suggestion of J. Bowman that Baba might have been regarded as a 'second Joshua'. His support for this theory is the slender fact of the abrupt end of the Juynboll 'Arabic Book of Joshua', which concludes after the time of Baba, thereby suggesting that 'the work may have been tailored to show Baba as Joshua's successor'.

Crown himself finds other, equally loose, parallels between the activities of Baba and those of Joshua, in particular the division of the land of Canaan among the Samaritans. While such a division is indeed referred to, none of the Chronicles, however, make more than a passing reference to it, and all describe the division as an arbitrary arrangement serving the more significant aim of allocating administrative areas to the six 'Priests of the sons of Aaron'. This was clearly a spiritual division, as the context makes clear, and can in no way be compared to the great conquest of the land effected by Joshua, followed by his division of the land.

The reference to Baba's division of Canaan among the 'families of the Samaritan Israelites' is itself suspect. Such a complex and important reorganisation deserves a much fuller description than the bald statement contained in the Chronicles. Not only is the 'division' linked to a priestly parish-structure — as we have mentioned above —

2 Chr.II, 10:14; Adler, p.93 (Not p.95, as stated in Crown's note 97.).
3 See Chr.II, 10:19-24.
4 Adler, p.93.
but there are no references, as there are in Joshua, to the delineation of the various boundaries of the tribal, or 'family' possessions. More significantly, it is impossible to harmonize this tradition of a division of Canaan into family units, under the authority of six priests, with the other 'divisions' introduced by Baba as a fundamental part of his integrated reforms. The latter, by contrast, are fully described, together with the names of the priestly and lay administrators of each 'division', as well as its location. The reference to another division, under six different priests, stands in total conflict.

The reference to a division of the whole land of Canaan is, in itself, suspect. The Samaritans only occupied a small part of the land, and nowhere in the Chronicle is it implied that they had designs upon the rest of the country. Chronicle II, in its full description of Baba's administrative reorganisation, confines the 'division' to the recognised areas of Samaritan habitation.2

Crown's reference to a group of Joshua-Dositheans may explain the presence of such a conflicting tradition regarding the division of Canaan. It is conceivable that this tradition owes its genesis to a writer of the Joshua-Dosithean persuasion who, in an attempt to find points of contact between Baba and Joshua, described the former

2 See 10:1.
following in the footsteps of the Biblical hero, Joshua, by apportioning the land to the Israelite families.

Granting the validity of the Crown-Bowman hypothesis, which detects a Joshua-Dosithean outlook in the account of the life of Baba Rabbah, and even allowing for the infiltration of one such Joshua tradition into the material which comprises Chronicle II, yet the overall Moses-orientation of this Chronicle suggests the possibility that it may have been written to serve the polemical aim of countering the Joshua-orientation of the other Chronicles by casting Baba in the role of a second Moses. Even if polemic was not, consciously, in the mind of the Chronicler, the Moses-orientation of Chronicle II does set it apart from the other Chronicles. It is unfortunate that Bowman and Crown had not been in a position to have read Chronicle II, as then they would not have hastened to the conclusion that Baba may have been regarded as a second Joshua. The Moses-orientation of our Chronicle would have given them a wider perspective, and they would then have realised that the role of Baba is cast in accordance with the particular theological propensity — Dosithean or Orthodox Samaritan — of the Chronicler himself. The frequent references to Moses found in Chronicle II, and especially the glorification of him as the instrument of the giving of the divine Law, suggest that this Chronicle emanated from the period

1 See Crown's statement that 'our sources for examining Baba's career are Abu'l Fath, Chronicle Adler and Chronicle Neubauer.' (Crown, op.cit., p.34).
2 See 3:26, 10:24, 12:10, 14:25, 21:17.
following on after the unification of the Dosithean and Orthodox groups, when Joshua 'Messianism' had finally been abandoned.

The non-Dosithean character of Chronicle II is, in fact, clear from the various references to festivals. Great play has been made, especially by Bowman and Crown, of the fact that Baba is said to have celebrated only the Sabbath and none of the other festivals — 'again suggestive of the apparent Dosithean nature of his ideas'.

Significantly, Crown himself admits that 'the fact that only the Sabbath is mentioned could well be fortuitous'. Furthermore, it cannot be over-emphasized that even if the other three Chronicles do lend themselves to such an inference, Chronicle II is sufficient to confound the suggestion. In this Chronicle we find references to the other festivals, and even to the minor Holyday of Rosh Hodesh. A significant reference occurs in the context of the regulations for the examination of candidates for the title of Hakham. Baba's instruction was that the latter should submit himself 'either on the day of the New Moon or on the days of the festivals'. References are also made to the festival of Tabernacles and the festival booths, to Shemini Atzereth — 'the conclusion of the festivals of the Lord', to the Day of Atonement and

1 Crown, op. cit., p.84.
2 Ibid.
3 9:3
5 19:52, 65.
6 5:27.
to the festival of Revelation. The suggestion that, in accordance with Dosithean practice, Baba only observed the Sabbath is patently without basis. These references to the festivals also prove that our Chronicle was not composed under Dosithean influence and that there is no evidence to present Baba as a Dosithean, and certainly not as a second Joshua. The only Dosithean strand we have uncovered is the tradition regarding Baba's division of the land of Canaan.

* * *

As will be clear from the foregoing discussion, our Chronicle II is not an isolated work, but must be viewed in relation to the other extant Chronicles of Samaritan history.

As a result of the extensive researches of Professor John Macdonald, a chronological classification of the Samaritan Chronicles was adopted, according to which our Chronicle was designated as number II, preceded chronologically by the Asatir and followed by the Tolidah.

A re-assessment of the interrelationship of the Chronicles has been made by A.D. Crown, who re-drafts Macdonald's table of Chronicles, though substantially

1 5:29.
retaining the same chronological arrangement. The
collection of Crown would lie in his demonstration of
the processes by which Macdonald's seven (types of)
Chronicles were enlarged or composed, as well as their
interrelationship.

Crown differentiates between two types of Chronicle II:
our own Chronicle (which he calls Chron.IIM(acdonald)
and IIA, which is postulated as the original Sepher
Ha-Yamim. Chronicle VII (Adler and Seligsohn type, Rylands
MS.257 type and J Book of Joshua type) is established
as an apocope of Chronicle IIA. Chronicle Adler and
Rylands MS.257 are admitted to be derivatives of an
original Sepher Ha-Yamim.1 Macdonald demonstrated,
however, that Adler is not a derivative of our present
Chronicle II; thus the enumeration by Crown of a Chronicle
IIA, representing the original textual tradition upon
which Chronicle VII type material was based.

The Chronicle II fills 281 folios. The first part,
covering the Biblical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel
and Kings (II Chronicles), has been published, with full
critical apparatus, by John Macdonald.2 Together with
A.J.B.Higgins, Macdonald also published a short section
covering the period of the beginnings of Christianity.3

1 Adler, "Une Nouvelle Chronique Samaritaine," R.E.J.
xi, pt.11, p.98; Rylands Sam.MS.257 fol.116.
2 The Samaritan Chronicle II (B.Z.A.W.), 1969.
3 "The Beginnings of Christianity According to the Samaritans,"
No other sections have yet been published, and the present study, dealing with the period of Baba Rabbah, presents a critical treatment of folios 179-220.

The importance of Chronicle II has been highlighted by Macdonald, who, without reservation, regards it as 'the best and most accurate of all the Chronicles'. This assessment is quoted, apparently with approbation, by H.G.Kippenberg. R.J.Coggins, comparing Chronicle II with the other extant Chronicles, describes it as 'a more ancient and probably more reliable source'.

A full general description of the nature of the Chronicle has been provided by Macdonald in the introduction to his edition. There is no need to duplicate this information here. We have also made some suggestions above regarding its provenance and theological inclination. One aspect of the Chronicle, however, still awaits clarification, namely the date when this sole surviving copy of the Chronicle was made, and the nature of its transmission.

No doubt, the high assessments of the value of Chronicle II, referred to above, were influenced not only by the quality of the published section, but also, in large

1 Macdonald, *Theology*, p.44.
measure, to the date attributed to our sole surviving copy of the Chronicle. Macdonald, basing himself upon the colophon, predicated the year 1616 A.D. The colophon reads as follows:

Now the copy of this Chronicle was completed this night of the fifth day of the ninth month in the year 1,026 of the kingdom of Ishmael, by the hand of the poor servant Tobhiah son of Phinehas, minister to the Synagogue of Shechem. I thank the Lord. 1

The year 1,026 A.H., stated herein, corresponds to the year 1617 A.D., the year consequently taken by Macdonald as the date of our copy of Chronicle II. 2

Doubt regarding the reliability of the date given in the colophon was expressed by Z. Ben-Hayyim in a review of Macdonald's edition of the Chronicle. 3 Ben-Hayyim

1 Chron.11, fol.281 col.2.
2 Macdonald, The Samaritan Chronicle No.11, p.69.
expressed the opinion that the words had been inadvertently omitted by the scribe before the words.
The amended version would then provide a date 1326 A.H., corresponding to the year 1908.

A reading of the last few folios of the Chronicle does, in fact, confirm the opinion of Ben-Hayyim. The Chronicler refers therein to a number of episodes connected with the High Priests and personalities who lived in the period leading up to his own day. He is particular to record the exact dates of their birth and death. All the dates specified are clearly 19th and 20th century dates. For convenience, and because the dating of our Chronicle is of such importance, we quote the final few entries:

(i) יְהֹוָה בָּנָתָהּ סֶפֶר מֵאָשֶׁר לְמָתוּנוּ לְיִשְׁמָרָהּ לְךָ
   ... ליְבַלְכָּה בָּרִים רַעִיתָרֶךָ
(ii) יְהֹוָה בָּנָתָהּ סֶפֶר מֵאָשֶׁר לְמָתוּנוּ לְכָדוֹן בָּשָׂר
   ... לְבַלְכָּה בָּרִים רַעִיתָרֶךָ
(iii) יְהֹוָה בָּנָתָהּ סֶפֶר מֵאָשֶׁר לְמָתוּנוּ לְכָדוֹן בָּשָׂר
   ... ליְבַלְכָּה בָּרִים רַעִיתָרֶךָ

These dates correspond to the years 1858, 1874 and 1897 respectively, thus making it abundantly clear that a scribal omission has, indeed, occurred in the colophon. Reference (iii), which includes the phrase יְמֵינָרָה מַמָּזְאֹת indicates, beyond any doubt, the nature of the omission, as suggested by Ben-Hayyim. Our copy may therefore be dated 1908.

Further evidence of this date is also furnished by the scribe's reference to his own ancestry. He informs us that

1 Fol. 281 col. 1.
he is the fourth son of the Priest Pinhās ben Isaac ben Solomon. If we consult Cowley's genealogical tables¹ we see the scribe and his family listed at the foot of the Levitical family, thereby substantiating Ben-Hayyim's view that the MS. was produced at the beginning of this century.²

Ben-Hayyim, having established the comparative modernity of our MS., proceeded to write off Chronicle II as being, consequently, of little value. Ben-Hayyim even suggests that Chronicle II was produced 'probably by the same person who compiled the well-known "Joshua Book" published by M. Gaster in ZDMG 62 (1908).'

Ben-Hayyim's strictures, and lack of respect for Chronicle II, are reserved, however, for the Biblical material published by Macdonald.³ Ben-Hayyim would be the first to recognise the value of the later material contained in the Chronicle, its independent origin and the linguistic and historical value of a lengthy Hebrew Chronicle whose material is far richer than that of the existing Hebrew or Arabic Chronicles.

.........................


2 Cowley makes the priest Pinhās ben Isaac even more prolific than does our colophon. Cowley attributes five sons to him (though he does not give their names), whereas our scribe claims to have been one of only four children(ד' ילドイツ), Cowley's statement should be corrected accordingly.

3 Ben-Hayyim states: 'At any rate, the Joshua part of the Chronicle (my italics)... is identical with the "Joshua Book".'
The quality and significance of the Biblical portions of Chronicle II are outside the purview of our study. One point that has to be made, however, — since it is relevant to both Macdonald's approach to his material as well as that of the present researcher — is that it displays a lack of critical acumen to confuse or lump together the date when a copy of a MS. was produced with the period when the literary and historical traditions underlying the Chronicle were first conceived and/or committed to writing.

The fact that we acknowledge, on the evidence of the colophon, that our copy was made in 1903, in no way forces us to the conclusion that it is a 'modern Chronicle' with no historical or literary value as an independent source. Obviously, the final folios, wherein the scribe has brought the Chronicle up-to-date, are circumscribed in importance; but the rest of the material — and especially the Baba Rabbah section, with its new insights into that period — is of great and abiding interest no matter when a modern-day scribe discovered and copied his Chronicle.

Cumulative internal evidence indicates, beyond doubt, that our section of the Chronicle contains very old elements not found in any of the other Chronicles, and that it represents an authentic early expression of Samaritan historical tradition, couched in the medieval Samaritan Hebrew-Aramaic, familiar to us from other writings of the period.
Ben-Hayyim does, in fact, admit the possibility that the historical sections of our Chronicle might contain just such valuable source-material:

'Nevertheless, I say that even such a young source is worthy of close attention. Sometimes there may be hidden beneath a young Chronicle information pertaining to an unknown early source, or there may be found in it some material known from an early source but preserved in a more authentic form, because the MS. used by the compiler was more reliable.'

Ben-Hayyim's reference to discovering 'information pertaining to an unknown early source' is, we believe, applicable in the case of our Chronicle. One particular reference could only have emanated from a very early source, since it reflects a ritual practice which was operative in the Chronicler's day, but which subsequently fell into desuetude, leaving no trace of its original existence — other than in Chronicle II.

The reference concerns the great victory won by the Samaritans with the help of Levi, nephew of Baba. Having routed the Romans, the memory of the victory was kept alive by a charming ritual practised by the Samaritan children. In commemoration of the beacons of fire, lit by Baba as a signal for attack, 'Samaritan children have set fire to the wood of their Succah—booths on the night of the termination of the festival

1 Z.Ben-Hayyim, op. cit., 298.
of the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly which concludes the festivals of the Lord. This episode has thus remained a memorial among them unto this day'.

There is no trace of this practice in either the Hillukh or the Masa'il al Khilaf. Furthermore, John Mills, who visited the community in 1855 and 1860, spending a few months among them and having 'daily intercourse with 'Amram the priest', has left us a detailed description of the ritual associated with the festival of Succoth and the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly. With reference to the latter, he states:

The Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly is kept strictly as a day of rest, a peculiarly sacred day when they go down to the Synagogue, and the Service book, adapted for the feast, is repeated by the priest.

As Mills was careful to note any peculiar or unique custom practised by the Samaritans, it is certain that the ritual of setting fire to the Succah booths could not have been practised by the Samaritan children of those days.

I. Ben-Zvi was another scholar whose close relationship with the Samaritans extends over the past century. In his description of the community and their practices he makes no reference at all to the existence of such

2 John Mills, Nablus and the Modern Samaritans, viii.
3 Ibid, 266.
a custom.

The use of the phrase '(This episode has remained a memorial among them) until this day,' is, consequently, of supreme importance, pointing to an early date when this material was first chronicled. We have, naturally, no way of knowing when the practice was discontinued, but the fact that Chronicle II is the only source to refer to it is a significant pointer to its value as an early and independent source. Ben-Hayyim's description of it as 'a young Chronicle' is thus most misleading.

That our Chronicle is an abstract of an earlier Hebrew Chronicle is implied in a few passages. H2 introduces section 18 by referring to the source of the account which follows:

And we have found in a Chronicle of our ancestors, written in the sacred Hebrew script, reference to further exploits of our great king and leader, Baba Rabbah, which we will relate in this book.¹

The lengthy and detailed nature of the original Chronicle, from which our Chronicle II was abstracted, is expressly referred to in a later, unpublished part of the Chronicle:

And this episode of the activity of the accursed Dusis, which we have described in this Chronicle, is but a part of a

¹ H2, 18:1 — וLanguages of Israel: The Hebrews' Account of Their History
The Hebrews refer to a later, unpublished part of the Chronicle.
large work; but we have not elaborated upon the episode to provide all its details.¹

These references to an original Hebrew Chronicle, of which Chronicle II is a digest, suggest that we may well have before us a substantial body of material that has been reproduced from the original source which was hitherto believed to have been lost. In his introduction to his own book, Abu'l Fath lists among his sources a few Chronicles written in 'the Hebrew language' — מְלֹאכֵי קַרְטָס — which were obtained from the High Priestly circle in Damascus. He refers specifically to a Hebrew Chronicle containing a detailed description of the many deeds and exploits, some of them gilded with legendary material, associated with one of the greatest of the Samaritan leaders, Baba Rabbah.² The nature of our Chronicle, and especially the close relationship — in the Baba Rabbah section — between it and Abu'l Fath's Arabic account, suggest the possibility that parts of our Chronicle may well have furnished Abu'l Fath with the source material for his history.

In the context of this suggestion, the words of M.Gaster are apposite:

'From Baba Rabbah dates the renaissance, or better, the consolidation of the Samaritan commonwealth in the third or

² Abu'l Fath, p.139.
fourth century A.D. In his time lived their greatest poets and writers....
Such an elaborate Chronicle of the fourth century had evidently been preserved in Hebrew among the Samaritans down to the period of Abu'l Fath (fourteenth cent.). Who knows whether it will not, sooner or later, come to light as so many other writings of the Samaritans hitherto unknown, and how much of it may be found in those already known.¹

Referring to the reliability of material or traditions emanating from the Baba Rabbah period, Montgomery avers that 'only for the period of the Samaritan revival in the IVth and Vth centuries does there appear to be any genuine native tradition.'²

Assuming then that Chronicle II achieved its present form as a result of a redaction of primary (Samaritan-Hebrew) material, can we be sure that the redactor treated his source with respect and transcribed it in its pristine form? The answer is, naturally, that we cannot be so sure. However, there are a number of indications that he regarded the text before him as inviolate. This explains the many difficult and complex phrases that occur in the Chronicle, and which would

1 M.Gaster, Studies and Texts, 1, p.485.
2 Montgomery, The Samaritans, p.310.
normally have lent themselves to simplification. This also explains the lacunae in the text, which no attempt has been made to fill. Furthermore, in instances where the scribe was aware that an inaccuracy had occurred in the Chronicle's transmitted text, he did not presume to correct it, but rather added a corrective gloss. To give but one example: In the list of the administrative boundaries we are told that Baba Rabbah gave to the second leader a 'permanent possession from 'Askor to Tarbios.' The scribe or redactor—which scribe—of the many who must have copied the MS. down the ages, we do not know—adds the corrective gloss: 'This is actually from 'Askor to Tiberias.' The fact that he did not just correct the original is clear evidence of his high respect for the Chronicle. It also serves to refute Ben Hayyim's description of this work as 'a modern Chronicle.' Another important factor militating against this assessment is the uniqueness of much of the vocabulary and grammatical forms—collected in our word-list—which has no parallel in the 'modern' Samaritan-Hebrew idiom employed by writers during the past century in order to supply the requirement of scholars and libraries researching Samaritan literature, much of which was written in Arabic. The Hebrew of these translators inevitably betrayed the Arabic original, in the form of structures and phraseology

3 9:9.
which were clearly literal Hebrew translations of Arabic idiomatic expressions or characteristic forms. No translator, however competent, could completely disguise the Arabic provenance of his master-copy, especially when Arabic was, at the same time, his own native tongue. Yet, in our Chronicle, we have failed to uncover one clear example of an Arabic idiom underlying any Hebrew form. The conclusion is inescapable that we are indeed dealing with an original Hebrew Chronicle, perhaps of the genre referred to by Abu’l Fath as one of the sources for his own work.

The fact that our MS. is the sole extant copy of the Chronicle is indicative of its rarity. One would have expected that the original, used by the scribe Tobhiah ben Pinhas, would still have been available. That this is not the case suggests that it must have been in a serious state of disrepair when Tobhiah undertook his task of copying it. Perhaps the sorry state of the original actually prompted him to devote his attention to it.

Had the original remained, for centuries, the property of the Shechem community it is still inconceivable that no further copies of it would have been made! A solution to this problem may be obtained, however, by consulting folio 280b, where the scribe, Tobhiah,
speaks of his father's literary activities, and especially his devoted and indefatigable efforts to collect together from many sources the treasures of Samaritan literature. With reference to our Chronicle II, Tobhiah states: 'It was he (i.e. his father, Pinhas) who collected the copy of this Chronicle.' The use of the term 'collected' implies that the Chronicle had been obtained from an outside source, and had not been in the possession of the Shechem community. It might well have originated in either Damascus or Egypt, the other main centres of medieval Samaritanism.

Pinhas himself had no opportunity to pay any attention to the Chronicle he had collected. The merit of doing so was that of his son, Tobhiah. It is possible that Tobhiah only became aware of the existence of the Chronicle when examining the large number of manuscripts left by his bibliophile father at his death. This is suggested by the fact that our Chronicle was completed in 1908, just ten years after the death of Pinhas.
One of the most mystifying characteristics of the Baba Rabbah section of Chronicle II is the liberal use made of passages from the Biblical book of Psalms. This is surely one of the most glaring literary examples of the infiltration of Judaist influence into the stronghold of Samaritanism. The infiltration of Judaist ritual practices has been well attested, but the Samaritans have zealously maintained a policy of exclusiveness in the domain of literature, and have resolutely refused to come to terms with the many winds of literary change that buffeted them from the direction of the Judaean centres of learning and culture. The classical example of this literary opposition to anything which smacked of Judaean influence was the translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch into Arabic, accredited to Abu al-Hasan of Tyre (11th cent.). His translation fell into disuse because it was felt to have become influenced by renderings of the Arabic translation of the Rabbanite scholar, Saadia Gaon.

The Psalm-versed employed by our Chronicle are, in the context of Baba's prayers, petitions and praises of God. In this genre it would have been natural for the Chronicler to have employed passages from the Deuter, or at least to have worked within its style.

---

1 Samaritan observance of the festival of Purim, for example, is referred to by Mills (ThreeMonths Residence, p.266). On Samaritan wearing of fringes see A Spiro, "Samaritans, Tobiads and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo," American Acad. for Jew.Research, XX,289

2 Encyc.Jud., 14, '54b.
and idiom. How then, do we explain the presence of these quotations from the Judaist Psalms in a Samaritan Chronicle?

Our starting-point will be a passage in the Midrash which refers to a discussion between a Samaritan and a Rabbanite theologian on the subject of the resurrection of the dead:

"The Patriarch of the Cutheans asked Rabbi Meir, "I know that the dead will return to life, for it is written, AND THEY (sc. the righteous) SHALL BLOSSOM FORTH OUT OF THE CITY (sc. Jerusalem) LIKE THE GRASS OF THE EARTH (Ps. 112:16). But when they arise, will they arise nude or in their garments?" 1

J. Isser, quoting this passage, 2 makes the following comment: 'A lay leader of the Samaritans during the second century A.D. knew that the dead would rise! And he quoted Psalms — a book not recognised as canonical by the Samaritans — as his reference! Surely we cannot be so naive.' 3

The employment of Psalm-verses in our Chronicle 4 may, indeed, be viewed against the background of this passage, whose authenticity, unlike Isser, we have no reason to

3 Isser's quoted source for this passage — T.B.Sanhed,90b — is incorrect. This passage does not, in fact, make any reference to Cutheans, but is introduced by the words, 'Queen Cleopatra asked Rabbi Meir.' See note (1) in Soncino Talmud, Sanhedrin, p.307.
repuelate.

The topic under discussion in this instance is of crucial importance. Resurrection quite clearly had its place in mainstream Samaritan Orthodox Theology. The usual proof-text, marshalled from Gen.3:19 ('To your dust you shall return'), was decidedly unconvincing, and Samaritan theologians would obviously have been keenly interested to see how their Judaist counterparts derived the doctrine, knowing full-well that they were equally hamstrung by the lack of a clear statement on the concept in the pages of the Pentateuch. The 'Patriarch of the Cutheans' was quite clearly in sympathy with the sentiment expressed in the Psalm verse he quoted, and the fact that this did not come from a source recognised as Canonical by his community did not invalidate the truth of the doctrine in his eyes. There is thus nothing surprising about his demonstration of the fact that he was aware that the Rabbis had appealed to that Psalm verse as a support for the doctrine of Resurrection! He is clearly speaking to Rabbi Meir in the latter's own language, taking up the Rabbi's theological exposition and probing it further.

It must also be noted that although the book of Psalms was not Canonical for the Samaritans, yet, as a book of hymns with few overt historical allusions and no theological or religious innovations, it contained

1 For the Samaritan doctrine of Resurrection, see J. Macdonald, The Theology of the Samaritans; also Encyc. Jud., 14, 739a.
nothing that was offensive to Samaritan belief. Quite the contrary; before the rise and development of their own Deuter, the Judaist Psalms might well have been accepted by some Samaritan groups as a useful devotional manual or source in the period preceding the rise and development of the Samaritan Synagogue as a central institution. Our knowledge of this development is still limited, notwithstanding the contribution of Kippenberg, though 'it is apparent that in Samaritanism, as in Judaism, the Synagogue played an important part, undergoing a similar development even down to minor details.' This being so, the Samaritans would clearly have had need of hymns or devotional songs along the same lines as those which developed into the Judaist Book of Psalms and the Qumran Covenanters' Book of Hodayoth. That we have nothing of this type of literature from the pre-Synagogual period in Samaritanism is surprising. It is just possible that some Samaritan communities — such as the one presided over by the 'Patriarch of the Cuthaeans' referred to in the Midrashic passage — actually used the Judaist Psalms in their own worship. It is also possible that certain of the Psalms, or individual verses from Psalms, were the common possession of both communities. These may have originated as 'Northern Psalms', and come down as the


2 Coggins, Samaritans and Jews, p.137.
common heritage of that part of Palestine, later to take their place as part of the Judaistic Psalter.

It would be contrary to all we have observed regarding the evolution of literary and liturgical genres to assume that the poetic and flowing 4th cent. compositions of Marqah and Amram Darah were inspired exclusively from within, with no borrowing or inspiration from a previously-existent, popular literary reservoir. It is quite conceivable that it was the Judaist (and, possibly, the Northern) Psalms which fired the poetic spirit of the early Samaritan liturgical writers. Restricted to the few books regarded by their community as Canonical, they would have been unlikely to have possessed the inspiration to develop, as they did, a new and rich orchard of liturgical composition.

The problem of the final separation between Samaritans and Jews — a still hotly debated issue — might also impinge upon this question of the use of the book of Psalms by the Samaritans. The observance of the festival of Purim by the Samaritans, as referred to by Mills, is a clue to the lateness of the separation. Coggins avers that 'the decisive formative period for Samaritanism was the epoch from the third century B.C. to the beginning of the Christian era; it emerged from the matrix of Judaism during this time, with some measure of communication

............................

continuing well into the Christian era between Samaritans and various Jewish groups. (my italics). 1

This reconstruction of the situation would confirm our contention that the growing popularity of the Psalms and their absorption into Jewish liturgy would undoubtedly have had some repercussions in the Samaritan community. The Psalms would have been known to the latter, and probably rehearsed and recited in Samaritan Prayer-meetings and early Synagogues. It was only with the cultivation of their own unique Deuter that the non-Samaritan elements were jettisoned. The Purim festival was able to survive, however, by a process of re-interpretation and a calendrical switch to a different month. 1 The Psalms, so closely identified by then with the spirit of Judaism Prayer, could not so easily be absorbed into the Samaritan ritual without incurring the charge of dependence upon Judaism. The Psalms or Psalm verses that had hitherto been regarded as Northern or common tradition might well have been preserved by the Samaritans of the early centuries of the Christian era. Hence the Talmudic reference to a Samaritan 'Patriarch' quoting the Psalms, and hence the employment of passages from the Psalms — with some minor variations — by the author of our Chronicle. This consideration can but enhance the uniqueness of the Chronicle; for if

1 Mills, loc. cit.
these Psalm verses were indeed actually spoken by Baba Rabbah, then his generation would have probably been one of the last to use them, for before long the influence of the Deftor, Marqah, etc., would totally have supplanted the use of the Psalms. This would then be an indication that in our Chronicle ii there have survived literary traditions and elements which were actually contemporaneous with the period being chronicled.

One final point may here be made regarding this meeting between Samaritanism and Judaism in the area of a common approach to, and use of, certain Biblical books. From the Tosephta we learn that in ancient Palestine there were Samaritans who were regarded as acceptable and suitably-qualified to teach the Scriptures to Jewish children.¹ Such teachers could not have been ignorant of the other components of the Judaist Bible. Furthermore, if the suggestion that the Samaritan Targum is an adaptation of Onkeios rests on any valid foundation, this would also present a picture of educated Samaritan leaders, thoroughly instructed in Jewish Biblical writings and Biblical tradition. This would certainly have included the Psalms, and may be a further explanation of the appearance of passages from this work in a Samaritan Chronicle.

1 Tosephta Abhôqâh Zârâh, 3, 1
(C) THE LEGEND OF THE SPEAKING BIRD IN THE CONTEXT OF RABBINIC POLEMIC

One of the most dramatic episodes in the account of the Baba Rabbah period is that of the Legend of the speaking bird. This is woven into the account of the return of Baba's nephew, Levi, to Samaria after an absence of thirteen years 'acquainting himself with every custom of Roman Faith' (18:2) in preparation for the longed-for day when the Samaritans would lead an insurrection against their hated oppressors.

The brazen bird is described as the main obstacle to Samaritan access to the Holy Mountain:

'For there was situated on that holy Mountain, Mount Gerizim Beth-El, a bird, like a dove, used for the performance of divination and sorcery by the Roman sorcerers. That bird was made of brass, and to any Israelite coming up to Mount Gerizim Beth-El the bird which they had made would call out Ἰβριγος. When the Romans used to hear the call of the bird they would arise and search for the Israelite person.....' (18:5-6)

The sole motive behind Baba's decision to send Levi to the Romans was 'that he might ascend Mount Gerizim Beth-El, and direct all his efforts to breaking down
the bird that is situated there. There follows an interesting and colourful account of Levi's fortunes among the Roman clerics, where he attained to the rank of 'Great Skopos'. From the account of his return to Samaria, accompanied by a great entourage comprising 'leaders of the Roman people, their officers, some of the kings and all the army,' it would seem that Levi is being depicted by the Chronicler as an overseer with special responsibility for kings. Who these kings were is not stated, although the reference to Levi having set out 'from the province of Constantina' provides the clue. Toward the end of the Baba Rabbah section it is related that Baba was imprisoned in Constantinople, where he was welcomed by all the kings who were resident there.

In a later chapter we analyse the Constantinople material and find it to be unhistorical as regards the life of Baba Rabbah. Baba died before Constantinople became the prominent Roman administrative centre. The reference to 'kings' living there is, however, historical, as we shall demonstrate. Levi's association with the 'Roman kings' suggests that the Chronicler is depicting
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1 18:3.
2 19:3.
3 ibid.
4 23:12.
6 See p. 385.
him in the role of supreme overseer of the nobles and 'many opulent senators of Rome and the Eastern provinces,' who were commanded by Constantine to take up residence in that city.

The conclusions that we have reached regarding the lack of historicity of the 'Constantinople period' in the life of Baba directly affect the Levi episode. Levi, likewise, could hardly have studied in Constantinople for thirteen years during the life of Baba, nor could he have become a city administrator. Baba died about 328 A.D., and Constantinople was not dedicated as the new capital of the Eastern Roman Empire until the year 330 A.D! It is thus apparent that our, or an earlier, Chronicler has taken the legend of the brazen bird and woven it into a further legendary setting wherein the hero is Levi who returns from the Roman court of Constantinople and, with the help of Roman nobles and soldiers, is instrumental in destroying the brazen bird and restoring access to the holy Mountain.

In a later (unpublished) section of Chronicle II it is related how this same Levi became an adherent of the heresy propagated by Dosis. It is conceivable therefore that this whole episode of Levi and the destruction of the brazen bird was fabricated in later Dosithean circles, with a view to glorifying their most distinguished convert from Orthodox Samaritanism.

1 Gibbon's phrase. See below, p.385.
2 See below, p.373.
3 Chron.II, fol.475-479.
In the light of our foregoing remarks, we may separate two strands in the account of the brazen bird: first, the Levi-strand — which, as we have suggested, might have come from a Dositean source — and, secondly, the legend of the bird, which, as a unified legend, challenges us to seek some explanation of its origin.

The description of the bird as 'like a dove' instinctively reminds us of the famous Talmudic charge that 'the Samaritans found a figure of a dove on the top of Mount Gerizim, and they worshipped it.' This charge was levelled by a contemporary of Baba Rabbah, the Amorah Nachman bar Isaac (d.356 A.D.).

The Talmudic report suggests that Nachman was giving his own, ex cathedra, interpretation of why social and religious intercourse with Samaritans is forbidden. The Talmud actually relates the proscription to an episode that is supposed to have occurred some two centuries earlier, in connection with a visit of R. Simeon b. Eleazar, who was sent by Rabbi Meir to fetch wine from among the Cethans:

'He was met by a certain old man who said to him, PUT A KNIFE TO THY THROAT IF THOU BE A MAN GIVEN TO APPETITE (Pr. 23:2). Wherupon R. Simeon b. Eleazar

1 Tal. Hullin 6a
2 See H. Strack, Introduction to Talmud and Midrash, p. 130
3 The 'old man', Montgomery rightly notes (p. 191), is a frequent Talmudic figure, 'a sort of oracle, probably representing popular opinion.'
returned and reported the matter to
Rabbi Meir, who thereupon proscribed
them. Why? — Rabbi Nachman b. Isaac
explained: because the Samaritans
found a figure of a dove......'

It is significant that the dove-worship charge is
not related by the Talmud in the name of any previous
authority. Had that, indeed, been the true motive
underlying the attitude of Meir, he would certainly
have publicized the matter. Instead, we have a very
abstruse warning of 'the old man' to keep apart from
them. No reason, however, is given! Had there been
any substance in the charge — had the charge even
been made in the period of Rabbi Meir — it would
hardly have been supressed, to remain a mystery for
two hundred years, requiring the elucidation of the
4th century Rabbi Nachman.

That the pre-4th century Rabbis knew nothing about
dove-worshipping Samaritans is obvious from the fact
that the slaughtering performed by a Cuthi was declared
permitted by the distinguished authority Abbaye,2 and
from the fact that R. Johanan (d.290 A.D.) and his
pupil Rav Assi had no compunction about eating of
such meat.3 The Talmud, in offering an explanation

1 Indeed, the proof-text (Pr.23:2) would suggest that the
import of the warning was merely to discourage the
scholars from imbibing too much wine!
2 Tal. Hullin 3a.
3 Op. cit. 5b.
of Samaritan reliability, points out that the latter even go beyond the requirement of Biblical law; for, whereas Dt.12:21 does not specifically include birds as requiring ritual slaughter, yet the Samaritans do accept its binding character, and are, in general, more scrupulous than the Jews regarding these laws.

The relevance of this seems to have been overlooked by Montgomery in his discussion of the alleged dove-cult of the Samaritans.1 Surely, had there existed such a cult it is inconceivable that they would have been regarded as suitable ritual slaughterers in the eyes of rabbinic law. Their slaughter would have been invalid for fear that the act was performed with idolatrous intention — whether or not they adhered to the details of practical halachic requirements.

The inescapable conclusion is that the Rabbis before R.Nachman's period were unaware of, or totally discounted, any calumnious charge that the Samaritans indulged in any idolatrous dove worship. It was only in the 4th century, when relations between the Jewish and Samaritan communities were especially strained2 — exacerbated, perhaps, by the religious revivalist movement, and military activities, of Baba Rabbah, which threatened to upset the political stability of

1 Montgomery, The Samaritans, pp.169, 320
2 Echoes of this are heard in our Chronicle; see 15:12-19, 16, 17:1-6
the whole region — that the Jews saw fit to make it abundantly clear to the Romans that the Samaritans were a totally separate religious entity, and that they were acting unilaterally in their current enterprises under Baba Rabbah. The most effective way of demonstrating the separatist nature of the Samaritans was to charge them with idolatry.

For the origin of the charge a number of suggestions have been made. Especially fascinating are the theories of Seiden and Ronzevalle, that Samaritan origins can be discerned in the primitive cult of Semiramis, practised under the form of a dove by the Hamathite colony in Samaria. However, the fact that neither Mishnaic nor early Talmudic tradition knew anything of the existence of such a cult, which would hardly have suddenly sprouted in the 4th century Palestine without any antecedents, coupled with the fact that Baba's reforms, on the evidence of the Chronicle, involved no sweeping changes in the spiritual direction of the Samaritan community, other than an intensification of their trust and faith in God, suggests that the dove cult was not endemic to Samaritanism, but rather owed its calumnious reference to some event which had occurred at the time when the charge was first recorded, i.e. the 4th century period of Baba Rabbah and Rabbi Nachman b. Isaac.

............... 1

1 See Montgomery, p. 321
The conclusion we draw is that Nachman was himself the author of the charge against the Samaritans, but that he bolstered his antipathy to them by attributing the charge of dove-worship to the 2nd cent. Tanna, Rabbi Meir.

But what inspired R.Nachman to level this particular charge against the Samaritans? Might not the idea have been implanted into his mind by a contemporary report of an effigy of a bird on Mount Gerizim, which bird had become a cause célèbre among the Samaritans?

Might not the legend of the brazen bird, as related in our Chronicle, have been the spark which fired Nachman's imagination? Whether or not he had received a garbled version of the events, or whether he deliberately distorted the facts as a plausible piece of anti-Samaritan propaganda, is immaterial. For our purpose, the 4th cent. tradition of the existence of an image of a dove on Mount Gerizim has highly significant points of contact with the legend as described in our Chronicle.

Might not the brazen bird, 'like a dove,' have been, in fact, an emblem of the Roman eagle. This would have been erected to symbolise Roman occupation of the mountain, in the very same way that Herod had erected a large bronze representation of an eagle over the great gate of the Temple.¹

¹ Josephus, Ant., XVII, 151.
The bronze eagle was probably posted at the main route up the mountain as a warning sign against Samaritan approach. It may or may not have had an inscription to that effect attached to it. We actually have a reference in our Chronicle\(^1\) to the practice of setting up a brass notice, especially when the purpose was to prevent access to an area. When the Samaritans had succeeded in driving out the Judeans from the city of Shechem, during the reign of Ptolemaeus Claudius (ca.140 A.D.), they 'made a brass tablet in the holy city of Shechem, and inscribed upon it: NO JUDAEAN SHALL DWELL IN THE HOLY CITY OF SHECHEM.'\(^2\)

In the realm of the superstitions of the period, nothing could be more effective in warding off intruders than a bronze bird emblem. The two properties -- it being a bird as well as cast in bronze -- were both efficacious, it was believed, in repelling intruders. It must not be forgotten that our Chronicle does make it clear that the bronze bird, placed on the mountain, was an object of divination and sorcery.\(^2\) We are entitled, therefore, to seek out its significance in the realm of superstition.

Birds were used, in Semitic magic, to make an enemy become a fugitive.\(^3\) This was wrought through transference of the birds' property of flight to the enemy. This also

\(^1\) Chron.\(\textit{ll}\) (unpubl.), fol.345-6

\(^2\) 18:5

\(^3\) R.Campbell Thompson, \textit{Semitic Magic} (1903), 186

underlies the common Talmudic application of the metaphor of a bird with reference to the soul. Its flight from the body paralleled that of the bird in flight, the soul having been regarded as a fugitive from the corpse defiled by death.\footnote{See, for example, \textit{Lev. Rabbah}, IV, 5: 'God says to the soul, "Why have you sinned before me?" The soul replies, "It was the body which has sinned, not me; since I have come out of the body, \textit{I have flown about like an innocent bird in the air}".}

The position of bronze is also well attested, in Semitic exorcism, as an aid to driving away the undesirable. 'The suppliant would make a bronze image which would then be cast ceremoniously into a brazier. As with atonement, where the bird flies away with uncleanness, so the bronze image of the bird was believed to possess by transference, the properties essential to make sin or disease a fugitive.'\footnote{R. Campbell Thompson, \textit{Op. cit.}, 202}

To sum up our discussion: It is suggested that the legend of the speaking bird has to be separated from the account of Levi's glorious exploit, which we have attributed to a Dosithean source. We have highlighted a description of the bird in our Chronicle as being 'like a dove,' but not actually that bird, and we have suggested that it was, in fact, the Roman eagle set up as a warning against trespassers on the occupied territory of Mount Gerizim. (This would, indeed, have been a choice site for a Roman garrison.) At the popular, superstitious level, the symbol of the bronze eagle

\textbf{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\n
\textbf{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}
would have been regarded as possessing repellent properties, and would therefore, have been viewed with great awe. This fact became embellished into the legend that it actually shouted 'Ibriyos at the approach of any Samaritan. In hostile, Jewish eyes the Samaritan predicament, aggravated by the presence of the hated Roman eagle upon their sacred Mountain, was turned to effective polemical advantage. The Samaritans were consequently charged by Rabbi Nachman b. Isaac with having worshipped the bird. Perhaps too diffident to preach aloud any statement containing a reference to the eagle, in case it was misconstrued by the Roman informers, Nachman changed it to a dove. Although we have described Nachman's charge as polemical, it may be objected that the presence of such a piece of sculpture at the central shrine, and the fact that it may well have accompanied the head of the emperor - divine, would, according to the strict interpretation, have been regarded by the Rabbis as an infringement of the commandment against graven images. 1 There was thus some truth in the charge of idolatry, though this would have been totally discounted in any charitable assessment of the situation — which the Judaeans were obviously not prepared to make!

According to ancient Jewish practice, the New Moon was only officially declared after two witnesses had presented themselves to the Jerusalem Sanhedrin and testified that they had seen the first sign of the horns of the new moon in the skies. Since the diaspora communities, especially Babylon, recognised the prerogative of Jerusalem to determine the New Moon — and consequently the date of any fixed festival occurring within the forthcoming month — they obviously had to be informed without delay which day had been declared the first day of the new month.

An early method of informing the far-flung diaspora communities was to kindle beacons on the tops of hills. The message was then taken up by fire-stations positioned 'from the mount of Olives to Sarteba, and from Sarteba to Agrippina, and from Agrippina to Hauran, and from Hauran to Beth Baltin. They did not go beyond Beth Baltin, but there the flare was waved to and fro and up and down until a man could see the whole exile before him like a sea of fire.'

The Mishnah states that this practice of informing by beacons had to be abandoned:

[Further passage]

1 Mishnah Rosh Hashanah, 2:5
'Beforetimes they used to kindle flares, but after the evil-doings of the Samaritans they enacted that messengers should be sent out.¹

This charge, that the Samaritans mischievously interfered with the process of Jewish observance, has always been accepted at face value. The bonfires that the Samaritans lit on the wrong day could only, it was believed, have been calculated to upset the Jews and create havoc with their attempts to convey to their fellow diaspora Jews the correct day of the New Month.

The discussion that will follow is not an attempt to exonerate the Samaritans in any way. Its purpose is merely to refer to one or two fire-practices that are obliquely mentioned in the Baba Rabbah section of Chronicle 11, to see these practices in the light of the part played by fire in Samaritan belief (and possibly practice) and to throw out the possibility that the Samaritan bonfires, referred to with such odium by the Mishnah, just may have been part of a serious and authentic Samaritan purification ritual.

Our starting-point will be the tradition and faint traces of the concept of purification by fire among the Samaritans. This is referred to by Montgomery,² although nothing substantial has yet been brought to

¹ Mishnah, loc. cit. 2:2
² Montgomery, The Samaritans, 112, 319
light on this subject. Montgomery relates the prohibition against burning anything, imposed upon the Samaritans by the emperor Zeno, to this religious fire-rite that is supposed to have been part of their ritual.

An obscure fire-rite is referred to in our section of Chronicle 11. After Levi had dispatched the Roman force on Mount Gerizim, we are told that Baba lit a beacon on top of the mountain as a signal for his community to take revenge on the Roman administrators who had persecuted them hitherto. The victorious slaughter that ensued was henceforth commemorated, we are told, by a fire ritual performed by Samaritan children; a ritual which, according to the Chronicler, had survived to his own day:

'From the day the Samaritan Israelite community aid this to the Romans, Samaritan children have set fire to the wood of their Succah-booths on the night of the termination of the festival of the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly, which concludes the festivals of the Lord. This episode has thus remained a memorial among them unto this day.'

It does seem rather curious that the victory of Baba Rabbah should have been commemorated in such a manner, which can only be regarded as wilful destruction of a sacred ritual object!

The fact that this ritual was performed as a climax

to the festival of Tabernacles — the last day of which is the 'festival of the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly' — prompts an immediate association with the celebration of Tabernacles among the Jews. One of the highlights of this festival in Temple times was the lighting of torches and candelabra. These are graphically described in the Mishnah,⁠¹ which states that there were three golden candelsticks, of huge dimensions, in the Temple court which were lit on this occasion (called Simhath Bet Ha-Sofébhah, the rejoicing of the place of water-drawing), 'and there was not a courtyard in Jerusalem which did not reflect the light of the Bet Ha-Sofébhah.' It is generally believed that this fire ritual was originally unconnected with the ceremony of water-drawing, and owed its origin — before it was Judaized — to an original fire-festival connected with worship of the sun or Baal-Adonis-Tammuz.²

It is possible that although the Samaritans had, at an early period, absorbed this fire ritual from Judaism, they were, however, at a loss to explain its origin and significance (in Judaism it remains unexplained, but, merged into the Water-drawing ritual, became regarded as merely a way of intensifying the gladness of the occasion.), not having the accompanying
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¹ Mishnah Succah, Ch.5.
² See J.Hochman, Jerusalem Temple Festivities, Ch.4; H.Schauss, Guide to Jewish Holy Days, 305 note 226.
Sə'ābāh festivity to which to attribute it. Each
generation probably had its own way of explaining
the ritual,¹ and our Chronicler has preserved a
convenient explanation of the post-Baba period, which
has related it to an event among the glorious exploits
of that hero.

That the Samaritans should have absorbed a fire
ritual from Judaism — there is the alternative
possibility that the Tabernacles' fire-ritual was
a common heritage from pre-Israelite, or early
Israelite, days, before the schism — is not surprising
bearing in mind their reverence for the spiritual
properties of fire, as we shall presently demonstrate.

We must first turn to the second reference to a
fire ritual in our Chronicle:

Now the chiefs, who had been appointed
over them by authority of the kings of
the foreign nations, arrived to prevent
them from carrying out the statutes of
the holy Law... However, all the men of
the Samaritan community rose up against
them, quickly slew them and burnt them
in fire. Simultaneously, in every city,
in every town and in every place this
act was committed against the chiefs of
the nations... It took place on the
night before the New Moon of the seventh
(month), and the Samaritan Israelites
established a commemoration of that event:'

¹ This is clearly demonstrable from the fact that an
early tradition associates the origin of the custom
with the act of King Saul in 'burning all the Sucah-booths
of the Samaritan community' (MacDonald, The Samaritan
Chronicle No II, 125).
What form that 'commemoration' took is obvious from the previous reference in our Chronicle to bonfires (of Succah-booths) being lit to recall the burning of their enemies' corpses.

The most significant aspect of the passage is the hint given as to when this 'commemoration' would have been celebrated — 'On the night before the New Moon of the seventh month', in other words, on the eve of Rosh Ḥodesh and Rosh Hashanah! Is it just a coincidence that the Mishnah Rosh Hashanah charges the Samaritans with lighting bonfires on the eve of Rosh Ḥodesh in order to confuse the Jewish communities? Could it not have been that the Samaritans observed some fire ritual on that eve of the New Year — according to Samaritan calculation, which may have differed in a day from the Jewish designation, based, as it was, upon the testimony of witnesses — of which the Rabbis were unaware, and consequently interpreted the Samaritan action as deliberately hostile?

Again, it seems likely that the Samaritan Chronicler was linking a New Moon or New Year fire ritual to an event in the history of Baba's life. It is conceivable that the ritual was observed only on the eve of the New Moon of the seventh month, i.e. Rosh Hashanah, and that the Mishnah is inaccurate in implying that there

..............................
was a Samaritan threat every Rosh Ḥodesh, or, alternately, it is possible that the Samaritans did observe such a fire ritual every eve of Rosh Ḥodesh. Either way, it is just possible, as we have stated, that the Mishnaic Rabbis have done the Samaritans an injustice in claiming that they had deliberately sabotaged the Jewish communication system. We do not rule out the possibility, however, that our Chronicler may have deliberately attributed this commemorative ritual to the eve of Rosh Ḥodesh/Rosh Hashanah in order to parry the Rabbinic charge of harassment at that particular time of the year.

Without wishing to enter into the thorny arena of the critical theories regarding the origin of the Feast of Tabernacles, if the regnant theory, as developed by P. Voltz and S. Mowinckel, is correct, that its origin goes back to an old Israelite New Year festival, then it is possible that the fire rituals that are echoed in our Chronicle in relation to both Tabernacles ('The Day of Solemn Assembly') and the New Year might well have been a vestigial offshoot of the original parent festival of the New Year. In Judaism the fire element survived in the context of the Tabernacles' קָשֵׁהָה alone, and in early Samaritanism in the
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1 P. Voltz, Das Neujahrfeft Jahwes (1912).
2 S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship (1962 tr.).
lighting of beacons on both the eve of the New Year and the conclusion of Tabernacles. At a later period of Samaritanism, when the origin and significance of the fire ritual was no longer appreciated, it was temporarily saved from desuetude by a process of re-interpretation, of the kind we have noted in our Chronicle, which related it to the commemoration of victories won by Baba Rabbah.

The connection between fire and the New Moon or New Year need hardly be stated. We may merely quote the statement of Mowinckel, referring to the Temple festivity of סֹּדְבּּהַּ, that 'like the sunfires all over the world it was originally meant to re-create and secure sun and light and warmth in the year to come.' The first glow of the new light of the moon on the eve of Rosh Ḥodesh would, consequently, have been the appropriate occasion for a fire ritual as obliquely referred to in our Chronicle.

Samaritanism shares with Judaism the identification and celebration of the days of the New Moon and the New Year as periods of Atonement. The fire ritual, traces of which, we have suggested, have been left in our Chronicle, may have had some special significance, therefore, as a purification rite.

.........................

1 S. Mowinckel, op. cit., 187
The concept of purification by fire is mentioned, as stated above,\(^1\) by Montgomery. His evidence is, however, sparse. A cursory reading of the *Nemar Marqah* has convinced the present writer, however, that Marqah not only knew of the concept, but that it also wielded a considerable influence upon him.

One of the clearest references to the doctrine of purification by fire occurs in *Marqah* IV, 10:

— *For a fire is kindled by my anger* (Dt. 32:22).

Souom and Gomorrah were evil, unclean places; the priest defiled, but the *fire purified* him.

Another reference makes it clear that Marqah believed that death by fire automatically expiated even the most grievous sin, leaving the sinner guiltless and fit to receive recompense on the Day of Judgment:

— *I will heap evils upon them* (Dt. 32:23), in the world. They will be burnt and in the Day of Vengeance they will be justly recompensed.\(^2\)

Marqah enumerates seven instances in the life of Moses where he was 'glorified by fire,' and one of the most frequently recurring attributes of Moses, referred to in Marqah, is that he 'trod the fire' of the burning Bush.\(^3\) The purifying nature of that experience is akin to that of Isaiah, whose mouth was touched with burning coals, the consequence of which was to remove his guilt and pardon his sin.\(^4\)

\(^{1}\) P. 339.


\(^{3}\) *Marqah*, bk. IV, 12; vi. 2, 3, 11 et al.

\(^{4}\) Is. 6:7.
One would indeed have expected that the doctrine of purification by fire would express itself in one form or another in Samaritanism, bearing in mind its established position in the sacred literature of early and late antiquity.

In the Old Testament fire is a familiar image for divine judgment, and in the Apocalyptic literature we find frequent references to the destruction by fire of the whole physical universe, as well as fire being the instrument of judgment upon sinners. In the New Testament the concept is developed of the refining fire which tests Christians, and in post-New Testament apocalyptic we have the imagery of fiery trial, as well as to the eschatological river of fire through which all men pass. Trial by refining fire is similarly well attested in Qumran literature.

The purifying and consecrating properties of the Temples were derived—it was believed by Jews and Samaritans alike—from the fact of heavenly fire having visited them. As regards the first Temple, this is expressly stated in 11 Chr.7:1. The Samaritans taunted the Jews that Ezra-Nehemiah reported no such fire in
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1 Dan.7:10, Is.66:15, Mal.4:1.
2 2 Bar.44:15, 48:39, 59:2, 64:7; Ps.Jol.15:16f. Sib.iii, 54, 689-691.
3 1 Cor.3:13.
4 Sib.ii, 252.
5 1QH.iii, 29; 1QS.11, 8; 1QH.v, 16; 1QM. xvi, 9.
the second Temple. The Samaritan smugness on this score was derived from their own sanctuary on Mount Gerizim having been visited by fire in the days of Joshua. The Fanuma, or hiding of the divine face, was ushered in, according to their belief, by the extinguishing of the fire.¹

The lighting of beacons by the Samaritans on Rosh Haosh and the eve of the New Year may, consequently, have been part of a fire ritual whose origin may lie in pre-Israelite, or at least, early Israelite, religion. It may have begun as a sun-festival ritual and developed as a purification-rite related to the themes of atonement, renewal and purification which are the basic motifs of those occasions. The Rabbis of the Mishnah may have been unaware of this Samaritan practice and its significance; and their charge that the Samaritans were purposely confusing their communities by lighting beacons on the wrong night may have been an unfortunate calumny.

¹ For further discussion on fire in the Temples, see A. Spive, Samaritans, Tobias and Judahites, in Pseudo-Philo, 305-307.
(i) General Considerations.

J. Macdonald, commenting on the distinctive Aramaic of the *Memar Margah*, observes that 'in the first few centuries A.D. Aramaic was certainly the spoken and literary language of the Samaritans, and in this work (so. the *Memar*) of that period there is revealed a form of that language, albeit through late MSS., possessing many interesting forms and loan-words, and many treasures of Aramaic syntax. Knowledge of the Aramaic of Central and Northern Palestine has never been as great as compared with that of Babylonia and Southern Palestine. Now the study of the Aramaic spoken by the large Samaritan population in Palestine can be further advanced.'

This claim may equally be made for the H2 (Aramaic) version of our Uchronicle, which presents us with a feast of idiomatic speech which has clearly differed little from the spoken Aramaic of the early centuries A.D. We will make the claim, below, that the H1 version is either a revision of, or at least inspired by, the H2 original. Traces of the Aramaic substratum are clearly visible in many passages and forms.

If, as we have suggested, H1's Hebrew orientation owes its origin to the medieval renaissance of Hebrew among the Samaritans, it may be assumed that the latter

2 See pp. 290-292.
did not concoct a new and artificial form of that language, but that the Hebrew represented in their works represented an authentic literary tradition which had been preserved by them, possibly in works that did not survive the ravages of time. The Samaritans would then have been parallelizing the Karaité development of Hebrew, the style of which was largely biblical, but also containing freely derived verb forms.

When Samaritan Hebrew was first displaced by Aramaic it became a literary language. We would do well to take note, however, of what has been said regarding the fate of Judaean Hebrew in a similar situation: 'Although it became a written language, Hebrew did not remain petrified, limited to passages quoted in their original form and meaning, but lived an active life in written texts. New topics necessitated an expansion of the language, especially in the coining of new terms for concepts and subjects not found in the Bible' (Encycl. Judaica, 16, 1608).

Because of the loss of the largest proportion of Samaritan MSS. over the centuries as a result of persecution, we are unable to trace this development of the Hebrew language through its various stages. However, the H1 version of our Chronicle, with its
close affinity to the classical style, is certainly of paramount importance for the history of Samaritan linguistics, as representing a purist trend — or even movement — among Samaritan writers, paralleling that movement in Jewish literary history which, from Hayyuj (12th cent.) onward, changed the whole complexion and direction of Hebrew philology and literature.¹

The scope of this study does not allow, however, for a discussion of such wider issues, and we must content ourselves, therefore, with an analysis of the general linguistic characteristics of the two extant versions of Chronicle II — H¹ and H².

The most striking and basic difference between these versions is that H¹ is couched in a distinctive Classical Hebrew style, characterized by the use of Waw Consecutive, biblical phraseology and quotations. Elements of secondary Hebrew also occur, and are easily discernible. H², on the other hand, is an Aramaic orientated Chronicle, although inferior in quality to the Aramaic compositions with which we are familiar from the writings of Amram Darah, Marqah, Nanah and the Defter. Its phraseology is idiomatic, though often disjointed, ungrammatical and complex. This might well have been the result of a long and turbulent literary transmission.

(ii) The Interrelationship of H1 and H2

Notwithstanding the above-mentioned basic differences between the two versions, we incline to the opinion that H1, although a composite work, was compiled under the influence of the H2 version, which probably approximated closely to the official version of Samaritan history current in the medieval period.

H1's purpose seems to have been to present a new version, couched in the Hebrew idiom which reflected the outlook of the school of Hebrew renaissance writers of the previous period. A further purpose would have been to offer a revised version, supplemented with material gleaned from other sources, both oral and written. One of these sources before the H1 redactor probably contained the prayers which Baba is said to have recited on various occasions during his ministry, prayers which appear to have been culled from a version of the Psalter. These compositions do not appear in the H2 version, an omission which the H1 compiler was not prepared to tolerate. As a "Hebraist," he probably felt that the inclusion of these lengthy selections of Psalmody served the additional aim of fostering an appreciation of the finest quality of Hebrew literature.

The H1 compiler also addressed himself to the task of clarifying abstruse renderings in H2,1 adding supplementary detail to H2's references (even to the

1 See on 7:3, 24:13.
2 5:27-29.
extent of providing explanations of the etymology of personal names\textsuperscript{1), correcting its errors,\textsuperscript{2} filling in its lacunae \textsuperscript{3} and heightening its dramatic effect by representing dialogue in direct speech, where H2 has it in a reported form.\textsuperscript{4} The H1 compiler also utilized the opportunity of including oral reports and traditions circulating within the community, but which did not possess the authority of literary substantiation.\textsuperscript{5} H1's disclosure of the practice of Samaritan children to make a bonfire of the wood of their Sukkah booths in commemoration of one of Baba's great victories, is a notable example of H1's particular contribution in this direction.\textsuperscript{6}

The H1 compiler seems to have been strongly influenced by the "Moses-Dosithean" movement, or, alternately, one of his sources might well have emanated from that source. This would explain the very strong Moses motif in that version, clearly setting out to cast Baba in the role of a 'second Moses.' References to Moses are introduced by him at every opportunity. Where, for example, he is about to quote a biblical passage, he frequently introduces it by referring to the Law, 'which He commanded by the hand of the Master of the Prophets, His servant, Moses ben 'Amram, peace be unto him forever.'\textsuperscript{7}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1] See 5:20.
  \item[5] See 8:18.
  \item[7] 12:10.
\end{itemize}
The H2 version is a chronicle in the literal sense of the term. Its author had had no other motive than to record events as they are supposed to have occurred, and traditions as they were handed down. It may thus be described as a secular account, as opposed to the H1 version which set out to present a type of Heilsgeschichte, especially nurtured by the inclusion of Baba's prayers and religious exhortations, which occupy a good deal of space in that version. This higher, spiritual aim comes over forcefully in the H1 chronicle's lavish embellishments of pious sentiments and expressions of divine adoration.¹

In line with this approach is the significant fact that whereas H2 always employs the tetragrammaton, H1, out of religious deference, never uses that sacred formula — even when quoting verbatim from the Bible.²

A difference of approach in the employment of epithets and attributes is also evident in respect of references to Baba Rabbah. H2 is comparatively sparing in its epithets, generally referring to him as, simply, Baba Rabbah. (From §18 to the end of the Baba Rabbah section, however, the single epithet gadilath occasionally occurs.³

As we have observed in our commentary to 18:1 this end section is probably from a different source. The single extra epithet attached to Baba's name should not, therefore, be regarded as refuting the principle of H2's general niggardliness in reverential epithets.)

1 See 9:2,5. 2 See 3:20,21
3 See 18:7; 19:10,13, et al.
H2, on the other hand, always appends an epithet of reverence to the name of Baba Rabbah. The simplest form of reference is Ha-Kohën; the title Ha-Melekh is often added, or Ha-Melekh Ha-Saddiq. H2 never refers to Baba as Ha-Melekh, and rarely as Ha-Saddiq. Again, after the mention of Baba's name, H1 occasionally adds the invocation, 'May the goodwill and forgiveness of God be upon him, Amen'. This is never included in H2, even though this must have been a common formula used by the Samaritans when referring to their revered departed leaders. This supports our contention that H2 is a 'secular' chronicle, whose purpose was merely to record history, without emotion or pious motivation.

Wherever possible, H1 utilizes a biblical quotation or turn of phrase. There is only one example, however, of H2 quoting a biblical verse.

H1 is a more refined version, even toning down expressions which might appear irreverent. To give but one illustration: When referring to the various categories of people who would, or would not, qualify to use the title Kohën and Hakham, H2 states 'the fools (sokhilim) among the priests...'. H1, on the other hand, refines this to, 'Any priest who is neither a sage nor a scholar...'. H1 is also far less

---------------------
1 See 5:1,13,16; 14:9,11. Cf. also "Ha-Kohën Ha-Gadol"(7:6).
2 See 10:23.
3 See 14:1,16:1, 19:5,62.
4 See 19:43.
5 5:14.
6 5:14.
militant than H2 in its descriptions of the pagan enemies of the community. The latter adds derisory and condemnatory remarks, which H1 chose to omit.\(^1\)

H1 is totally independent of any of the Arabic versions. It is clearly not a translation of any such version. Abu'l Fath, followed by other Arabic versions, approximates far more closely to the H2, Aramaic-orientated, version, even to the extent of rendering in reported speech those passages which H1 has converted into direct speech. Similarly, the Arabic versions do not have Baba's prayers.

In an number of instances, where H1 clearly could not make sense of the H2 rendering, it was forced to abandon the attempt and omit the phrase altogether.\(^2\) Had the H1 chronicler had access to an Arabic version, he would have frequently had no difficulty with such phrases, which read smoothly according to the Arabic elucidation.

\textbf{(iii) A Linguistic Survey}

1. \textit{Verbs}

(a) The verbal noun sense is not usually conveyed, as in biblical Hebrew, by an infinitive with prefixed \(\text{\textit{he}}\) or \(\text{\textit{he}}\). We have noted the propensity toward abstract nouns with \(\text{\textit{th}}\) termination.\(^3\) This is extended to an

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1] See 1:6, 1:15, 16:18.
  \item[3] See Word List (III).
\end{itemize}
approach which transforms the simple verbal idea into a more complex verbal noun situation. Thus the phrase, 'in order to take us and our children and our wives into captivity,' becomes, 'for the taking of our children, and the seizure of our wives' —

Verbal nouns, with the power of governing like a verb, are not unknown in the Bible. Witness the form נָֽעַר יַעֲשֹׁת, where the secondary form of an infinitive acquires the value of a noun. Its use in our Chronicle, however, is a distinctive feature.

(b) The simple infinitive is also commonly replaced — even where the ordinary verbal idea is intended — by a second verb in the imperfect tense. Hence the forms: נָֽעַר יַעֲשֹׁת (3:11); נָֽעַר יַעֲשֹׁת (17:4). This also occurs after nouns: 'It is my desire to go' is expressed as נָֽעַר יַעֲשֹׁת (8:26, 19:1); 'It is my desire to sing,' as יָשֹׁת נָֽעַר (13:2); 'It is good for us to be,' as נָֽעַר יַעֲשֹׁת (2:14). Also after participles: 'They are seeking to destroy' is expressed as יָשֹׁת נָֽעַר (1:17). Again, although this is not unknown in B.H., in our Chronicle it is a distinctive feature.

(c) There is a strong tendency to place the main verb as late as possible in a clause — even after the object pronoun it governs. This occurs in both H1 and H2.

1 14:22. See also 9:1, 10:2 et al.
2 See G-K (115a), 354.
4 See first example, below.
An awkward word order is often obtained in situations where the subject of a fairly lengthy clause is inserted at the very end, as in the following example:

Israel, where "the subject of a fairly lengthy clause is inserted at the very end, as in the following example:

The same occurs in situations where adjectives are well separated from the nouns they qualify. Note the position of ha-zökhārīm in the following example:

(a) There are many examples of both abstract and concrete plural nouns, whether they be masculine or feminine, being construed with the feminine singular of the verbal predicate. This construction is also not unknown in B.H.¹

Examples:

(v) There is a particular predilection in H2 for using Hithpa'el forms. Where H1 has, for example, a past participle Qal, נוכות, H2 employs a Hithpa'el participle, שנותנו (see 9:7). Where H1 has a Niph'āl, הנה, H2

-----------
¹ See G-K (145k), 464.
employs a Hithpa'el, רססנ (see 19:31). In 11:14 we have an extreme example of a succession of six Hithpa'el forms, where H1 has a simple Qal form:

H1: רות לעת אזל ריבעופ

H2: קוקבלי התככים ותבגרו ותבתו ותבתו ותבתו ותבתו ותבתו

Another aspect of the Hithpa'el, as employed in our Chronicle, is that, in verbs whose first radical is of the sibilant group, there is no transposition of the raw and the first sibilant, as occurs in B.H. Hence such forms as בְּמַעֲשַׂה (3:12), בְּמַעֲשַׂה (15:2) and בְּמַעֲשַׂה (16:21, 21:8). Furthermore, unlike B.H., which changes the raw to the more emphatic נַשִּׂי, after first-radical נַשִּׂי (as נַשִּׂי, Gn 44:16), our Chronicle makes no such adjustment. Hence the forms בְּמַעֲשַׂה (24:5) and בְּמַעֲשַׂה (15:2).

(f) There are examples in our Chronicle of verbs which, in B.H., do not take a simple accusative, but only a dative, whereas, in our Chronicle, they appear as accusatives in the form of pronominal suffixes. Hence, זָרַע, 'I will sing unto you' (14:9) and זָרַע, 'I will speak of it' (16:9*).

(g) H1 employs a curious circumlocution in order to avoid a passive construction. The sense is converted into active mood by the help of the preposition נַשִּׂי, which, in our Chronicle is used to signify the subject of the sentence.¹ Thus, in 17:6, the context suggests

1. See on 10:4.
quite clearly a passive sense — 'The house was taken out of the possession of the Judeans.' The Chronicier, however, expresses this as והיכנ ינד היה-param הוקינ ad, lit. 'the house went out of the possession...'

Again, in 16:8, to avoid having to say 'I will be the cause of my soul having been cast into great suffering,' the Chronicier creates an active situation by means of the preposition את: אַנִי תֹּאכָל לַעֲבֹד קֶסֶף קֶסֶף, lit. 'I will be the cause for my soul to fall into great suffering.'

2. **Nouns**

(a) We have already noted the propensity for nouns with *uth* terminations to convey an abstract sense. These occur more frequently in H2, though H1 is not unaffected by this usage, as Word List III demonstrates.

(b) There are a few examples of nouns in the construct case taking a definite article; hence the forms

הַיַּלְוָה (10:20*) and הַיַּלְוָה (2:19/20*).

In the first of the above examples it will be observed that, in addition, there is no elision of the key and the prefixed preposition הֶ. This is, in fact, quite common. Thus, הַלֶּכֶר (14:7), הַלֶּכֶר (19:4) and הַלֶּכֶר (19:9).
(c) The Chronicler's sense of style did not preclude him from expressing himself by a succession of nouns in the construct case — (20:18), where B.H. would have rendered: Another example occurs in 15:15.

(d) A number of examples occur of words, ending normally in א in, loosing this final sound. The apocopated pronunciation is reflected in the orthography, as shown in the following forms:

- גֶּב (for גע), 19:61
- רְה (for רה), 20:25
- הָנָ (for הנ), 23:5
- הַנָ (for הנ), 25:2
- מַד (for מד), 4:3

(e) There are a number of examples of nouns which are construed in one passage as masculine and in another as feminine. Thus: אַתַּה נְתַן (19:45), but חָכָם (4:21). Also, nouns construed in different genders from those of the Bible. Thus, for example, חֲרַשָּׁ is construed as feminine (19:28) and חֲרַשָּׁ as feminine (19:8). Regarding such variations in gender, we are advised to note the observation of M.Dahood that 'the frequent concurrence in Ugaritic and Hebrew of the same noun in both masculine and feminine gender cautions the Semitist against .................

1 The occurrence of the phrase נְתַן חֲרַשָּׁ (14:6) suggests that the above forms may not be purely orthographic variants, but independent masculine alternatives.
treat ing a noun as always masculine or always feminine.\(^1\)

There are also frequent variations in the gender of the plural suffix appended to a noun. Thus we find פֶתֶק (2:19) and נֹקֶה (4:10); מָשְׁבִּית (3:21) and נֹקֶה (4:21). The particular termination seems to be arbitrary, and does not convert the noun itself to the gender of the termination.

(f) We have already drawn attention\(^2\) to forms which appear, anomalously, to be plura ls (especially of feminine nouns) but which have singular possessive pronominal suffixes attached, e.g. נַתֵנָה (1:17) and נַתֵנָה (1:15). The long \(\hat{a}\) vowel, in the second syllable of these words, is, we have noted, nothing more than an orthographic variant of the long vowel \(\bar{a}\), both being closely related, in the Samaritan pronunciation, to the sound \(\bar{a}\), which is the sound actually represented in the orthography — not the long \(\hat{a}\) of the plural.


2. See our note on 2:1.
(h) There is an occasional freedom in the gender of adjectives. This is especially the case with numerals, as the following examples will illustrate:

\[ \text{תואונושם (10:2);_ADDRESS1 (10:3);_10:20, 21}. \]

3. Pronouns

(a) Relative Pronouns

Very frequently the relative pronoun יָאָשֵׁר (or Aramaic וְ) is omitted, and the attributive relation is expressed by simple co-ordination.\(^1\) Hence:

\[ \text{כָּל אִישׁ מִשְׁמִיר אֶשֶר רוּ֫עָשׁ (4:19);_16:6}. \]

Conversely, we also have an example of a double relative situation, as in יָאָשֵׁר יְהוּדָּה (5:8). This form may have arisen, however, through textual corruption.

The normal relative pronoun יָאָשֵׁר, when it stands as a relative of time, is frequently replaced by the word זָא. Thus:

\[ \text{כִּי זָא בְּלַיְלָה זָא הָבָל (16:8);_15:12). In both these examples זָא stands for קָאָשֵׁר (when).}\]

\(\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\)

\(^1\) See \text{G-K (155b), 486.}\
Subject pronouns are occasionally omitted when serving as the subject of a participial clause, especially when the subject has once been described, or is obvious. Thus אֶלֶףְנוּ תֻּקֵּדַה (1:20).

The subject pronoun is sometimes inserted after a verb in order to give extra emphasis. Thus: נַחֲלֶה אָלְכָּה (5:9).

The demonstrative pronoun, as it occurs in our Chronicle, exhibits the familiar biblical characteristics, but also some that are unique and can only be explained as a suspension of the syntax, especially governing the feminine demonstrative זֹ·תָם.

Thus, we find acceptable forms, such as כָּנָה יָדָה (18:3), מַעֲשֵׂה לָה (15:9), קַרְיָת הַבָּטֹחָה (18:14), וּמְלֻאָה (1:17), וּמְלֻאָה יְבַלֵּי (1:15), וּמְלֻאָה יְבַלֵּי (1:15)*, וּמְלֻאָה יְבַלֵּי (1:15)*, וּמְלֻאָה יְבַלֵּי (1:15)*, וּמְלֻאָה יְבַלֵּי (1:15)*, וּמְלֻאָה יְבַלֵּי (1:15)*.

Occasionally the definite article is omitted from the demonstrative pronoun where the normal rule of grammar would demand its appearance. Thus נַחֲלֶה יָדָה (18:12).

The demonstrative זֹ·תָם is freely used, without any consideration of its gender or number. Hence the biblically anomalous forms: כָּנָה יָדָה (1:20), מַעֲשֵׂה לָה (21:10).

In one instance, the influence of the demonstrative pronoun זֹ·תָם is so strong that it influences the
person and number of a following prepositional suffix; hence, ... מה אמך תבואך ו_Mouse (3:1*).
The third person sing. suffix of ה, is clearly the result of the influence of the demonstrative sing. זה' th.

Occasionally we have a double demonstrative. Again, the lack of agreement between the two, in number or gender, does not seem to offend. Hence the forms, והנה את הנע長いים (1:20) and הנה את הנעְרִיִּים (19:9).

A most curious example of a double demonstrative occurs in the expression הפשה והנה זה (4:20), with the addition of הָיָה as copula.

The demonstrative זה' th is clearly the favourite of our chronicler, possibly since it was felt to convey a stronger emphasis than זה. The importance of conveying emphasis outweighed even considerations of number and gender. It should be pointed out, however, that although זה' th occurs with masculine nouns, such licence is only extended where the demonstrative precedes the noun, as in זה' th ha-ma'asim (2:9), זה' th ha-aylāh (19:28*).

An interesting demonstrative adverb occurs in the form הה, 'now' (22:23). This seems to be a hebraized form of the Aramaic קִדוֹן.

4. Negatives

(a) Negatives are expressed in the usual manner. A negative sense is also conveyed, however, by
employing the noun הָסָר or הִסְרָן (as constructs) before a verbal noun idea. The literal sense of the construction is then, 'lack of, absence of, desisting from,' as, for example, הָסָר רָכְבָּן (22:15, see our note ad loc.), 'that you should not go away' (lit. the lack of your going).

(b) To express the double negative 'neither...nor,' we have the construction לֹא... לֹא in H1, and לא... לא in H2 (see 3:11).

(c) There is a penchant for placing the negative adverb as early as possible in the sentence, as ולא מתוכך לֹא התובע (11:22*). In this respect, H2 reveals the tendency even more, as a comparison of their respective versions will demonstrate:

(ד:6)*
ולא מתוכך לֹא התובע

(ד:6)

5. Glosses

Attention is drawn in our commentary to the numerous glosses that have been inserted into our Chronicle. While the H1 redactor is particular about making his version as informative as possible by the aid of such glosses, he is not always too sensitive as to whether, or not, his gloss blends syntactically or stylistically into the context. A glaring example
of this occurs in 7:4, where the insertion of
the gloss makes for considerable awkwardness:

The gloss — אֶ֣שֶר ...... רבָּה — here separates
the noun ha-نشاطה from its adjective ha-צֹקִהירִים,
providing the awkward expression Baba' Rabbâh
ha-צֹקִהירִים.

6. Purpose Clauses

In addition to the usual ways of expressing purpose
clauses, our Chronicle frequently employs the particle
'tad as introductory formula. In this respect it has the
same sense as יְּסָנָן, 'in order to.'

(8:6) רִבְבוּתָה ...... כֵּן כֹּן עַד יְלֵדוּ בָּהּ
(11:1*) רֱבָּאָה פְּרֵקֵדֵי הַרְפָּטִים עַל יִלָּדוּ עַּל מַעֲצוֹן

*** *** ***

It should be noted that the above account of the
linguistic features of the Chronicle makes no claim to
being comprehensive. The scope of this study has been
limited to the Baba Rabbah section of Chronicle II.
Any comprehensive treatment of the Chronicle's
linguistic characteristics would, of necessity, have
to consider the entire Chronicle. It is hoped, however,
that our account will serve as a useful introduction
through having highlighted some of the more general
and significant aspects of the Chronicle's linguistic
approach.
9. PROBLEMS OF THE DATING OF THE
HISTORICAL BABA
To ascertain exactly when the great leader Baba Rabbah lived is well-nigh impossible. We are reliant exclusively upon our Chronicles, there being no external references to him in any of the known contemporary or later sources.

The Chronicles - especially Chronicle II - are replete with rather loose points of contact with Roman history, especially in respect of the names of the Roman emperors with whom Baba is supposed to have had dealings. The chronology, however, is confusing, and a number of glaring contradictions must be admitted. A consequence of this is that we have to approach the Samaritan Chronicles judiciously and critically. R. Coggins is certainly accurate in his observation that 'it is certainly not possible to take the Samaritan account of events as straight history'.

Internal Samaritan historical data are also very sketchily presented in the Chronicles; thus we do not even know the age of Baba when he assumed leadership. Montgomery is patently in error when he observes that 'his activity is said to have begun in his 40th year'. No such statement is made in any of the Chronicles. Montgomery has clearly confused the age of Baba Rabbah at his call with the duration of his ministry, which is repeatedly given as 40 years.

..........................

1 Coggins, Samaritans & Jews, p.121.
2 Montgomery, The Samaritans, p.102 n.73.
3 Neubauer, p.404; Adler, p.93; Chr.II, 10:11.
Even the convenient number of 40 years for the duration of Baba's 'reign' is suspicious. Viewed in the context of the Moses-Baba motif — expressed nowhere so clearly as in our Chronicle, which even employs the biblical phraseology of the Call of Moses 1 in order to depict Baba as a Moses-Taheb figure 2 — the number 40 may be seen as a contrived attempt to parallel the duration of the ministry of Moses.

We have noted that, according to the evidence of our Chronicle, Baba's father, Nethan'el, died only a short time before his son, who ended his days in Constantinople. The duration of Nethan'el's reign is given as 32 years. Thus there arises the additional, though related, problem of harmonising a figure of 40 years for the 'reign' of Baba with a concurrent reign of 32 years for his father Nethan'el. Any attempt to allocate independent, successive reigns to these two leaders throws the carefully-wrought genealogical lists of the Chroniclers into total disarray.

In the light of these considerations, as well as of our discussion regarding the respective leadership roles of Baba and his father 3 we can only conclude that the figure of 40 years for Baba's 'reign' is an artificial attribution, paralleling the 40 years of Moses' ministry.

........................

1 See p.296.
3 Chr.II, 25:4,5.
4 See p.411 ff.
The allocation of 40 years of exclusive leadership to Baba would, in fact, presuppose that he was a man of over sixty years of age when he died, assuming that he was a young man in his twenties when he assumed leadership of the community. This would be very difficult to harmonise with the fact that Baba's son, Levi, was clearly only a child when Baba died. This is clear from the oath Baba extracted from his Judaean friend that he would look after Baba's son after his death, that he would 'return him to his relatives and not suffer him to become polluted through uncleanness'. It is highly unlikely that Baba had attained the age of sixty when his son was born. The evidence would rather suggest that Baba was still a young man at the time of his death.

Furthermore, allowing for the authenticity of the figure of 32 years for the exclusive leadership of Baba's father, Nethan'el, who died just before Baba, plus a period of 40 years of exclusive activity for Baba himself, this would force us to postulate a life-span of over 92 years for Nethan'el (20 yrs. when he assumed office, plus 32 years of ministry, plus 40 years of his son Baba). This is extremely unlikely in the light of the general life-expectancy at that period, as is evident from the lengths of reigns of the High Priests. Taking as a sample the ten High Priests who preceded Nethan'el—from Shem'ayāh until 'Aqbon—we arrive at a combined total of 266 yrs., which provides an average of only 26 years per

1 Chr. II, 25:6.
2 Shem'ayāh (10 yrs.), Tobhiyah (8), 'Amram (9), 'Aqbon (30), Phinehas (40), Levi (45), 'Eleazar (32), Baba I (28), 'Eleazar (41), 'Aqbon II (23). The list appears in Neubauer, 402–403.
High Priestly reign, which in turn suggests a life-expectancy of not exceeding fifty years.¹ The identical average is also obtained by taking as a sample the ten High Priests from 'Aqbon, Baba's brother, until 'Eleazar.²

A clue to the approximate age of Nethan'el when he died is, in fact, provided in our Chronicle. His last act was to instruct his son, 'Aqbon, to give his daughter in marriage to the son of Baba Rabbah. This marriage is said to have been arranged 'when he learned that his son, the righteous King Baba Rabbah, was imprisoned in the city of Constantinople'.³ This was clearly a hurried arrangement of a child marriage in order to calm the spirit of the unfortunate prisoner, Baba, by satisfying him that all arrangements had been taken care of for the future of his lineage. We have already noted that Baba's son, the bridegroom, was of tender age, as must have been the bride. Thus, Nethan'el's grandchildren were but youngsters at the time of his (and Baba's) death. He is unlikely, therefore, to have been a man of ninety.

The truth is rather, as we have suggested,⁴ that the numbers given in the Chronicles for the reigns of Baba and Nethan'el cannot indicate independent, consecutive reigns. Baba assumed leadership of the community during the course of his father's ministry, and the 32 years activity attributed to Nethan'el must have overlapped quite considerably the period of Baba's leadership. It is conceivable that the 32 years

¹ The average of 26 years per reign is reduced to 24 yrs. if we follow Chr.II and Scaliger who allocate only 25yrs to Levi.
² See Neubauer, 404-5.
³ Chr.II, 25:1.
⁴ See p.369-371.
comprise Nethan'el's early period as High Priest, before Baba rose into prominence, as well as the final period as caretaker while Baba was incarcerated in Constantinople. Baba's own rule probably covered a period of no more than twenty years, and he was little more than forty when he died.

A period of twenty years for Baba's ministry is in perfect harmony with the Chronicler's tradition that Baba ministered during the reigns of the three Roman emperors, Severus, Gordianus and Philippus. The reigns of these three emperors spanned a period of 22 years (222-248 A.D.). This figure allows for an overlap of the reign of Philippus, who, on the evidence of the Chronicle, outlived Baba by a few years.

A number of conflicting factors have to be considered in an attempt to provide a date for the life of Baba Rabbah. We use as our starting point a specific chronological note incorporated into the Chronicle. Baba Rabbah was such an important historical figure in Samaritan eyes that the date of his "appearance" (niglā'ūth) is given not only in relation to the creation of the world, but also in relation to major events in Samaritan and — suprisingly — Jewish history. These include references to the concealment of the desert sanctuary, the building of Solomon's Temple, the first and second exiles, the rebuilding of the second Temple and the appearance of Jesus.

1 For a discussion of the historicity of this tradition see our discussion below.
2 10:3.
3 10:4.
4 10:5-7.
5 10:8.
6 10:10.
Baba's appearance is stated to have taken place in the year 4600 A.M. The subject of the chronology of Chronicle II has been fully treated by John Macdonald, whose findings need not be duplicated here. Suffice it to observe that the dating of 4600 A.M. for Baba's appearance is also stated to correspond with the year 1050 since the first exile and the year 308 since the "appearance" of Jesus. Assuming the traditional dating of 722 B.C. for the first exile, Baba's appearance would then correspond with the year 328 A.D. This accords with the figure of 308 years since Jesus, since the "appearance" of Jesus was regarded to have taken place in the year 20 A.D.

On the basis of our conclusion above, that the duration of Baba's ministry was no more than 20 years, we may state that, purely on the basis of the internal chronological reckoning of the Chronicle, Baba's ministry would have to be dated circa 308 - 328 A.D., and the term "appearance" should not, therefore, be given too literal an application.

We need hardly take seriously in this context the dating of the chronological list of Samaritan High Priests worked out by Theodore Juynboll. Having placed Baba's father, Nethan'el, in the period 333 - 365 A.D., Juynboll then assumes an independent, succeeding reign for Baba Rabbah; and, lumping Baba together with his son Levi, Juynboll allocates a period of one hundred and nine years to them both! He

1 Chr.II, 10:2; Tolidah, p.404.
3 Macdonald, op.cit., p.221.
consequently dates Baba between 365 and 474 A.D. It need hardly be pointed out that none of the Chronicles lists Baba's son, Levi, as a High Priest. Baba was, of course, succeeded by his brother 'Aqbon. The absurdity of Juynboll's reconstruction is seen clearly by his subsequent dating of Baba's brother, 'Aqbon, whose reign Juynboll supposed to have followed on after that of Levi, namely from 474 to 494 A.D. According to this arrangement, the father Nethan'el, who died in 365 A.D., according to Juynboll, would have been succeeded by his son, 'Aqbon, after an interval of one hundred and nine years!

The unreliability of Juynboll's dating becomes further manifest when we test it against some of the traditions accepted by all the Chronicles. To give but one example: Juynboll dates the reign of 'Aqbon II, grandfather of Baba Rabbah, as 310 - 333 A.D. All the Chronicles record, however, that that 'Aqbon sent a delegation to meet the King Ardashir (Artaxerxes) of Persia in the wake of his successful campaign. Now Ardashir invaded Parthia in April 227 A.D., and spent the next three years consolidating his position in Media. In 230 A.D. he overran Mesopotamia and threatened Syria and Cappadocia. Chronicle II states that the reason for the deputation was that the High Priest 'Aqbon 'feared the king'. This presupposes victories gained by the latter in the region, and may be identified therefore with the Mesopotamian foray.

1 Chr.II, fol.357.
The Chronicles are also in agreement that Baba set himself the task of throwing off the repressive yoke of Alexander Severus. It was indeed against Severus that Ardashir undertook his campaigns, and a Samaritan delegation to the one commander who would be regarded as an ally would have been a logical piece of diplomacy.

If the Samaritan tradition, regarding a peace delegation sent by 'Aqbon to Ardashir, is authentic — and Juynboll does not reject its historicity — then the High Priest 'Aqbon must have lived during the first half of the third century A.D., not, as Juynboll computes, the fourth century. Juynboll is thus a century out in his reconstruction of the High Priestly dating, and this goes a long way toward explaining why he dates Baba Rabbah so late.

Juynboll's chronology is not, however, without some value. It serves as an additional list which may be used critically in any treatment of the length of years for the reigns of the High Priests, though even there only as a support or corroboration for one or another of the main Chronicles. To take but one example: Chronicle Neubauer allocates a reign of 45 years to the High Priest Levi, 'in whose days Hadrian, king of Rome, came'. Chronicle II allocates only 25 years to this Levi. Juynboll's source, the Codex Scaliger, agrees with our Chronicle, and may be viewed therefore as a useful buttress. We shall, indeed, presently avail ourselves further of Juynboll's suggested chronological relationship

1 Chronique Samaritaine, p.403.
between the Samaritan High Priests and the Roman emperors in order to attempt to unravel a serious discrepancy in the historical data contained in our Chronicle.

We suggested above a dating of 308 - 328 A.D. for the ministry of Baba. Assuming that he was a man of 20 years when he assumed leadership — in order to do justice to the traditional '40 years' associated with him — we would therefore conjecture that Baba was born circa 288 A.D. This date will be seen to fit the chronological data of the Chronicles admirably.

According to the Chronicles, 'Aqbon II ministered for 23 years and Nethan'el (Baba's father) for 32 years. If the delegation to Ardashir was sent about the year 230 A.D., near the commencement of 'Aqbon's reign and at the height of Ardashir's activity in the region, then, by adding together the stated years of the reigns of 'Aqbon and Nethan'el (total 55 years) we come remarkably close to the date 288 A.D. which we postulated for the birth of Baba Rabbah!

It is important for us to attempt to harmonise the Garman episode — which Juynboll already recognised as of great chronological value — with a dating of 288 - 328 A.D. for the life of Baba. According to Juynboll's source, the High Priest whose son Garman permitted to be circumcised in defiance of the Roman prohibition was Nethan'el, and the child in question was Baba Rabbah. We would then date the

1 This is also in line with our observation (p. 410) that Baba's support came mainly from the younger generation, who were his own contemporaries.
Garman episode as having occurred in 288 A.D.

References to a Bishop Germanus, who attended the Council of Neo-Caesarea in 314 A.D. and Nicaea in 325 A.D.¹ are indeed in consonance with this dating. However, it should be pointed out that Chronicle II and Chronicle Adler attribute the episode to the circumcision of Baba's nephew. They state that it took place after Baba's death, when his brother 'Aqbon (III) was High Priest. Now, assuming the child was born but a few years after Baba's death, circa 330 A.D., this would have been but five years after Bishop Germanus' attendance at the Council of Nicaea, and therefore closer, in terms of possible external corroboration, than the earlier tradition associating Germanus with the birth of Baba. For we cannot be sure that Germanus had already assumed his high office as early as 288 A.D., our suggested date for the birth of Baba according to the internal evidence of our Chronicle.

The date 288 A.D. for the birth of Baba is also consistent with the stated duration of the reigns of the five High Priests between Hadrian and Baba. These were² Eleazar (reigned 32 years), Baba I (28 yrs.), Eleazar (41 yrs.), 'Aqbon (23 yrs.) and Nethan'el (32 yrs.). Adding the total for their reigns — 156 years — to the year 132 A.D., the Hadrianic rebellion, we arrive at the desired year of 288 A.D.

Our discussion so far has taken the form of an attempt to harmonise the various chronological and historical traditions in order to establish a date for Baba Rabbah at

.........................

2 Neubauer, p.403.
the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth centuries A.D. The evidence we have sifted so far has enabled us to support this thesis without too much difficulty. However, we have to face the fact that our Chronicle also presents us with a number of historical traditions which cannot be harmonised with a Baba Rabbah who reigned at that period.

The most obvious difficulty is presented by the names of the Roman emperors with whom Baba is said to have had dealings. The emperors are named as Alexander, who was succeeded by Gordianus, who was succeeded by Philippus. These are, unmistakably, the emperors Alexander Severus (222 - 235), Antonius (Gordianus) III (238 - 244) and Julius Philippus (244 - 248). These reigns can obviously not be harmonised with a late third and early fourth cent. Baba Rabbah.

Furthermore, Philippus is referred to as 'the king of Constantinople,' and much space is taken up by the Chronicler with an episode describing how Philippus imprisoned Baba in that city until the end of his life. The anachronism is glaring: Philippus, a mid 3rd cent. emperor, could not have been 'king of Constantinople', when that city was not founded until 324-6 A.D., nor dedicated as the new capital of the Eastern Roman Empire until the year 330 A.D., by the emperor Constantine! Conversely, a Baba who lived out his years in Constantinople could not have had dealings with any of the emperors mentioned in the Chronicle, the

1 Chr.II, 22:6.
latest of whom died some eighty years before the inauguration of that city as the capital city of a Roman emperor.

We are therefore forced to the conclusion that the Chronicler, or the redactor of the material, had little historical sense or knowledge of Roman imperial chronology. This is supported by the fact that he attributes to Alexander Severus political activity spanning the administration of both Nethan'el and Baba Rabbah. The comparatively short duration of Severus' reign would have rendered that an impossibility.

In fol.363 (unpubl.) we are told that 'in the days of that High Priest, Nethan'el, there came upon the community of Samaritan Israelites many very great evils which would weary the tongue to recount. This was in the days of the accursed kingdom of Alexander...'

Following after this account, we are told (fol.365) about the birth of Baba Rabbah, and fol.402 discloses that the war between Alexander Severus and the king of Chaldea was the principle reason why the former 'was unable to wage war against the righteous king, Baba Rabbah' (14:1).

According to the Chronicler's reconstruction of history, Alexander Severus would have had to have reigned for a minimum of twenty five to thirty years to have been concurrent with Baba's birth, adolescence and leadership, whereas Severus reigned for a period of no more than thirteen years, from 222 to 235 A.D.

1 Fol.363: \begin{quote}
ością יבשה וברכת הגדול סוף עליה כי עשת בנים בני ישראל המפזר בלאה לא בון רמת להאשה
כי זכרונות כל העם יברח מעולמה אפור (שמגנזרו).
\end{quote}
Our harsh judgment of the Samaritan Chronicler, as devoid of historical sense, is not based purely upon the single case of chronological confusion before us. His ignorance is displayed elsewhere, as, for example, in the account of historical periods which were notable and glorious for the community, but which the Chronicler describes with a remarkable absence of national pride, attributable only to ignorance of the true historical circumstances.

We may refer, for example, to the Byzantine period, which, in Abu'l Fath's description, is represented as one of unmitigated despair and impotence as regards Samaritan national aspirations. The picture that is painted is one of a lowly, harassed, restricted and weak community, subjected to the whims of foreign rulers and devoid of independent spirit. The emphasis is exclusively upon the persecutions and restrictions imposed upon the wretched community, in sharp contrast to the preceding glorious era inaugurated by Baba Rabbah.

From the Chronicler's account one would never have believed that that same community, during the period described — a single century, from the end of the 5th to the end of the 6th cent. A.D. — initiated and sustained three large scale rebellions against the Byzantine authority, with no small measure of success, or that they possessed the numerical and physical strength, as well as the military acumen and organisation, to offer Chosroes II fifty thousand troops for his campaign in Palestine, on the evidence of Malalas.

It is, indeed, surprising that a historian of Abu'l Fath's ability should have been unable to draw upon traditions and historical reminiscences, albeit of a legendary character, which would have enabled him to have painted a brighter picture of Samaritan achievement during that period of great activity and vigorous struggle. The only explanation is that, during the seven centuries of decline which separated Abu'l Fath from that last great period of Samaritan self-assertion, most of the historical records must have been destroyed or lost, and that the historian, with the paucity of records at his disposal, had been unable to piece together the positive aspects of the Byzantine period.

We do not have to search far in our Chronicles for other examples of confused chronology of the kind we have uncovered in the account of the Baba Rabbah period, particularly in the attempt to delineate Samaritan history against the backdrop of Roman imperial history and chronology. Tolidah, for example, devotes a mere two lines to a period of over one hundred and fifty years. Of the period 474 - 622 A.D., it has the following to say:

'In the twelfth year of that Nethan'el, Zenon, king of Rome, plundered Mount Gerizim and built a tower on it. He dwelt there and died there, and they buried him on the top of the holy hill. Peace be upon him.'

'Abu'l Fath adds the comment: 'And he was the last of the Roman kings to enter this land'. The Tolidah itself,

1 See, in this connection, D.Sidersky, "Note Sur la Chronologie Samaritaine", in Journal asiatique, 10, 513-32.
however, contradicts Abu'l Fath's statement in its reference to the travels of the emperor Heraclius – or 'Arq'lay, as he is called – through Palestine. Heraclius was, undoubtedly, 'the last Roman king' to enter Palestine, before the Arab expulsion of the Byzantines from that land.

In this example of Samaritan chronological confusion, two characteristic shortcomings may be discerned: the first, a confusion between the names and identities of the particular Roman emperor concerned, and, secondly, a contraction of (150 years of) history into a few lines, in the face of a paucity of source material. We suggest that a solution to our central problem of the dating of the historical Baba Rabbah may be discovered by taking account of these characteristic approaches of the Chroniclers to their material, as revealed in the examples we have quoted.

Our Chronicler's limited historical knowledge of Roman history enabled him, with impunity, to set the final episode of Baba's life against the 'background of Constantinople, and to make the emperor Philippus one of the dramatis personae, although that emperor died some eighty years before the inauguration of that city.

The Constantinople motif may have served a polemical purpose, either of camouflaging the true circumstances of the end of Baba's life or to enhance the 'Moses-Taheb' motif which is strongly in evidence in Chronicle II. ¹

The visit of Baba to Constantinople is one of the most mystifying episodes of the whole saga. No plausible reason

¹ See pp. 295-300.
is given as to why Baba should have brushed aside the
attempts of his father and all the leaders of his
community to dissuade him from undertaking such a
dangerous mission. The Samaritans were strong and
victorious at that juncture, and there was no military
or political crisis confronting them that they had not
hitherto experienced, such as would necessitate a
personal meeting between Baba and the emperor to resolve.
Quite the contrary; the Chronicler preserves a tradition
that when the royal summons arrived, Baba addressed
the envoys in the most confident and courageous of terms:

'I am well able to wage war against the
king of Constantinople for the whole of
my life. Also, my Samaritan Israelite
people are innumerable and the men of
the army are stout-hearted'. 1

It is perplexing, therefore, how to explain Baba's
determination to go to Constantinople, especially as
it is clear that he did suspect that a trap was being
set for his life. 2

Another mystifying aspect of the episode is the fact
that Baba steadfastly refused the request of the
Samaritan leaders that he take with him an entourage
'so that they may know your glory, and honour your
high status'. The stated motive of the Romans in
extending the 'invitation' to Baba had been precisely

1 22:9,10.
2 22:23.
that they 'might see Baba's glory'. The natural and expected response to this should, consequently, have been for Baba to have been accompanied by bodyguards and splendid entourage. Baba's justification for going alone sounds in no way convincing.

These cumulative problems, both internal as well as chronological, point in a direction which would call into serious doubt the accuracy and credibility of the whole Constantinople episode. The options are either that it merely serves as remplissage, to round off the life of Baba Rabbah in the absence of any well-attested historical traditions regarding his last days, or there may have been a polemical motive underlying the legend. If the great and glorious hero of the Samaritan community had met with an inglorious end on the field of battle, this fact would hardly have been admitted by a partisan and biased Chronicler, seeking to inspire his comrades by depicting their history in the brightest of colours.

Assuming the Chronicler belonged to that school of theological thought which sought to identify Baba as a Moses-"Maheb personality, a divinely-sent deliverer, his motive in writing—in a 'Constantinople period'—in preference to admitting that the great man had ultimately led his people to defeat at the hands of the Romans—would be understandable, and, possibly, even excusable.

1 22:8.
Similarly, someone writing from such a theological perspective as that of our Chronicler — who frequently employs a Moses/Baba association through the employment of Exodus terminology culled from the call of Moses — would find points in common between Moses, 'whose burial place no man knoweth' and Baba, who also left his brethren to live out his last days estranged from the community he had led and loved. We therefore relegate the Constantinople episode to the realm of legend, a legend whose creator was unwilling, and probably unable, to harmonise it with his other sources which place Baba as contemporaneous with three emperors of the mid-third century A.D.

Although we dismiss the historicity of our Chronicler's tradition, or legend, regarding the imprisonment of Baba Habbah in the city of Constantinople, it is, however, apposite to observe that the tradition, associating that city with the imprisonment of foreign kings, does, in fact, rest upon a firm historical basis. It was, indeed, in that way that the city's population grew, rapidly and dramatically, to overtake that of Rome itself. Gibbon tells us that 'many opulent senators of Rome and the Eastern provinces were invited by Constantine to adopt for their country the fortunate spot which he had chosen for his residence. The invitations of a master are scarcely to be distinguished from commands; and the liberality of the emperor obtained a ready and cheerful obedience. He bestowed on his favourites

1 Dt.34:6.
the palaces which he had built in the several quarters of the city, assigned them lands and pensions for the support of their dignity. This piece of historical information was probably known to our Chronicler, and on the basis of it, the tradition of Baba's "invitation" to Constantinople, and subsequent incarceration there, was created.

The chronological problem we have attempted above to unravel, regarding our Chronicler's anachronistic reference to the existence of the city of Constantinople as early as the period of the emperor Philippus, may also be accounted for on the assumption that he was, similarly, misled by a tradition that had gained widespread credence, identifying Philippus as the first Christian emperor of Rome. This tradition is recorded by Eusebius, and probably owes its origin to the fact that Philippus had displayed great friendship to Christians, that he had corresponded with Origen and had permitted the Pope Fabianus to convey the ashes of his predecessor from Sardinia to Rome. This tradition may well have been responsible for the confusion in the mind of our Chronicler, who, having correctly associated Constantinople with the first Christian emperor, lumped both traditions together, and consequently Philippus with that city.

Having accounted for, and removed, the difficulty of the apparent conflict between a Baba who lived in the reign

1 Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, II, 154-5.
2 Eusebius, H.E., VI, 34.
of Julius Philippus (244-248 A.D.) and the same Baba
who is supposed to have lived in the Constantine era, we
have succeeded in narrowing down somewhat the chronological
discrepancy. We are still left, however, with the difficulty
of conflicting internal traditions, one of which describes
a Baba Rabbah who ministered between 308 and 328 A.D.
( according to our reading of the literary evidence) or
4600 A.M.( the stated date for the "appearance" of Baba),
and another tradition which places him in the reigns of
Severus, Gordianus and Philippus. Having already demonstrated
the general historical incompetence of our Chronicler,
we are in a position to explain the genesis of the
obvious chronological confusion in which he was groping.

There is a general uniformity in the Chronicles regarding
the chronological order of Samaritan High Priests in
the pre-Baba period. Confusion invariably sets in — as
we have already encountered it — where an attempt is
made to relate those reigns to those of the Roman emperors.
Thus, the High Priest 'Aqbon I is described as having
ministered during the reign of the emperor Hadrian
( דניאלאכ). 'Aqbon ministered for 30 years, and was
succeeded by the High Priest Phinehas, who ministered for
40 years. Phinehas was succeeded by Levi, who is said
to have ministered during the reign of (another?) Hadrian
( דניאלאכ) 'who besieged Jerusalem'. 1 This Hadrian is
said to have been a contemporary of Judah Ha-Nasi ( end

1 Fol 345.
of 2nd and beginning of 3rd. cent.). This is perhaps the most blatant example of the Samaritan Chroniclers' inability to place their native sources into a general historical sitz im leben.

It is inevitable that any Samaritan attempt to work forward, using either of the two Hadrians as a 'fix' for determining the interrelationship of Roman imperial chronology and Samaritan High Priestly lineage, is bound to prove abortive in the face of such confusion.

Some path through the confusion is possible, we believe, when we discover that a High Priest, referred to in some sources by the name of Baba² and in others by the name of Tobhiah,³ ministered some sixty years after the second (Samaritan) Hadrian, contemporary of Judah Ha-Nasi. The chronology is set forth in the Chronicles as follows:

'Aqbon (reigned 30 yrs.) contemporary of Hadrian I

Phinehas (reigned 40 yrs.) contemporary of Antoninus

Levi (reigned 25 yrs.) contemporary of Hadrian II

and Judah Ha-Nasi

Eleazar (reigned 32 yrs.)

Baba/Tobhiah (reigned 28 yrs.)

Now, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that our Chronicler's lack of historical acumen was further

............................

¹ Adler, "Une nouvelle Chronique Samaritaine", R.E.J. 45, p.84: "בריתם חיה הם שעשה להם עבר את רימצתם" עניין מובא בווג מחברת הרניק עם המשנה רימצת

² Tolidah and Shalsheleth.

³ Abu'l Fath and Neubauer. Chr. II employs both names.
aggravated by this perplexing tradition that Baba lived at a much earlier period than generally regarded. The Baba/Tobiah uncertainty made it difficult to state categorically that he was a totally different leader, bearing the same name; and our Chronicler may well have regarded that reference as identical with the great Daba. He may consequently have felt impelled to do justice to both traditions by attempting a synthesis of the conditions attending the two periods and by setting side by side a chronological tradition giving the date 4600 A.M. for Baba with an historical tradition placing him in a much earlier context.

A glance at the chronological table above provides the clue to the Chronicler's modus operandi. If the High Priest Levi was indeed a Contemporary of Judah Ha-Nasi — and bearing in mind that the chronology for Judah, which places him some 60 years after Hadrian, is accurate — then Baba I would have commenced his ministry some 32 yrs. (for the reign of Eleazar) later, plus a few years for the end of Levi's reign. This brings us squarely into the period of Alexander Severus (222-235 A.D.), and Baba's ministry of 28 yrs. would consequently span the reigns of his successors, Gordianus and Philippus!

We have referred, in another chapter,1 to the composite nature of our Chronicle, as witnessed by the marked differences in the style of the Hebrew/Aramaic, differences in titles employed to describe Baba Rabbah, differences

\[ \text{See pp. 349-363.} \]
in emphasis, depicting Baba either as a warrior or as a reformer, and so on.

Assuming that our Chronicle achieved its present form as a result of a combination of two main sources and possibly also some secondary traditions, we would then have the overall clue to the problems with which our Chronicler was struggling. Any redactor would have had difficulties in constructing a Samaritan "history" from such a disparate body of material, embellished with polemic, legend and suspect historical epic. A Chronicler — such as that of Chronicle II — with little or no historical flair would have found the task insuperable.

If the thesis that we have argued is valid, then we have succeeded in accounting for the various chronological discrepancies which loom very large in the pages of our Chronicles. The kernel of the discrepancies we have attributed to the Chronicler's attempted rationalisation and synthesis of two historical periods in which the name Baba occurs. The Constantinople tradition, which would further postdate Baba's activity, we have rejected as unhistorical, while attributing its origin to a specific area of Samaritan polemic or, possibly, to the influence of a popular Roman tradition identifying Philippus as the first Christian emperor. Any 40 year period for Baba's activity as an independent leader we have shown to be in total conflict with all the data.
provided by, or implied in, the Chronicles. On the basis of internal evidence we have regarded the figure of 40 years as referring rather to the total number of years that Baba actually lived. For his life we have suggested the dates 288 - 328 A.D., his independent reign covering the last 20 years of that period.
10. BABA RABBAN — NAME OR ACOLADE?
Babarabba — Name or accolade?

The name Babā (Bābarabba') is extremely rare, even in Judaistic circles. Josephus refers to a prominent Jewish family, known as "Sons of Babā", who resisted the surrender of Jerusalem in the time of Herod (Ant. XV 7, 10). There is only one scholar in the whole of the Talmud — one Babā' ben Sayāf (B. Batra 3b) — who bore that name.

In the Palestinian Talmud the name Bā' occurs as a regular variation of 'abbā', and several scholars bear that name. Babā, being a reduplication of the name Bā', may therefore be construed as the equivalent of 'abbā', "father". (Cf. Per. 44a, Ramb. Baba, "father").

The term 'abbā' was used commonly in Judaistic circles as a title for distinguished persons. We have Abba Mari, Abba Saul, Abba Yudan, etc. In the same spirit, the term 'father' became a title of reverence in Christianity. It is not inconceivable then that Bābarabba is merely a Samaritan variation of 'abbā', employed as an honorific title for the great national hero.

The term Bābarabba Rabbāh in this context would then be closely reminiscent of the title 'abbā' Rabbāh, "Grandfather" (Targ. 11 Sth. VII, 10; Tal. Yeb. 21 b), though in the Samaritan usage its sense would be much wider, and understood as "Great Father".

While such a connotation can be read into the name Bābarabba Rabbāh, yet the occurrence of the simple name Bābarabba in our

.........

1 H. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, p. 120.
Chronicle, without any qualifying epithet, would militate against regarding it as an honorific title, such as "The Great Gate", as suggested by Montgomery. Indeed, the Chronicle makes it clear that Nebuval called his son by the single name Bābā (1:2). The epithet Rabbāh seems to have been an accolade, added later as a token of distinction, as will be demonstrated presently.

It is more plausible then that Bābā was not a title, but a proper name. It was apparently a Semitic term of endearment, occurring in Phoenician, Akkadian (bab), Arabic (habba), Ugaritic (bh, P.R.U.117), Hebrew (bahāy, Ezr.2:11), Aramaic (abûs, Dura 64) and Pal.Aram. (ba'â', bahay).

As firstborn son, it would be understandable for Nebuval to call him by a name suggestive of special endearment.

The word Rabbāh is certainly not a proper name. There are no other examples of doublé names featuring in the list of Samaritan High Priests of those days, neither is there an occurrence of the simple name Rabbāh in any of the lists extant, even though this was a common name in rabbinic literature.

The evidence is thus in favour of regarding it as a title or accolade. The designation "hā-rabbān" was applied to some distinguished leaders; it is a title borne by two authors whose works appear in the Deuter, Jacob hā-rabbān (d.1348) and Joseph ha-rabban of the same period. The source and significance of the title rabbān is unclear, but it seems to be associated with Damascus. The definite

1 Cf. 1:2,4,6,8,10,13; 2:1.
2 The Samaritans, p.102 note 73.
4 Gowley, 11 p.xxvi.
article and ḫin-termination would suggest that its connotation is not one of unparalleled distinction, but rather is it a professional attribution, suggestive of special scholarship and religious expertise. Rabbāh, on the other hand, is an epithet with a wider and more generalized connotation, suggestive of a greatness which transcends the ages.

The name Baba Rabbāh occurs uniformly in our Chronicle. A variation of the title Rabbāh, as found in the Tolidah in the form ḫaggādōl, and the application of this latter attribute to only one other Samaritan leader — ḫiqhūn — suggests that the terms Rabbāh and ḫaggādōl are synonymous, and that they have some special honorific nuance which will only become apparent on comparing the historical Sitz im Leben of both these leaders, decorated with the same title.

In the medieval Samaritan Aramaic, the terms Rabbāh and ḫaggādōl are synonymous designations. This may be demonstrated by the juxtaposition of these terms in the Tolidah:

Although the titles Rabbāh (pl. ᵐᵃʳʳᵃʸᵃḥ) and ḫaggādōl, when applied to high priests and used together with the noun ḥakkōhēn, have no other significance than to designate their high office², yet, when used independently, as an

---

1 Ed. Neubauer, Chronique Samaritaine, p. 403; Ed. Bowman, Transcript (Univ. of Leeds, undated), col. 163v, 1.3.
2 Viz. as a professional rank. Cf. נִירָיוֹ (p. 398), נִירָיוֹ (p. 412), נִירָיוֹ (p. 401) etc.
appendage to a proper name, they can only be construed as complimentary epithets denoting distinction and greatness.

The Tolidah certainly construed the appellation "Rabbah" as an honorific designation, as is shown by the fact that it uniformly refers to Baba as Baba Haggadôl, a designation never rendered in this way in our Chronicle. Any suggestion that the Tolidah form might be elliptical for "Baba [Hakkôhen] Haggadôl" — a form in which other High Priests' names are recorded — is untenable, since the addition of a High Priestly title would be superfluous and out of place in the Tolidah context of a list consisting only of High Priests, wherein no others are referred to by their titles.

It is clear then, that we are not dealing with a mere ellipsis, but rather that the designation Rabbah or Haggadôl is titular in intent.

The Samaritans had a problem when it came to finding a suitable designation for Baba. They could not call him by the usual title of leadership, "Kohen Haggadôl", since Baba was not a High Priest. We may here point out a very common error found in the works of most writers on this period, that of referring to Baba Rabbah as a Samaritan High Priest. Baba is nowhere referred to as a High Priest, nor, on the evidence of our Chronicle could he have been, since his father Netan'el, the High Priest, died only after Baba had completed his lifetime's activity and had already been incarcerated in Constantinople ( 25: 1,4 ).

1 Cf. Tol. p.411: יְסֹה וּבְנֵי אֶשְּרִים חָיָה זֹה הָאֶזְרִיאל. Similarly untenable, for the same reasons, is the suggestion that Baba Rabbah might be elliptical for יַבָּה (Tol. Ed. Bowman, Ms. T. Unpubl) col. 14 a.

A number of alternative titles are found in the Chronicle. These include the following combinations:

- דוד קדוש (9:5,8) דוד קדוש (17:2)
- דוד אבשלום (10:22) דוד אבשלום (11:14)
- בניו של משלחת (16:32) בניו של משלחת (17:1)
- בניו של משלחת (22:3)' בניו של משלחת (10:23)
- בניו של משלחת (25:5,11)

The sense of the term מלך must be understood through Samaritan eyes. It did not imply 'royalty', in the dynastic sense, that it did for the Jews. The Samaritans refer to the Judges of the biblical period as 'Kings'. Thus, the term מלך for a Samaritan meant no more than 'leader', 'chief' or 'commander'. In similar vein, the Chronicle consistently speaks of 'the Roman kings' when it means no more than district governors.

Elsewhere we refer to the recurring motif in our Chronicle, depicting Baba as a 'Moses-figure', with the implied suggestion that he is the (or 'a') leader or prophet like Moses, foretold in Dt.18:15,18. Now the term "Rabbâh" is used frequently in the Hemar Marqah to describe the Prophet Moses. He is referred to as סָלַק - 'The Supreme Prophet'.

Our Chronicle refers to him as יְבִלָּה (22:26). The ascription to Baba of the titles יְבִלָּה and תֹלְדָּה (Tolidah) would be in keeping, therefore, with the Moses motif as it is represented by our Chronicler.

The epithet Rabbâh was current in Judaistic circles, from where the Samaritans might have borrowed it. The Jews had their own problem of finding suitable titles for their leaders. They employed the title "Rabbi" (in Babylon a

1 These combinations, other than the title יְבִלָּה, are restricted to H1. H2 consistently refers to Baba simply by the appellation Baba Rabbâh.
variation, Rabb or Rabb was employed); and when the scholar was elevated to the position of Nasi – president of the Palestinian colleges – they employed a variation of the title Rabb, in the form of Rabbah ("Our teacher"), although the suffix eventually came to be seen as meaningless, and was dropped.

The term (Baba) Rabbah is employed occasionally in rabbinic literature as a designation of a senior teacher or specialist teacher – הראב יזאמל "A thing like this requires a specialist" ¹. Similarly, where two scholars share the same name, the epithet Rabbah is appended to the name of the senior (e.g., יב, ירavar יב, יבר יב).

It is in this sense that we may understand the title Baba Rabbah, namely "The Master Baba", with the overtone of seniority and supremacy over all other leaders. It is indeed in this sense that the epithet Rabbah is applied to Moses in the Nomer Margah: מזמר גב יב בא נה (p.153).

* * *

We mentioned above that the accolade "Great" is accorded to one other leader, in addition to Baba: the High Priest 'Aqbon. It is apposite, therefore, that we should glance at the situation which gave rise to the award of the title מרגadol to 'Aqbon, as this might well shed light upon the specific qualification for such an award, and will be helpful in determining the specific contribution

¹ Baba Meṣṭa' 101a.
or aspect of Baba's activity which was regarded as his most abiding and significant achievement, and for which the title Rabbah was chiefly awarded. Before proceeding to draw any conclusions from such a comparison, we have first to unravel a chronological discrepancy regarding the identity of the particular 'Aqbon who was the recipient of the title Haggadol.

It will clarify the discussion if we commence by listing the chain of High Priests from Baba to Netan'el the fifth:

- Baba Rabbah
- 'Aqbon iii
- Netan'el iv
- 'Aqbon iv
- Eleazar, father of Miriam
- 'Aqbon v, builder of the Kinsha
- Eleazar vi
- 'Aqbon Haggadol (vi)
- Eleazar vii
- Netan'el v

Our discussion focusses upon the attribute haggadol conferred by Tolidah¹ and Abu'l Fath (who calls him 'Aqbon vi).

Abu'l Fath acknowledges² that one of his principle sources was a work called 'Aqbon vi. Whatever version of Tolidah was before him—and Bowman, referring to his Ms.T., appears convinced that "part of (his) actual Ms. was undoubtedly in the hands of Abu'l Fath"³—we may assume that the latter had no other literary or oral

***************

¹ Eds. Neubauer p.405; Bowman p.18.
³ Loc.cit.p.i.
tradition regarding the award of a title to 'Aqbon vi, but merely copied the name 'Aqbon Haggadol directly from the Tolidah ms. or msn. before him. This method of Abu'l Fath, with regard to other sources, has already been clearly demonstrated by Gaster, who observes that "it will be found that Abu'l Fath copies out verbatim the work of his predecessors". J. Macdonald notes that Tolidah was one of the sources of which Abu'l Fath made critical use. On the point under consideration, however, he will be seen to have departed from his critical approach!

Our certainty on this particular issue is based on the fact that Abu'l Fath has nothing at all to report regarding the details of the life of this 'Aqbon, who, nevertheless, was sufficiently celebrated in his eyes to be awarded the honorific title Haggadol. It is beyond doubt, therefore, that Abu'l Fath was slavishly following the Tolidah's chronological list, and hence his enigmatic attribution of the title Haggadol to 'Aqbon vi, notwithstanding the fact that he had not even one snippet of information which would justify the accolade to that particular High Priest.

The historical accuracy of the attribution of the title to 'Aqbon vi comes under suspicion, however, when we consult Chronicle V, the "Shilshelat" or "Chain of the High Priests". In that work he is listed

1 Gaster, Studies and Texts (London, 1925-8) vol. iii p. 405.
2 Macdonald, Theology, p. 47.
3 Published by Gaster in Studies and Texts, vol. iii, p. 134.
It is clear from this passage that it was not 'Aqbon vi, but 'Aqbon v, the builder of the Kinsha, who was decorated with a title reserved hitherto for none other than the illustrious Baba. The title 'Aqbon Haggadôl was clearly bestowed in recognition for devoted services and courageous leadership, especially in resisting the bitter opposition to his scheme for the rebuilding of the Kinsha.

Samaritan tradition has carefully preserved full details of the activities of this 'Aqbon v and his heroism. Of 'Aqbon vi, however, H1 has only one terse observation to make:

Chronicle II is thus the only source to preserve the authentic version, attributing the accolade Haggadôl to 'Aqbon v, builder of the Kinsha. This is obviously
of the greatest significance in assessing the reliability and independence of our Chronicle in relation to the other main sources for Samaritan history.

We are now in a position to assess the import of the designations Rabbah and Haggadôl. It was a type of canonization, awarded to the two men who did most to fire the imagination of the Samaritan community, to raise their faded hopes, to restore their national pride and to arouse them from spiritual lethargy.

The deeds of Baba Rabbah we have no need to recount here. The esteem felt for 'Aqbôn, builder of the Kinsha, comes over forcefully in the (unpublished) Chronicle II account of his life. The Elders, whom he summoned to disclose his plan to build a large Kinsha, describe him as nêšî 'Elōhim — "A prince of God in our midst" (fol.507) — a phrase used to describe Abraham. They swear allegiance to him with the formula used by Israel at the Sinaitic Revelation: כל דבר.savak אלהינו והנה נגש - "whatsoever you say to us, we will hear and obey" (Ex.24:7). 'Aqbôn succeeded in galvanizing the people into a task force to undertake the building - "the men by day and the women by night". His unique saintliness enabled him to pinpoint, by miraculous means, the exact location of the doors of the Jerusalem Temple which had remained hidden from human sight since Hadrian had carried them away (fol.510). 'Aqbôn's diplomacy and spiritual charisma is fully revealed in the competent manner with which he conducts his dealings with King 'Siptwe, ultimately converting him into an ardent sympathiser.
The parallels between Bube and 'Aqbon are unmistakable, and, historicity apart, the Chronicler certainly wrote about these two leaders in a style which would place them in a similar category, enjoying equal eminence and distinction. As administrators, diplomats, spiritual innovators and builders of Synagogues, their reigns constituted high water-marks in Samaritan fortunes, the like of which they were never again to know. The appellation "The Great" — Rabba and Hazoidol — was meant to express something of the unique regard in which those two leaders were held in Samaritan history and tradition.
11. THE ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS OF

BABA RABBAN
THE ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS OF BABA RABBAH

The account of the reorganization of the religious life of the Samaritan community by Baba Rabbah is contained in sections 4 and 5 of our Chronicle. Unfortunately, the account abounds with textual problems, caused, probably, by the composite nature of its transmission. We have, in addition, variations in the titles of officials between the texts of H1 and H2, as well as information in one version which is missing from the other. Nevertheless, by application of the critical process, we believe that we are able to reconstruct the essential details of Baba's reorganization of the Samaritan hierarchy.

According to the evidence of our Chronicles, the main burden of Baba's reform was directed toward a wholesale revision of the hierarchical structure of the community. The situation confronting Baba in his day was of an almost total breakdown of communal discipline, organization and leadership, especially in the area of religious expression. This situation is blamed upon the turbulent political circumstances of their recent history, especially the repressive measures imposed upon the community by the Roman conquerors. The latter had especially singled out the sages of the community for punishment, according to the Chronicles, because of their refusal to apostatize (4: 11). There is, indeed, some external evidence to support this; for a passage in the Palestinian Talmud condemns the Samaritans for succumbing to the pressure upon them to participate in idolatrous sacrifice. Toward the

1 Chron.11, fol.364 (unpubl.), see below p.412.
2 'Abdāh Zārāh, 5,4.
end of the 3rd century A.D., the talmudic sages prohibited the wine of the Samaritans on grounds of suspicion that the latter made libations of wine to the image of a dove.

The Samaritans were not as fortunate as the Jews, in the respect that the latter were able to resist many of the decrees against their religion on account of their numerical strength and the support they were able to muster from a flourishing diaspora in Babylon, Egypt, and even in Rome itself. While there are numerous indications that the Samaritans were spread wide across the Mediterranean basin and beyond, into Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, yet 'the Samaritan diaspora was never able to develop in the same way as the Jewish diaspora'¹. Thus feelings of isolation took root, especially during periods of intensified persecution.

The Chronicles report a catalogue of disasters which befell the Samaritan community during the previous century. The most poignant of these was between the years 193-211 A.D., when war raged between the followers of Septimius Severus and Pescennius Niger. The Jews supported the former; the Samaritans, together with the Syrians, allied themselves with the latter. After the victory of Severus, the Samaritans were cruelly victimized, heavy taxes were imposed upon them, Neapolis was deprived of the _jus Italicum_ awarded to it under the Flavian family,² and many Samaritan leaders were exiled or executed, as the responsibility for the alliance with Niger was placed at their feet.³

2 De Saulcy, _Chrêst. Arabe_, 1, 244 ff.
3 Ben Zevi, _Séfer Ha-Somronîn_, 22.
This was the legacy of persecution and communal disorientation inherited by Baba Rabbah; and this explains why, when he sought out men of scholarship as a prelude to his efforts at reorganization, he was able to muster so few.

There did exist, however, some hierarchic structure even before Baba's reform. An upper class is referred to, either as nō dibbē haqqāhāl or mō 'aynē hā'ōdāh (4:1,9). These were probably men of substance, of localized prestige, or heads of influential families. These had in no way attempted to usurp the spiritual or priestly function, or even to exert any spiritual or national leadership, in consequence of which they were fully prepared to give Baba free rein (4:3,8). Baba made sure that they accompanied him on his mission around the community, re-opening the Synagogues (4:9). Baba probably felt that the presence of these people would help to dispel the inevitable awe and fear that would grip the ordinary Samaritan at the act of defiance against Rome involved in re-opening Synagogues closed by decree of the conquerors.

The second manifestation of a hierarchic structure was that of the Mispakhath Hašibhim. While their rival administration and social exclusivism did not meet with Baba's approval once he had the dynamic of the Samaritan community working along an even keel, yet it is clear that the exigencies of the age -- the lack of leadership, decline in observance and low morale which obtained up until the time of Baba Rabbah -- had dictated such a policy and justified the breakaway movement.

1 See chap.12.
Baba's first task, before initiating his reforms, was to receive the unanimous assurance of his community that it was prepared to abide by his decisions on all matters. The significant factor in attracting their wholehearted allegiance was clearly the force and charisma of Baba's personality. He did not possess the dignity and awe that comes with age, nor the power and influence inherited through office. It was, after all, his father, Netan'el, who occupied the office of High Priest throughout the lifetime of Baba. Yet, Baba's leadership was given practical expression while he was still in early manhood; and it gained momentum solely as a result of the unique qualities of the man himself. His charismatic appeal is hinted at in the Chronicle, where we are told that Baba, 'from his youth was endowed with the holy spirit' (1:4).

It is not surprising, therefore, that Baba already had a significant following even before he decided to make his bid for leadership of the community, to reform its administration and to lead an armed resistance against the conqueror. Apart from the logical consideration that no man would be foolhardy enough to undertake widespread measures involving social, political and religious reform, if not revolution,—so conspicuous in nature that it could not but draw the unwelcome attention of the Romans—unless he inspired implicit faith and trust in the majority of the people, there is also an implicit reference, in the Chronicle, which suggests

....................

1 See p.372.
the chief direction from which Baba drew his encouragement, influence, strength and resources. Baba's first-recorded act was to assemble the 'sons of his generation' — benê dârê — who were obedient to his voice' (1:10, 14, 19). The 'sons of his generation' points to people of Baba's own age, who grew up in his circle. H2 refers to them in one passage (1:14) as benê 'amîthê, a term suggestive of familiars, intimates and associates.¹

The picture to emerge, therefore, is of a popular rebellion, inspired by the youth of the community, especially the clique that had gathered around Baba Rabbah, fired by his idealism and nationalism, and sharing his contempt for the apathy and lethargy of their leaders, from the High Priest, Nethan'el downwards.

Support for this theory is forthcoming from 3:1, where a distinction is drawn — among the people assembled to listen to Baba — between the me'ayanê 'adath benê visrâ'êl and the benê dârê. In 4:1, the former are referred to as nê'dîbhê qâhalê, an indication that they were the traditional leadership, as constituted by the elderly, the heads of well-known families and men of influence in their localities. The benê dârê could only mean, in this context, the people of Baba's own age and clique, thereby supporting the theory of a youthful rebellion. From the Judaist social and political history we have a precedent for such a situation in the biblical story of Rehoboam² acting upon the advice of the yô'lâdim as opposed to that of the zô'qênîm.on a most vital matter of domestic reform.

¹ B.D.B. *Lexicon*, p.765.
² 1 Kings ch.12.
The 'sons of his generation' responded readily and enthusiastically, a fact emphasized by the Chronicler in the employment of the phrase 'All that you say to us we will hear and obey (ניאמה ונתאשה)', a quotation closely reminiscent of the affirmation of the Israelites that they readily accepted the terms of the Sinaitic blood-covenant with God.

There is one aspect of Baba's assumption of leadership of the community which is somewhat enigmatic. We have already observed that Baba's father, Nethan'el, was still young enough, himself, to wield authority as High Priest. What, we may ask, was his reaction to this apparent usurpation of his authority on the part of his son? The Chronicles are strangely silent on this point; there is not a single statement that would betray the reaction of Nethan'el to his son's activities. One thing is certain, and that is that Baba never consulted his father, neither did he seek his advice at any time during the course of his ministry on any single issue affecting the life and security of the nation. A simple explanation of this would be to suggest that Nethan'el was a totally ineffectual man, whose views carried no weight with his son. Alternately, there is the possibility that Nethan'el did not willingly surrender his authority, and that he did make strenuous objections, and took positive action to restrain his son, but that this was not recorded in the Chronicles of the day, or that it was expunged from

---

1 Exod. 24:7.
A third explanation of Nethan'el's silence is probably nearer to the truth, and this takes account of the terrifying experiences undoubtedly suffered by him in his early youth. To appreciate this fully, we would have to read the poignant account of Roman violence at its worst, as directed against the Samaritan community of Nethan'el's day. Since this is directly relevant to the backcloth of Baba's reforms, we shall cite here the account of Nethan'el's early reign, as described in the unpublished section of our Chronicle (fol. 364).

During the days of the administration of the High Priest, Nethan'el, there befell the Samaritan community numerous, grievous ills that would wear out the tongue to enumerate. This was the reign of the cursed Alexander, whose persecution was even more grievous than the violence perpetrated by the king Commodus — may the Lord's curse attend their spirits forever!

During the period of that wicked Alexander there was a great famine, pestilence and destruction in the land, and innumerable and great plagues.

Alexander commanded his people thus: 'If you find anyone worshipping other than our gods, he shall die. Whoever succeeds in smiting and killing him shall receive a reward of twenty brass shekels. As a result of that edict, whoever had an enemy or someone he hated among the Samaritans would lie in wait for him at the gate of the city, or outside it, in order to set upon him, kill him and take the ransom, as prescribed
by the accursed King Alexander. In consequence of this, innumerable scholars, elders and leaders were killed.

This King Alexander also destroyed the Synagogues, the Houses of Assembly and all the schools of learning. He burned the teachers, imprisoned the little children, wreaked vengeance upon the youth, and crucified many sages. He slew the young people, though without iniquity or sin, burning their bodies in every cave. He seized every virgin girl, taking away their virginity by rape. He lay with many women and polluted them, and he also defiled many of the priests.

He also commanded that inspectors be appointed in every city, town and place, to prevent them from performing the law of circumcision.

God fulfilled thereby the words of the curses which he had foretold by the chief of the prophets, Moses son of 'Amram, peace be unto him, when he said, 'And you shall tremble by day and by night. In the morning you shall say, 'Would that it was evening!'; and in the evening you shall say, 'Would that it was morning!''.

Viewed against such a background, we can hardly speak of Baba usurping his father's authority, for there was clearly no authority left to usurp. It would have been surprising if Nethan'el had been left with his sanity, let alone authority!

Helpless in the face of the decimation of his community, the pollution of the priesthood and the annihilation of

1 Bättê Hammiqveh. Possibly 'ritual bath houses'.
2 Chron.II, fol 364.
his leaders, Nethan'el remained High Priest in name alone. If he did give his son any advice at all, it would probably have been to dissuade him from undertaking any potentially suicidal mission of the nature determined by Baba.

The attitude of Baba's brothers, at least at the outset, is unclear. Granted that Baba was the eldest of the three, nevertheless it would be no foregone conclusion that they would support his pretensions to leadership and inclinations to revolution, especially as this involved a de facto limitation of their father's hereditary authority.

The position of Baba's brothers, 'Aqbon and Phinehas, is slightly enigmatic. Surprisingly, they do not figure in the hierarchic lists of new officials appointed by Baba to be leaders of the community, nor do they play any significant part in the unfolding drama of Baba's reforms and the struggle of the community to assert its independence. The point at which any significant reference to them is made (other than in 1:2, where the number and names of Nethan'el's children are mentioned) suggests a rather late acceptance by them of Baba's claim to leadership. They appear, rather suddenly and unexpectedly, in the account of Baba's attempts to rally support. They are not mentioned as having been present at Baba's first public assembly (1:10 ff.) or at his fast day (2:3). It is only when Baba returns from a period of prayer and spiritual solitude on the Chosen Mount that the Chronicle records that 'he returned to his brothers and the leaders of his community'.

1 Such an attempt to dissuade him does, in fact, appear in 22:14.
Possibly it was only while Baba was away that they had been prevailed upon by their friends among the h₃n₅ dārₕ to support Baba's new movement. They accompany Baba and some of the other leaders on his official visit to all the Samaritan districts, in order to re-open and restore the Synagogues (4:9); but, apart from that initial token act of public support, they fade into the background and play no further part in events. Their initial reticence to rally to Baba's cause probably reflected a luke-warm attitude toward it, which, we may assume, they were never able to shed. This would fully explain why, notwithstanding the deep sense of kinship and family unity which has always characterized the Samaritan community, the brothers of Baba Rabbah were completely divorced from the seat of power in Baba's newly-formed administration. It was only his nephew, Levi, who was singled out for any mission; and that was one which was unprecedented in the dangers attending it.

Significantly, Baba commenced his activity by summoning all men who fitted into the three categories whose members ought to have been possessed of the traditional learning. These were (i) Hakhmê ha-Tôrâh, (ii) Kôhânîm and (iii) Zêqênîm.¹

Although it is not explicitly stated, we may suppose that Baba subjected them individually to a searching examination of their knowledge and competence in the law. Only after such a process would Baba have been able to make his selection of leaders, and only then would he have

***************

¹ 4:11
seen fit to take the potentially hazardous step of rejecting all but a few as leaders. One would have thought that the need of the hour would have prompted Baba to accept lesser qualified men until such time as standards improved and a higher calibre of leader was available. Baba's refusal to recognize them could only have been based upon a sure assessment of their unsuitability.

H2 substitutes the term Šimmûrē ha-Tôrāh for Ḥakhmāh ha-Tôrāh of H1. The H2 version is undoubtedly preferable, for the simple reason that their subsequent rejection by Baba proved them not to have been, in fact, Ḥakhmāmīm. We may assume, therefore, that the criterion for the invitation to appear before Baba in the first place was the fact of being in the category of Šimmûrē ha-Tôrāh, namely, one who was recognized as a strictly observant Samaritan. At the popular level these people were hitherto equated with Ḥakhmāmīm. This was a situation that Baba was immediately to change, however, by reserving that title for men of proven scholarship,1

H2 preserves an exclusive tradition that Baba was only able to assemble fifty Šimmûrē ha-Tôrāh (Bearers of Tradition). The first time the word 'fifty' (Ḥamišim) is mentioned,2 it is clearly an added, syntactically ill-fitting, gloss. It is repeated later,3 form that is in no way textually suspicious. In the second

1 Cf. 5:2.
2 4:11.
3 5:1.
passage, the fifty Šimmūrē ha-Tôrāh are referred to as Zēqînē bōnê yisrâ'ēl ha-hamišîm. This substitution — or identification — of Zēqînîm and Šimmūrîm substantiates the suggestion\(^1\) that the Zēqînîm referred to in H1 as having been summoned by Baba Rabbah, as a prelude to his re-organization, were not "Elders" in the traditional, administrative sense of the word Zēqînî, but rather men of advanced years, who might be relied upon to recollect the authentic traditions of the community, as observed before its decline and disintegration in the era of persecution. This is all implied in the exhortation given to them by Baba prior to their installation: 'You shall direct your energies toward maintaining the practice of the reading of the Law, and toward improving the standard of such reading . . . as you have had it transmitted to you from those who came before you' (4:13). That these Zēqînîm were not all gifted with the powers of leadership expected of people bearing such a title, is obvious from the fact that the situation confronting the community was so critical. The existence of fifty religious leaders, or Zēqînîm, would hardly suggest a spiritual crisis. The only conclusion, therefore, is that their only qualification for having been selected to appear before Baba was that they were Zēqînîm purely in the sense of age, but that their authority and

\(^1\) See on 4:1
influence in the community was negligible. This alone
would explain why Baba could only find seven amongst
the ranks of both the aged (זג'אֲנִים) and the observant
(שיםורים), who truly merited the title of הָאָכְהָא מֵאָא מֵאָא.

Regarding the attribution of the title הָאָכְהָא מֵאָא מֵאָא, there
is an apparent contradiction in the text. From 5:2
it would appear that Baba reserved the title for the
seven chief administrators whom he appointed over the
community — רִבְעַת אֲשֶׁר לְכוּנִי בָּנָא לְבוּם מְדָרָא אָא

However, in 5:13 we have a statement which would
suggest that the title was not reserved for the highest
echelon, but that henceforth it was to be the honorific
title conferred upon anyone who could prove himself
by examination to be possessed of special scholarship
and wisdom.

'And the priest commanded all the people, saying:
The title of הָאָכְהָא מֵאָא מֵאָא shall only be conferred upon
those who are sages and scholars, whether they
be of priestly stock or of the general community'.

To harmonize these two statements, we would first note
that the latter passage, which extends the application
of the title הָאָכְהָא מֵאָא מֵאָא, is substantiated by a further
statement in 9:3:

'Any man who claimed to be a הָאָכְהָא מֵאָא at that time
was brought on a New Moon or a festival day and
set before the great (priest) king and the sages,
in order that they might test him. . . . And if he was
found to have been endowed with wisdom, discretion and understanding, they conferred upon him the title Ḥākhām.\(^1\)

Whether or not this was a later innovation, introduced by Baba, we have no means of knowing. Its late mention in the Chronicle might support this view. We may then conjecture that its introduction was a practical measure in order to forestall—or meet—any criticism that Baba had introduced a rigid, authoritarian, hierarchic system. Such criticism might well have been levelled especially against the hereditary aspect of the rank of the seven chief sages.\(^1\) This does seem to have been one inconsistent feature of Baba's reforms.

There is a distinct possibility that, in terms of historical chronology, the situation reflected in 5:13 and 9:3—which widen the scope of those eligible to receive the title Ḥākhām—is one which superseded Baba's original plan of making the office of Ḥākhām hereditary, as stated in 5:16. The motive behind the widening of the scope of the title and office of Ḥākhām would have been to enable new, and more talented, leadership to rise into prominence as the effects of Baba's intensified educational programme made themselves felt. The praesidium of seven would then be elected from the "college" of titular Ḥākhāmān.

\(^1\) Cf. 5:16
Either way, it is clear that the seven chief administrators shared the same title of Ḥakham with these other doctors of the law. A distinction between the ranks would undoubtedly have had to be made; and this took the form of a distinctive apparel, personally presented to "The Seven" by Baba at their installation. H1 calls it hālifōth sōmālōth; H2 simply bōgādām. Its distinctive nature is clear, however, from the context.

The introduction of a system of religious leadership where real authority is no longer vested in High Priests and dependent upon lineage, but rather upon ordination and competitive scholastic attainment, inevitably calls to mind the conditions attending the Judaistic Semikhāh (Ordination). Whether Baba was modelling his administration upon the Semikhāh system is an open question. Certainly the title Ḥakham was used in rabbinic circles of the Talmudic period as the designation of the authority second in rank to the Nasī'¹. As special adviser to the leader, the rabbinical Ḥakham would have fulfilled a function identical with the one desired by Baba to be occupied by his seven senior administrators. We may assume then that the parallel between the title and office of Ḥakham in both communities was not merely coincidental.

Significantly, the presentation of apparel is also paralleled in the rabbinic system. The rabbinic Ḥakham

¹ Talm. Hōrāvōth 13b.
was presented with a gold-trimmed robe at his ordination:

— 'They have made you a Ḥakham, and spread over you a gold-trimmed robe.'

Baba also addressed himself to the problem of the title Kohen. A good deal of confusion had arisen in Baba's day as a result of the haphazard attribution of that title to anyone who had attained a respected and honoured position in the community. To Baba this situation was intolerable, especially since he had even limited the right of true, lineal priests to call themselves Kohenim unless they possessed a requisite degree of scholastic attainment:

'Whosoever among the priests is neither wise nor scholarly shall be called neither by the name of Ḥakham nor by the name of Kohen' (5:14).

As a true priest himself Baba would certainly have resented the false attribution of this sacred title to ordinary people, notwithstanding their influence and respected position. He was too much of a diplomat, however, to alienate those influential people at the very outset of his ministry. After all, his toleration of the Miṣpahath Haḥashibhim had been motivated by such realistic considerations. Baba sought, therefore, an alternative title for such people.

The tradition preserved in H1 that 'from Baba's day onwards they were called Ḥakhamim' is highly

1 Tal. Bābā Mesi'a 85a.
2 5:5
suspicious. This would have introduced chaos into his newly-promulgated reform, which reserved that title for elected praesidium of "The Seven", as well as for the distinguished doctors of the law. We prefer to accept, therefore, the tradition of H2, that the new title to be applied to the distinguished laymen was that of Şofet.

The limitation of the title Köhen, referred to above, suggests an attempt by Baba to raise dramatically the standard of the traditional priesthood by demanding that they attain to the standards demanded of them in the 'Era of Favour', when the priest was the authority on the law and the teacher of the community.

The practical implication of Baba's reforms in this direction would have been to introduce a clear division between (i) priests who were wise and scholarly, but who had not submitted themselves to an examination with a view to obtaining the title Ḥakham; (ii) priests who were also ordained as Ḥakham; (iii) priests who were ignorant, but who enjoyed power and influence among the masses, and (iv) priests who were both ignorant and without any influence or power.

Baba's reform meant that the first category were eligible to use the title Köhen; the second category, to use the title Köhen or Ḥakham, or both; the third category, to use the title Şofet, and the last category were prohibited from assuming any title at all.
It is apposite here to deal with a passage in the Chronicle which attempts to give a rationale for the reforms specifically relating to the priesthood, and particularly for the fact that Baba had removed the prerogative, hitherto enjoyed by many, of using the title Köhên:

'Regarding the (title) "priests" — before this time any man who inspired fear or respect was called "priest" by the ordinary people. With the advent of Baba Rabbah, however, they were called Šofṭim; and the priestly title was removed from many.

The cause of this was that, at the time when the priest Baba Rabbah came to Baššan, the priests who were there did not come forth to meet him, neither did they fulfil their obligation to accord him honour and glory. Because of this act, he removed them from their positions, for they did not journey out of the city to meet him. In their place he appointed ordinary individuals to discharge their supervisory function, with the exception of the responsibility of teaching the holy Scripture.'

(5:4-10)

We regard this section as an independent, secondary and garbled tradition that has been slotted into the context of Baba's reforms, because of one or two 

1 Cum H2.
superficial points of contact, especially as regards the removal of officials from their posts. In the context of our Chronicle's account of Baba's reforms, the passage in question abounds in difficulties and contradictions.

The most obvious anomaly is the reference to Basân. It would be totally inconceivable that because of some localized difference between Baba and the priests of Basân, Baba would have vented his ire upon the priesthood of the entire Samaritan community, depriving the entire fraternity of its traditional status. Furthermore, from the succeeding section (5:13-14) we learn explicitly that the title Kohen was not 'removed', but only restricted. The priest who was wise and scholarly was still permitted to use his title.

A close examination and comparison of 5:4-6 and 5:7-10 also reveals that they reflect conditions mutually at variance and totally incompatible. In the first section we are concerned with the men of influence who, by reason of their prestige alone, were popularly called "priests". They were not of priestly descent and had no statutory right to such a title. There is no suggestion that they ministered as priests or spiritual functionaries. Their title was merely a popular expression of reverence; and Baba's reform was solely directed toward replacing the sacred title Kohen with a more acceptable one.

In the second section, however, the 'priests of Basân' were, indeed, true priests who had hitherto discharged


1 For a suggestion regarding the possible motive underlying the assumption of this title, see below, p.429.
a sacerdotal function. There is no question - or mention - in this section of Baba merely substituting their title for another. He directed his efforts, at Bašān, to demote the priests forcibly from their office and 'supervisory function'. In their place he appointed 'ordinary individuals', i.e. laymen. Since the latter did not possess the competence or requisite knowledge to serve as teachers of the Scriptures Baba reluctantly had to leave that prerogative in the hands of those renegade priests.

In short, the first, and primary, section presupposes merely a re-allocation of titles, whereas the secondary section presupposes a penal measure imposed by Baba upon the priests of Bašān.

Viewing the chapter as a literary unit, we cannot also but notice the secondary nature of the whole section comprising 5:7-12. Apart from the fact that it is clearly a heterogeneous unit, dealing with two unrelated topics - the offence of the priests of Bašān and the problem of circumcision - there is also the significant fact that 5:13 flows logically and contextually from 5:6, thereby further substantiating the thesis that the intervening verses are from a secondary source.

The corollary of the above source-analysis is that we must exclude 5:7-10 from our consideration when reviewing the administrative reforms of Baba Rabbah. While this unit may, indeed, preserve an authentic
account of a bitter feud between Baba and the priests of Bāṣan, the latter episode is nevertheless valueless as an "explanation" of Baba's reform of the priesthood. That the unit presumes to provide such an explanation is clear from the introductory words: V'ha-qlal l'dābhār ha zah (5:7).

Among the reforms specifically relating to the religious life of the community was the one prescribing the re-introduction of circumcision. This had been outlawed by order of Alexander Severus, who had even appointed Roman inspectors 'in every city, town and place' to enforce the edict.¹

The reform is expressed thus:

'And so, during the days of the priest Baba Rabbah and afterwards, the Samaritan-Israelites could perform the ceremony of circumcision. For, before the days of the priest Baba Rabbah no Samaritan-Israelite could circumcise the foreskin of any Israelite child. It was only the priests who could circumcise the foreskin of any Israelite child born to the people'.²

The final statement of this passage ('It was only the priests...') appears rather suspicious, and, especially in the Hebrew text, has every appearance of being a later gloss. The implication of the passage, as it stands, is that before Baba's reforms it was only the

¹ Chron.II, fol.364.
² 5:11.
priests who had the prerogative to perform circumcision. This presents three problems: First, we have already been told that in the pre-Baba period the title Köhên was applied to 'anyone who possessed respect and honour in the community'.¹ This fact in itself is sufficient to render the above statement relating to circumcision meaningless. For was it the true Köhänim who previously possessed the prerogative to circumcise, or was it the group popularly 'called' Köhänim, namely the men of influence? If the latter, then Baba's reform meant only a limited extension of the prerogative.

Secondly, the statement itself that in the pre-Baba period only priests could circumcise, is in blatant contradiction to the earlier statement of the Chronicle describing the restrictions of Severus, where no distinction is made between priests and laymen. The prohibition, enforced by inspectors, was imposed upon the whole of the Samaritan community. Furthermore, as the priests and leaders were the object of special persecution and harassment, it would have been nonsensical to entrust the performance of the rite of circumcision to the hands of the most pursued and persecuted group in the community.

Thirdly, the suggestion that only priests had the prerogative of performing circumcision is refuted by all the Samaritan traditions relating to this period.

¹ 5:4.
It is especially refuted by the famous story of the prefect Garmán Ar-Rümë. According to the account of this episode as described by Theodore Juynboll on the basis of the Codex Scaliger,¹ 'Nethan'el hesitated for a long time as to whether he should circumcise his children.² The details of story, and especially the precautions taken to avoid detection, are well-known. Had the priests—as our Chronicle suggests—indeed possessed authority, presumably from the Roman government, to circumcise Samaritan children, then Nethan'el the High Priest need not have hesitated before circumcising his own child!

The above considerations lead us to conclude that no reliability is to placed upon the statement contained in 5:11 relating to circumcision in the pre-Baba period. We would regard as a later gloss the statement that in the pre-Baba period, 'it was only the priests who could circumcise the foreskin of any Israelite child born to the people'. This was probably added by a pietistic scribe in order to avoid an admission that the community had for a time been constrained to abandon this most sacred rite. Had the glossator been a priest, this would also explain why he attributed to his own circle the sole prerogative of performing circumcision during the period of persecution.


1 T. Juynboll, Commentarii in Historiam Gentis Samatitanae, p. 151.
2 Hic quum natus esset, pater diu haerebat, quomodo ipsum circumcideret. Romani enim eo tempore Samaritanis hoc interdixisse dicuntur, et delatores contituisse, qui caverent, no hicce ritus clam ab iis institueretur.
We have referred above to one aspect of the Chronicler's tradition that in the pre-Baba period, 'any man who inspired fear or respect was called "priest" by the ordinary people'. Since that era was characterized by an almost total lack of spiritual leadership, the 'men who inspired fear and respect' would undoubtedly have been the men of wealth and property. Indeed, the Hebrew word kābhōd, in the phrase ḫōl ḫēś ba'āl ḫēmāh v'khābhōd, might well be interpreted in the sense of "wealth"; "substance".2

The perplexing aspect of this tradition is the assumption of the title "priest", a title invested by the community with such a specific and spiritual connotation. It is rather surprising that members of the community should have had the effrontery to usurp such a sacred and hereditarily exclusive title. One aspect of Roman economic policy may provide an answer to this problem.

The Romans imposed a large number of crippling taxes upon their subject peoples. These were collected with such a ruthless thoroughness that the name "Tax Collector" (Heb. Mōkhēs) is the one referred to with the greatest odium in Talmudic literature.

There is evidence, however, that the Romans exempted from personal taxation — especially from the Leitourgiās —

1 5:4.
2 Cf. Gn.31:1.
certain classes of religious officials, including ordained scholars and teachers. Generally speaking, anyone who could be classed in the category of priests — sacerdotes — was accorded such exemption. This situation is reflected in the well-known Talmudic tradition that 'the tribe of Levi was exempted from payment of Leitour gia in Egypt'. This statement reflects rather the immunity granted to the rabbinical sacerdotes, or ordained scholars, in Palestine than an authentic historical tradition regarding the Israelites of ancient Egypt.

One of Constantine's first acts after espousing the Christian cause was to grant immunity from civic duties and the payment of taxes to Christian Clergy. This had the effect of creating a flood of people all clamouring to be accepted into Holy Orders. The result was that in 329 A.D. the Emperor, while not revoking his former grant, nevertheless robbed it of its effect by ordering that, henceforth, no person of curial status should be ordained. Later a compromise was reached whereby Decurions, if they wished to take the Orders, had to surrender their property as proof of the purity of their motives.

A number of cases are recorded in the Talmud where the ordinary people brought pressure to bear upon the Patriarch, preventing him from granting ordination to certain scholars

1 See H.M. Parker, A History of the Roman World, pp.125-127.  
2 A. Jones, The Greek City, pp.228, 354 n.33.  
5 Jones, op.cit.p.198.
because of the single fact of their being wealthy landowners. The privilege of tax exemption — from both *augs* and *capita* — which would have accompanied the granting of Ordination was regarded as a compelling inducement and an unfair advantage of office in many instances.

There is no reason to suppose that the Samaritan class of *Sacerdotes* was treated any differently in this respect; and herein may lie the clue to the assumption of the title *Kohen* by the influential and wealthy classes in the pre-Baba period. This title put them into the category of *Sacerdotes*, giving them the most desirable privilege of tax exemption on their incomes and estates. The Chronicler is correct when he states that 'the people' called the men of substance by the title *Kohen*. It is more than likely, however, that it was the wealthy classes themselves who first assumed the title for financial reasons.

Baba's subsequent removal of that title from the wealthy classes, and his restriction of it to true priests who were also scholars, suggests a refusal by him to allow the wealthy of his community to enjoy privileges not accorded to the poorer classes who constituted the vast majority.

Baba was probably also opposed to devaluing the sacred title of *Kohen* even for the purpose of enabling some of his community to escape the financial stranglehold of the oppressors. He might also have considered that by appealing to sacerdotal privilege under Roman law his community would have been acknowledging the justice of the Roman claim to such taxes. Baba's plan was to overthrow the enemy, not to enjoy their concessions. A Samaritan victory would remove taxation from rich and poor alike; a claim to sacerdotal privilege would not.
According to our re-construction of the administrative hierarchy introduced by Baba, we note a two-tiered system, comprising a ruling praesidium of seven and a subsidiary corps of fifty 'bearers of the tradition'.

The respective tasks given to each group are in conformity with their qualifications and expertise. For convenience of comparison we quote the specific instructions given by Baba concerning each group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of the seven Hakhamim:</th>
<th>Of the fifty 'bearers of tradition':</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are to be the leaders of the whole community of Samaritan-Israelites; each one supervising his own territory, teaching his own community, making a distinction, within it, between the impure and the pure, the holy and the profane...jurisdiction over the study of the text of the holy Law (5:8).</td>
<td>Observe, be obedient, consider carefully, and direct your energies to the teaching of the holy Torah to the whole congregation...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display leadership of the whole community, young and old alike. Be their judges, and decide between one man and another (6:2).</td>
<td>Direct your energies toward maintaining the reading from the holy Law...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct your energies to the service of the Synagogue, as well as to whatever requirements you find necessary (4:12-14).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between these instructions are clear-cut and significant. 'The Seven' are the undisputed leaders of the community. They have a judicial function as well as an educational one. They alone have the authority to
decide on matters of ritual purity and impurity, as well as on other aspects of law. They are the overseers of the educational system.

The fifty "bearers of tradition", on the other hand, have no judicial status. They are merely teachers of the Torah and supervisors of the Synagogues, under the overall jurisdiction of the praesidium of "The Seven". As we noted above, the fifty were chosen specifically because of their piety and standard of observance, rather than for their knowledge. For that reason they were known as "Observers", Šimmûrê ha-Tôrêh, rather than as Sages. There is very likely a play intended on their name, in Baba's opening words 'Observe, be obedient'. The Hebrew of this is v'šîmrû v'hiššāmrû — an obvious play on their name Šimmûrîm. The implication of Babâ's instruction was thus that they should be true to their title and act as paragons of religious observance and piety.

From 6:5 we learn the additional fact that of the seven senior administrators four were selected to serve in the more senior position² of Pâqid. They were chosen, apparently, because they enjoyed a greater prestige as ba'ālê šēm.

From 7:4 we learn of the specific function of a Pâqid, namely to go on circuit as controller and overseer of the judiciary. From that passage we learn of the peqîdim appointed to keep the priests of the Mišpâhath Ḥăšṣîbhîm under surveillance. We may therefore suppose that it was

1 Note the phrase vayyaṣigēm (‘al talmûd mîqrath ha-Tôrêh).
2 The seniority is implied in the prepositional word of the phrase pqîydim ‘âlêhem (6:5).
in this area, of the inspectorate, that the qidām of "The Seven" served. Their itinerant function as overseers recalls the system of episcopacy in the early Church. 'In Syria and parts of Asia Minor each country church was provided with a resident staff supervised by chorēspōcōi or itinerant bishops, who were answerable to the bishop of the nearest large city'.

While there is still a divergence of opinion among New Testament scholars regarding the origins and evolution of the early Church's three-fold hierarchy of bishops, presbyters (or elders) and deacons, it would be invidious to attempt to draw any comparisons between Baba's structure and that obtaining in Church circles. We would nevertheless draw attention to the significance of the seven men ordained by the apostles to assist them (Acts 6:1-6). 'These may possibly have been the first elders or presbyters, who formed a kind of council with the apostles in Jerusalem (15:2). These elders were on occasion called episcōpoi; i.e., overseers (guardians) or bishops (20:28)'.

As we have no evidence of any councils of seven in Judaistic history of that period, we are forced to consider the possibility that Baba might have been influenced by the existing organization in the hierarchy of the Church. The structure which Baba introduced may likewise be seen - as we shall presently demonstrate - to conform to a three-fold ministry, not too dissimilar from that of the early Church.


Having dealt with the judicial praesidium, and the lower echelon of fifty "bearers of tradition" (Simmûre ha-Tôrâh), we must now complete the picture by referring to another group of people appointed by Baba to a particular rank within the Samaritan hierarchy. In section nine we learn that Baba appointed eleven priests, each of whom was assisted by another priest, and that he allotted to these "pairs" specific areas of Samaritan territory as a permanent inheritance.  

Significantly, no exhortations, instructions or even specific tasks are given to these priestly leaders on their appointment. We are merely told which geographical borders marked the extremity of their administrative inheritance. We are not even given any information regarding the extent or limitation of the power and authority that these eleven pairs of priests wielded in their territories, nor are we told of their status within the overall hierarchy. 

The inference from all this is that they did not, in fact, possess any juridical function, and that matters of law still had to be referred for decision to "The Seven". This conclusion commends itself notwithstanding the fact that two of the priestly appointees — Zâriz ben Mânîr and Zayyith ben Lâvî — are singled out as men of unique knowledge and wisdom. The second is even described as 'a distinguished man, whose renown  

1 Cf. frequent refs. to nahâlâh and 'âhûzâth nahâlâh, 9:6-19.  
2 The number eleven would be totally uncharacteristic as a Semitic administrative unit. Montgomery (The Samaritans, p.150) is obviously correct in adding the Shechem "Archdiocese".
was heard everywhere throughout priestly circles, because he was paramount in all branches of wisdom, understanding, knowledge and exegesis' (9:19).

It is most perplexing that these two priests, though endowed with such superior qualities and qualifications, nevertheless only served as assistants to the other priest of the "pair".¹ This substantiates the thesis that this priestly hierarchy had little judicial or administrative function in the context of Samaritan religious life, and that their raison d'être is to be sought amid extraneous considerations.

It is tempting to draw parallels here with the Judaistic administrative structure of Zugôth ("Pairs"), the name given to the pairs of sages who flourished at the time of the religious persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes (174-164 B.C.), and who were responsible for maintaining the chain of Oral Tradition or Qabâlîn.² At the beginning of the Hasmonean period there existed a system of dual appointments of heads of public institutions. Yohanan the High Priest appointed Zugôth to supervise the collection of tithes.³ These Zugôth would undoubtedly have been priests themselves in order to be entitled to handle the sacred food.

This structure would have been known to the Samaritan priesthood; and this may well have inspired Baba in

¹ Cf. 9:18, 19.
² Cf. Mishnah 'Avoth ch.1.
³ Pal.Tal.Ma'asîr Şenî, 5:9, 56d (Krot.ed.).
his re-organization of the priestly hierarchy. In the Judaistic tradition the first-mentioned of the Zugōth served as senior official, apparently as Nasi', the second as 'Av Beth Din. We infer this distinction in rank in the case of Baba's appointees from the formula used to introduce the second of the "pair", namely, vayyasem 'immō (9:8,9,11) and vayyasem 'ittô (9:10,13,14). The distinction in rank is underlined by the fact that the second of the "pair" is merely added at the end - almost as an afterthought - after the geographical boundaries have been delineated in association with the name of the first priest.

What emerges from this is that Baba, having totally re-organized the community along lines which were calculated to deprive the traditional and authentic priesthood of its claim to authority, by replacing it with a meritocracy of Hakhāmīm, felt obliged to accord some token recognition to the priestly families. He did so by confirming them in geographical areas where they claimed a patrimonial right, and where their ancestors had probably exercised priestly influence in bygone periods. While possessing no juridical authority within their own estates, these "pairs" of priests would nevertheless have been recognized as civic leaders, and, with specialized and intimate knowledge of the political and social conditions obtaining in their own territories, their
advice would have been sought when matters of wider policy, affecting their specific areas, were planned by Baba or his praesidium. We may also assume that these "pairs" advised the Simmûrè ha-Tôrân, aiding them also in the running of the Synagogues under their regional jurisdiction, as well as in the re-organization of the educational system.

A relic of the "pairs" structure survives to the present day. The Levitical High Priest always has an associate, usually a Levitical relative, to assist him in the Synagogue service. The associate 'performs most of the service, though the High priest is required for the blessing'. It is conceivable that this Synagogical practice goes back to the "pairs" of priests who probably shared similar functions in the Synagogues of their own region.

The following chart represents the hierarchical structure established as a result of Baba's reforms:

```
          B A B A
         ↓      ↓
4 Eqidim + 3 Hakhamim
         ↓
11 "Pairs" of priestly administrators
         ↓
50 Simmûrè ha-Tôrân
```

This basically tri-partite structure is summed up in 10:20, referring to the leave-taking of Baba's appointees to take up their new posts: 'And the Sages

1 Montgomery, op.cit., p.29.
(i.e. the "Seven") of the Children of Israel, and their leaders (רֹעֶהוֹן, i.e. the שִׁיםְבוֹת הָאָרָה) and the priests (i.e. the eleven "pairs") went out from the presence of Baba Rabbah.

At the foot of our table we should perhaps add the titular הָאָרָה־מָיָם, those who had obtained the prerogative of using the title as a result of examination. Our hesitation to include them is on the basis of the fact that the other three categories were administrative offices, whereas this was merely a titular status. It is likely, however, that when a vacancy occurred among "The Seven", it would have been filled by the most senior of the titular הָאָרָה־מָיָם.

As we have demonstrated, the reforms of Baba Rabbah were calculated to create territorial areas of religious and civil administration. In the case of the eleven "pairs" of priests, their activity and influence was restricted solely to their own 'inheritance'. To a lesser extent this was also the case with the ruling praesidium of "The Seven". They were also allocated specific territories by Baba,' over which they were to exercise a tight and comprehensive control; but they were also, collectively, to be responsible for the whole of the Samaritan community:

'You are to instruct the whole assembly of this people. Discipline them and display leadership of the whole community of Samaritan Israelites... Be their

1 Cf. 5:20-31.
judges, and decide between one man and another..." (6:2).

How this balance of influence was to be maintained we are not told. From the context of the above passage, however, it would seem that each individual member of "The Seven" had exclusive control of every single facet of life within his own administrative area wherever and whenever the issue related to, and could be confined to, his own borders. Where a dispute arose, however, between contending Samaritans from different areas, or where an issue transcended individual geographical and administrative boundaries, then the Hakhamim acted collectively as a supreme court of seven, and assumed a more objective and panoramic perspective.

"The Seven" were clearly doctors of the law. Montgomery observes that 'the sect has never developed the difference between the priests and the doctors of the law to the extent which marks Judaism.' We are now in a position to observe that this was precisely the plan of Baba Rabbah, to make such a distinction and to invest greater power upon the doctors of the law. That the sect never 'developed the difference' is correct in historical terms. Many of Baba's innovations left an indelible influence upon Samaritan religious life. His administrative hierarchy, on the other hand, probably did not survive very long after his death. It was clearly a system which owed much of its cohesion

.................

1 Montgomery, op. cit. p. 32.
to the authority which Baba himself devolved to it. As an extension of his power and as a concomitant of the independence he won for the Samaritan community the new system could flourish. In the absence of these conditions it could not.

Meetings of the praesidium of "The Seven" were held in the "Hall of Meeting and Decision", which was specifically built by Baba as a place 'for hearing all petitions' (9:1). We are not told how frequently "The Seven" had to make the journey to the supreme court. We may infer, however, from the fact that any candidate for the title of Häkhäm could present himself for examination 'before the great king and before the Häkhämim on a New Moon or a festival day' (9:3), that they were expected to be present at the Holy Mountain on these occasions in order to attend to judicial matters and other affairs of national interest.

Again we may draw a parallel to the Judaistic judiciary, wherein the supreme court was situated in the Hall of Hewn Stone in the Jerusalem Temple. Both traditions were inspired by the direction contained in Deut. 17:8-9:

'When the issue in any lawsuit is beyond your competence... then go up without delay to the place which the Lord your God will choose. There you must go to the
levitical priests and to the judges then
in office; seek their guidance, and they
will pronounce the sentence'.

Baba's appointees fulfilled the very letter of this
biblical prescription, which required a judiciary
composed of levitical priests and laymen. Of Baba's
seven Hàkhámim four were ordinary Israelites,1 two
are described as 'levitical priests'2 and one, simply
a priest.3 With Baba presiding, there would be a
significant balance of four priests and four ordinary
Israelites. This inevitably calls to mind the
rabbinic "Great Sanhedrin" which always contained a
priestly representation especially competent to
deal with matters relating to levitical purity and
Temple cultus. According to Josephus4 and the New
Testament5 the president of the Sanhedrin was always
a High Priest. Whether or not this was an unwritten
law is a highly-debated issue.6 Certainly, both the
"Great Sanhedrin" and Baba's praesidium of "The Seven"
maintained, at the least, a significant balance
between priestly and lay representation. In Baba's
system the balance was probably weighted more toward
the priests—viewing the administrative system as
a whole—since the fifty śimmûrê ha-Tôrâh were more

..........1
1 Cf.5:22,23,25,31.
2 Cf.5:24,26.
3 Cf.5:20.
4 Ant.xiv.9,3-5; xx.9,1.
6 Cf. A.Buechler, Das Synedrion in Jerusalem (1902);
Schuerer, The Jewish People at the time of Christ,1,180-4.
teachers of the community than policy makers.

Baba's reforms were particularly directed toward the reconstitution of the Synagogue and the religious ritual as the primary source of inspiration in the life of the community. To that end he re-opened the Synagogues closed by the Romans, built new ones—siting them in a strategic circle with Shechem at the epicentre—and constructed a Miqveh at the foot of Mount Gerizim.

When Baba had appointed his praesidium of seven, he built thrones for them, utilizing the stones of the Samaritan temple destroyed by Saul. Baba's purpose herein is not stated; but the symbolic challenge expressed by that act would not have eluded the community or the Hakhamim, namely that they were being charged with the task of rebuilding the community, repairing its physical, communal and spiritual breaches, and restoring it to the pristine position it occupied in the Era of Favour, before the reign of Saul and Eli, the schismatic, who anointed him. It need hardly be stated that, from the biblical, historical or archaeological evidence before us, we cannot substantiate the Samaritan claim to have been a developed religious community, with their own Temple, in the period of Saul, though this claim is, of course,

1 Cf. sec.8.
2 Cf.6:4.
3 Cf.8:8-9.
central to Samaritan tradition.¹

Of great significance is the emphasis on ritual immersion and the construction by Baba of a number of ritual baths.² These are always referred to in a Synagogue context, implying the prerequisite of ritual purification for prayer. The necessity for ritual immersion, according to the Pentateuch, is restricted to instances of impurity, such as defilement through contact with a corpse, reptile, or through nocturnal emission. According to rabbinic sources³ it was only sectarians, such as the 'morning bathers' — probably the μεταβατίσται ⁴ — who immersed themselves daily before morning prayers.

In 8:4 with reference to the miqveh built by Baba at the foot of Mount Gerizim, the Chronicle states that its purpose was that 'whosoever of the Samaritans wished to pray upon this mountain shall immerse

¹ For a discussion of the date of the construction of the Samaritan Temple, see H. Rowley, "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple", BJRL 38 pp.48ff.
² Cf. 8:4; 9:1; 10:13.
⁴ Cf. Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, iv, 22.
himself at the very time of every prayer'. The Hebrew
of the last phrase – לְהַטָּה יִתְפַּתַּקְלַסְלִּית – is
unnecessarily complicated, there being no reason for
the word יִתְפַּת. Our rendering of this phrase – 'at
the very time' – has, if correct, a sectarian ring
about it. It is suggestive of a sectarian practice
of reciting prayers while, at the same time, making
ritual ablutions. Indeed, Abu'l Fath tells us of the
followers of Dusis ibn Fufily, who 'performed all
their prayers in water'.

In the context of the thorny problem of the relation­
ship of Baba Rabbah to the Dosithean movement such
a reference is obviously of crucial importance. It was
precisely in the area of ritual purification that the
Dusitan sect introduced extra stringencies, surpassing
even Pharisaic legislation.

Although the context of the Dusis account would place
him in the age of Baba Rabbah, chronological inaccuracies
such as bringing Simon Magus and Philo of Alexandria
into the same period – make association of Baba and
Dosithean apostles a rather tenuous assumption. The
conclusion of S.J.Isser is that Dositheus was an early
first century A.D. eschatological figure among the
Samaritans, who became prominent through a particular
sect of the Samaritans which had been formed a century

......................

4 Cf.Chron.Neubauer,Journal Asiaticque,6th series,14
(1869) p.404.
earlier, and which was Pharisaistic, in contradistinction to the Sadducee-like "Orthodox" Samaritans. 'This sect, now called Dustan, or Dositeans, adopted him as their prophet, and created a Dositeus aretalogy'. 1

There is, thus, no evidence for the appearance of a personality called Dustan, Dusus or Dositeus, in the period of Baba Rabbah. However, we may acknowledge that it would have been a natural, and not unexpected, socio-religious development that pre-existent eschatological or messianic ideas - couched in a sectarian mould - should have surfaced in the fourth century A.D., just at that cataclysmic period of decline, followed by sudden ascendency, of Samaritan fortunes.

References in Epiphanius and Eulogius, associating the Dositeans with extreme asceticism 2 and the eternity of the world, are assumed by Isser to 'have been reflections of secondary developments among the Dositeans or their daughter sects'. 3

We may assume, therefore, that there was some Dositean influence working among the Samaritan community of Baba's day, and that some expression of its

1 S.J. Isser, op. cit. 163.
2 For relevant texts see Isser, 39 (Epiphanius), 64 (Eulogius).
'Pharisaistic outlook' actually permeated the thinking of Baba Rabbah. A Dosithoan 'daughter sect' might well have established a prayer-site upon Mount Gerizim, wherein immersion during prayer was practised, and this may well have been perpetuated by Baba under the illusion that this was a traditional form of worship upon the Holy Mountain.

J. Bowman would go even further. He asserts that 'there can be little doubt that Baba had become Dosithean; in fact the fourth century C.E. was the high water-mark of Dositheism, when the High Priest became such'.

It must be pointed out that Bowman's certainty on this score rests on no solid foundation of evidence from Samaritan sources, other than the unconvincing juxtaposition of the Dusiš episode and the history of Baba Rabbah. One or two observations on this are in place: first, as we have pointed out already, Baba was never a High Priest. To this may be added the fact that he, consequently, did not personally supervise or, as far as we know from the Chronicles, even administer the Synagogue liturgical re-organization. He gave sole charge of this to the Simmûrâ ha-Tôrâh. Baba was, in fact, particular to point out that it was the 'ancestral' traditions of the Synagogue that were to be perpetuated. There is not the slightest hint that Baba 'had become Dosithean' or that he had espoused any tradition other

2 See p. 409.
than the one upon which he was nurtured.

On the question of the juxtaposition of the Dusis episode and that of Baba Rabbah we have noted above that no conclusions may be drawn from this, especially in the light of the fact that the Chronicle also places Simon Magus and Philo in that same period of Dusis. To this we may add that the Tolidah¹ actually places the arrival of Dositheus at Shechem in the period of 'Aqbon, the successor of Baba!

Furthermore, had Baba embraced a sectarian branch of Samaritanism, it is very unlikely that he would have built his entire, re-constituted administration upon the pillars of the old tradition. Baba sought out his Ḥakhāmim, his ʾimmūrīm and his "pairs" of priests, from the body of the entire Samaritan community. He did not import any apostles of a new order.

We are prepared to admit the possibility, however, that Baba, in his effort to intensify spiritual awareness, absorbed something of the spirit of the Dosithean sectarians. The preservation of a Dosithean practice, such as immersion during prayer — on the Holy Mountain alone — indicates the direction of Baba's Dosithean tendencies. We do not rule out the possibility, however, as mentioned above, that Baba perpetuated the Dosithean practice, believing it to have been the "Orthodox" ritual associated with the Holy Mount.

............................

¹ Ed. Neubauer, p. 404-5.
At this point we may offer a suggestion which would account for the Chronicler's association of Baba Rabbah with the Dosithean apostles. The redactor of the Chronicle might well have been aware of the influence of Dositheanism in the Baba era, as suggested by the ritual of immersion during Prayer. He was also aware of the liturgical hymns attributed to one ed-Dustān. The hymns of ed-Dustān borrow liberally from the fourth century Durrān, and were, therefore, probably regarded as emanating from that particular genre. If the redactor assumed that the liturgist ed-Dustān and the sectarian Dusiṣ were one and the same person, and if he regarded the ed-Dustān hymns as being an original element in the fourth century Deftīr, then we can fully understand why he felt constrained to marshal his material relating to Dusiṣ in the fourth century context of Baba Rabbah.

The reference to immersion during Prayer occurs, as we have noted, only in the context of the miqveh on the Holy Mountain. Baba did, however, construct ritual baths in other places, though it is not clear from the Chronicles whether these were for normal use, or whether they also had a Synagogical usage, suggesting that immersion before Prayer was incumbent upon all.

............... 1

The problem is resolved, however, by a description of Samaritan worship written by the twelfth century traveller, Benjamin of Tudela. He writes:

'They remove their garments which they have worn before they go to the place of worship; and they bathe and put on fresh clothes. This is their constant practice'.

This information, affirming that immersion was always a prerequisite for worship, owes its emphasis, if not its origin, to the reforms of Baba Rabbah, and the ritual baths he built.

It is apposite in this context to refer to the contemporary fourth-century Christian ecclesiastical tradition on the subject of ritual immersion as a prerequisite for worship.

The great Church historian, Eusebius (264-349 A.D.), contemporary of Baba Rabbah, gives the earliest extant description of a Christian Church, the Church of Constantine at Tyre. In it he refers to a number of 'symbols of sacred purification':

The construction of fountains exactly in front of the Cathedral, these with their ample flow of fresh water, enables those who are proceeding towards the centre of the sacred

precincts to purify themselves. For all who enter, this is the first stopping-place, lending beauty and splendour to the whole, and at the same time providing those still in need of elementary instruction with the station they require....

He constructed halls and chambers along both sides, on a great scale. These too were provided with water for those still in need of cleansing and sprinkling.¹

The similarity between the Samaritan Synagogue purification rites and those of the early Church are striking. This association adds an extra dimension to the close relationship between Prayer and immersion that exists in rabbinic literature. A well-known Midrashic observation has it that 'Prayer is (symbolically) like the Miqveh' — נִמְשָׁלָה הָעַל פֶּלֶשׁ הֶכְּמִיּוֹב.² This is amplified by another passage: 'Just as the miqveh has times when it is open and times when it is closed, so it is with the gates of Prayer'.³ We are reminded, in this context, that any Israelite wishing to enter the Temple court had first to undergo immersion.⁴

² Mid.Ekhah Rabb.iii, 34.
³ Yalkut on Psalms, sec.789.
⁴ Mishna Yoma,iii,3.
Apart from the similarity between the Samaritan Synagogue purification rites and those of the Church, we also have the significant reference by Eusebius, quoted above, to 'the first stopping-place' by the fountain, which spot also served as a place of 'elementary instruction'. This lends special significance to a passage in the Chronicle\(^1\) which refers to Baba's construction of Synagogues where instruction — especially in the traditional reading of the sacred scrolls — was given. The following verse (in H1) speaks of Baba establishing bätté ha-miqveh; in H2, however, these are referred to as bätté ha-midrásóth. This re-inforces the link between Constantine's Church and Baba's Synagogue, in both of which instruction was given near to a ritual fountain or bath. We may now understand far more clearly the sense of the statement in 9:1 associating the miqveh with study, interpretation and petition:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ירגון זור זכרת בוא קנה סקינה רחב רשם} \\
\text{מקוה המקרא KeyCode לקויים הפועלים חק כל שיאלי}
\end{align*}
\]

The relationship between the miqveh and study or instruction is here clearly manifest. We are reminded here of the well-known Midrashic motif, explaining water as a simile for Torah study — Ha-Tôrâh nimsalinâh lammayim,\(^2\) and ' SYN mayyîm 'alâ' Tôrâh.\(^3\)

\[\text{\cdots\cd-
One talmudic reference\(^1\) clearly has the miqveh storage system in mind as underlying the symbolic association of the ritual bath and Torah study — Mah mayyim mënihin mágàm gëbhëah vëhélkhin lëmágàm nàmôkh 'aph dibhrê Tôraḥ ... The symbolic idea is that just as the water is collected in ground level storage tanks, from which it is conducted down to the subterranean bath, so the words of the Torah have the power to penetrate the deepest recesses of the human heart.

Perhaps the clearest explanation of the association of miqveh and Torah study is contained in the following passage:\(^2\)

> המ מים hakkג מקריה גדולה יותר מאשרורות ליבך
> איזר נבזא במעליס כל הברך מקריה שקריה...

From our discussion on this matter we are enabled to view Baba's extension of the usage of his bätta ha-miqveh in the wider context of both Judaistic and early Christian tradition, which viewed instruction in Holy Writ as an act of purification, and which, consequently, conducted such instruction close to the ritual fountain or bath-chamber.

\(^{\hspace{1em}1}\) T.B. Taanith, 7a.

\(^{\hspace{1em}2}\) Tanna' Dëbê 'Éliyâhû Rabb. ch.18.
One problem associated with the reforms of Baba Rabbah is that of their duration. Surprisingly, none of the Samaritan Chroniclers have anything to say on this aspect of Baba's activity and contribution. Perhaps for this reason not one modern scholar or historian of Samaritanism has even raised the question. Inevitably, the evidence we can offer to substantiate our view that his reforms were of very brief duration will only be circumstantial.

The duration of Baba's reforms, and their practical implementation as the basis for the organization of Samaritan religious and juridical administration, can only be gauged by paying close attention to the history following on immediately from the Baba Rabbah period. In order to ascertain the prestige and authority wielded by Baba's new hierarchy we must, likewise, look to the immediate post-Baba period, in order to see how they rose to the problem and challenge posed by the demise of the great leader. We would also look for any evidence of the existence of rival contenders for communal and spiritual authority, as had existed in the days of Baba in the form of the Miṣpahath Haḥṣibh'īm. We know from the later literary evidence of the community that Baba's complex hierarchical structure — with its "Seven", its priestly "Pairs" and its "Simmūrê ha-Tôrâh" — did not survive as the model classification even into the medieval period. We do not know, however, exactly when
their power was actually eclipsed.

The solution to this problem is to be found, as we have suggested, in the circumstances of the post-Baba era, as described in the Chronicle. One of the most surprising features of the period is the assumption of leadership by Baba's brother, 'Aqbon. 'Aqbon had played no part in Baba's re-organization of the community, he had occupied no official position within the administration and had, consequently, no experience which might qualify him for the position of leader. Yet, he assumes leadership, with the title of High Priest, and there is no reference which even betrays the continued existence of any vestige of Baba's appointees. Their titles do not recur and their presence or authority cannot be detected. It is as if, with the demise of Baba, there was a revolution which restored the old order of direct rule by the High Priest. So immediate and complete a reversion to the old order can really only be explained in the context of just such a revolution.

In our discussion of the date of Baba Rabbah, we have referred to the difficulty of accepting the historicity of the tradition that he spent his last years incarcerated in the city of Constantinople. If that was, indeed, a legendary tradition, created in order to hide the fact of an anti-climactic defeat on the field of battle, it would explain why, in a mood of abject despair, and with all their unprecedented hopes of spiritual renascence

1 See p. 366ff.
and national independence dashed to the ground, Baba's administration — and administrators — would have been brusquely set aside and discredited. This would have been followed by a return to the only other form of government known to the community, that of High Priestly rule. If Baba did, in fact, fall in battle, then it would have been logical for the Roman authorities to have insisted on the removal of his devolved administration, with its complex power-structure, and the return to the old system, favoured by the Romans, of one leader who was solely responsible to the conquerors.

Our theory, of a post-Baba period of communal despair, is borne out by most of the Chronicles, which speak of intensified persecution during that period. Our Chronicle¹ and Chronicle VII² both aver that the Samaritans were under tighter and firmer Roman control in the post-Baba period. Both these Chronicles place the Garman episode in that period, referring the circumcision to that of the son of 'Aqbon, who succeeded Baba.³ These Chronicles also place the appearance of Dusis, and the expansion of his heresy, in this post-Baba period.⁴ Psychologically, this would fit a period of spiritual disillusionment as might be expected in the wake of the failure of Baba's movement to live up to its spiritual and national expectations.

---------------------
¹ See fol.456.
² See Adler, "Une Nouvelle Chronique Samaritaine"; R.E.J. 45, 223.
³ See, however, Montgomery, p.101.
⁴ Chr.II, fol.467; Adler, p.225.
A further pointer to a situation which might suggest the sudden removal of Baba's appointees is furnished by the account of a tragic error of judgement perpetrated by Baba's successor, the High Priest 'Aqbern, at the cost of the life of his own daughter.

The episode is introduced by a harsh condemnation of 'Aqbôn's total lack of ability and suitability for judicial office:

'Now that 'Aqbon was hasty in his judgement of all the people, so that many were wont to say of him: "The High Priest 'Aqbon perpetrates injustice, and deals with cases expeditiously, before the truth has come to light. This is clearly because he is an incompetent judge. Had he been qualified to judge he would not have acted in this way, to rush the judicial process."'

The Chronicle then proceeds to relate how certain people, 'who hated the actions of the High Priest 'Aqbon' proceeded to frame his daughter, bringing against her a false charge of immorality, with a view to demonstrating publicly the inability of the High Priest to evaluate true and false evidence. Acting in his usual precipitous manner, 'Aqbon had his daughter condemned and executed peremptorily.

The situation reflected in this story is one which fits exactly a transition period between the removal of Baba's judiciary and the emergence of one which had earned the

\[\text{\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots}\]

\[1\text{ Fol. 452.}\]
confidence and respect of the disillusioned community. The assessment of 'Aqbon given in the Chronicle is precisely what we would have expected of a man suddenly thrown into the position of leader and judge in a period of great communal upheaval and with no previous experience. It does not stretch the imagination too far to suggest that the people 'who hated the High Priest', and attempted to demonstrate his incompetence, would have been the supporters — if not representatives — of the old order, introduced by Baba.

Baba had laboured to provide the community with leaders chosen from its most educated and talented quarters. Baba's appointees were never challenged, nor was their competence and distinction called into question. The story of 'Aqbon's daughter reflects a situation wherein such judges as had ministered in Baba's administration could no longer have held office. It suggests a transition period when no one was available to step into the breach left by the removal from office of all who had functioned under Baba, and when a High Priest was struggling, against bitter opposition, to re-assert the traditional function of his ancestral line.

Thus, although the resurgence of national pride, engendered by Baba, certainly survived many generations, and while his Synagogue buildings became the focal-point for Samaritan spiritual activity for centuries, and his
intensification of the religious spirit paved the way for the great liturgists of the schools of Marqah and 'Amram Darah, yet, it must be admitted that his detailed blueprint for a highly structured political and judicial system apparently did not long survive his own lifetime.
12. THE MISPAHATH HASSYIBHIM
There is a remarkable admission in the Chronicle that, notwithstanding Baba's unqualified claim to leadership and his total re-organization of the Samaritan hierarchy, there was, however, a dissident group which maintained, in defiance of Baba Kabbah, a separatist administrative structure. They are portrayed in the Chronicles as a dynastic (or family) entity, referred to as the Miṣpāḥāh Haṣṣibh'īm, "Family of Seventy."

Their total rejection of Baba Kabbah's authority is clearly stated: חָזָקְתְּנוּ נְאֵנוּ בְּנֵי זֶה (7: 2). The same verse also provides the motive of their secession, namely their antipathy to the yōṭēb (ordinance) regarding the division of Samaritan territory into seven administrative areas, each under a dual-leadership appointed by Baba Kabbah.

Reference is made to rival appointments of Priests, made by the Miṣpāḥāh, which was not — according to the evidence before us — itself of priestly descent. Yet, they assumed to themselves a hereditary right to preside over, and regulate, the appointment of their own priests and leaders. According to H2, they had a predilection for the appointment of "Priests of the sons of Kehāth" (7: 3), though H1 was unaware of, or did not acknowledge, this particular fact.

The territorial extent of the influence of the Miṣpāḥāh was, apparently, quite considerable. The Chronicle makes reference to appointments made by them בְּמַסְדִּירֵנוּ בְּכָל שְׁבָרָה בְּכָל עִירֵיָה— 'in their own centre(s), and in all the cities under their inheritance'.

THE Miṣpāḥāh Haṣṣibh'īm — A RIVAL ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY
Baba would clearly not have welcomed this rival body, and friction between their appointees and those of Baba probably occurred fairly often. This is suggested, in fact, in the reference to those occasions when 'an error was discovered as having been made by one of their priests, in the statutes of the Torah, in judgment or law' (7: 5). The official priests would thereupon 'hasten and report the matter to Baba Rabbah' (7: 6). The impression given is that the appointees of the Miṣpahāh Haṭṭībhîm were kept under close surveillance by the official leadership of Baba. They were clearly regarded as unqualified priests, for had they possessed the requisite knowledge and qualifications they would undoubtedly have been recognized by Baba when he combed Samaritan territory looking for Ḥâkhāmîm (4:11). Even at a later time they could have presented themselves for examination in order to gain an official ordination and the title of Ḥâkhām (cf.9:3). The fact that they were regarded by Baba as unqualified people, according to his criterion of leadership, would explain why they were kept under such surveillance, and why their judgments were constantly monitored by Baba's representatives.

The problem posed by their existence is obvious. They were a divisive element in the Samaritan community, and their rival administration may well have undermined Baba's prestige, as well as having sown no small amount of confusion among the ordinary folk. It should be especially noted that, on the evidence of the text, the area of authority assumed by the Miṣpahāh was in no way circumscribed. Their priestly appointees functioned in matters of Ḥqqóth
ha-Tôrûh (ritual law), mišpât (civil litigation) and din (day-to-day religious affairs); in other words, the whole gamut of communal and religious administration.

The Chronicler does not make it clear whether their priestly appointees confined themselves to exercising jurisdiction within the cities of the Mišpâhâh or whether they functioned throughout Samaritan territory, alongside Baba's official representatives. If the former situation was the case - and this appears to be more creditable from the account before us - this would necessitate the conclusion that Baba's officials had an entrée into the strongholds of the Mišpâhâh; for without such, they would not have been aware of any miscarriage of justice or error in law on the part of the rival appointees (cf.7:5). We conclude, therefore, that they were able to attend as observers during sessions of the courts of the Mišpâhâh. These "observers" are indeed alluded to in the reference to four Pêqîdîm, appointed from among the seven sages (6:5). These Pêqîdîm are described as 'men of renown' (ibid.), and frequently they were sent out as representatives of the courts to make a tour of judicial inspection 'in every city' (7:4).

The modus vivendi arrived at between Baba and the Mišpâhâh did not mean that Baba recognized their rights to exercise total and independent authority within their own areas of domicile and influence. This is emphasized by the fact that, notwithstanding their localized independence, Baba still allocated priests to function in the areas under their rule.
The fact that the latter rejected the authority of Baba's representatives - רודו חמשה ל舳 נון תור (7:2) - did not prevent Baba from proceeding with his own appointments and signifying thereby that he did not intend to surrender any of his own authority or jurisdiction over the territory of the dissidents.

Unfortunately, the text is rather vague in its description of the procedure which followed upon Baba's inspectorate having discovered an error in judgment on the part of the rival priests. The text states that 'they would hasten and present their objections to their High Priest' (רימזור וגרינה גא דבדינתו על התורה הגדולה ואשתו ל הנ). The High Priest concerned could hardly have been Netan'el or Baba, as these would surely have been named by the Chronicler. The only alternative is that the reference is to the High Priest of the Mišpāḥāh. In other words, Baba's inspectorate would refer any erroneous judgments detected by them to the High Priest of the Mišpāḥāh, who, under the terms of some agreement concluded with them (or Baba), would guarantee to rectify the error and reverse the judgment.

If this interpretation of the passage is correct, we learn from it two points not specified in the Chronicle: that the Mišpāḥāh maintained their own High Priesthood, and, secondly, that the latter deferred to the superior authority of Baba's sages in matters of religious law, and made every effort to ensure that, in this area at least, no departure from orthodox tradition was encountered.
Baba was quite clearly unable to curb their activities, and was constrained to tolerate them; and from this situation, a measure of their influence, power and prestige may be gained. From one observation of the Chronicler we learn why Baba was prepared to allow this dilution of his authority:

'And these "Seventy" used to help the Priest Baba Rabah in every war, providing him with grain and giving him unnumerable gifts; indeed fulfilling his every need' (7:6).

We have here nothing short of a separatist oligarchy. Baba found himself obliged to enter into an arrangement with these separatists on a quid pro quo basis. Baba allowed them to retain their (apparently-)traditional hierarchical structure, and in return they placed at his disposal their quite considerable economic resources. The reference to 'their centres and cities' suggests that they were totally self-sufficient, and had hitherto exercised hegemony within their own territorial areas. Their recognition of Baba's powers of leadership, and their faith in his ability to rid the country of the hated oppressor, prompted them to throw in their lot with Baba and give him every support. They were not prepared, however, to merge their own identity; and they insisted, therefore, on functioning as a state within a state.

Without casting doubt upon the historicity of this tradition regarding the Mišpahath Haššibh'îm and their rival claim to authority, it is inevitable that an association will be made between the latter and the Qumran tradition of the rival to the Teacher of Righteousness. The latter wielded priestly authority, but, not belonging to the family of Žadok, he was
without the traditional right to do so — a right inherited by reason of ancestral lineage through that particular family.

The difference between the 'Wicked Priest', or "Man of Untruth", in the Scrolls and the "Mišpāḥāh Haššibh'īm" as described in the Chronicle, is obvious. The latter, while constituting a rival authority to that of Baba — portrayed in the Chronicle as a "Teacher of Righteousness" type of leader — did not, however, seek to persecute him or destroy him. On the contrary, co-operation was the hallmark of their relationship. Nevertheless, it is clear from the account of the tension still existing between the two groups that their basic conflict owed its origin to a much older and basic division within the ranks of the Samaritan community on the issue of vested authority. The apparent co-existence and co-operation between the rival factions in the period covered by our Chronicle in no way rules out a past history of strife and competition for administrative power. The unity at this period was clearly imposed upon them by the threat of a common enemy.

There is also the possibility that we have, underlying the struggle between the Mišpāḥāh and the official priesthood, a faint echo of the classical Judaean 'Priest-Prophet' and 'Pharisee-Sadducee' class struggle, wherein the predominant priestly administration is challenged by a rival faction which does not deny the priestly office its exalted function ( hence the Mišpāḥāh Haššibh'īm appoint their own priests ), but which resents the extension and expansion of that sacred authority into the secular
administrative arena.

On the question of the origin of the claim of the Mišpəḥəth Haṣṣibh'îm to independence and authority, the Chronicles are not specific. Had this arisen as a result of a rebellion by one particular "family" against the hegemony of the hereditary High Priestly administration, it is unlikely that Baba would have been so accommodating towards them. It is noteworthy that Chron. H2 nowhere uses the term Mišpəḥəh when referring to them. Conceivably, then, the word Mišpəḥəh, as used in H1, is to be understood in a wider sense than that suggested by the translation 'family'. It may require here to have the sense of "descendants" or "posterity" (cf. Gn.10: 30,31,32). The word "Mišpəḥəh" also occurs in the sense of 'a guild (of scribes)' (cf.1 Ch.2:55). The Mišpəḥəth Haṣṣibh'îm may be regarded, therefore, as a guild or clan who claimed descendence from the 'Seventy Elders' (צָקְנֵים) who wielded authority in the 'Era of favour'. (cf.6:6). At that time the (ideal) administration was shared between a lay judiciary of seventy Elders and a priestly coterie. These two bodies had complimentary, though specifically-delineated, areas of authority.

Our knowledge of Samaritan social history in the pre-Christian era is too scanty to determine whether or not the community preserved the executive body of 'Seventy Zəqēnîm'. That just such a body enjoyed judicial authority during the period of, and following, Joshua, is stated explicitly in that biblical book (cf.Josh.24:31), and this would, consequently, have remained a divinely commissioned legislature in Samaritan eyes. It is apposite, in this connection to refer to the Judaistic tradition
that 'Moses received the Torah on Sinai, and handed it down to Joshua, who handed it down to the "Elders", who handed it down to the Prophets' (Avot 1:1). As the Samaritans did not accept the religious legality or authority of "Prophets", their sacred writ breaks off after the book of Joshua; and consequently the climactic picture of their 'Era of Favour' is of a community ruled by Ziqenim. We have, in our Chronicle, a reflection of that situation; and the clan which now, in the period of Baba Rabbah, reserved unto itself an exclusive right of leadership and organization, appealed, for legitimation of that prerogative, to their claim to being the hereditary heirs of the office of the Sibhi'im, the 'Seventy Elders'.

The theory that the Mişpahath Haşsi'am derived its raison d'être from an assumed hereditary lineage back to the 'Seventy Elders' of the classical period is suggested by an introductory note, or gloss, to the episode, which contrasts the administrative organisation in the "Days of Favour" with that as instituted by Baba Rabbah:

'Now the above (sc.Baba's) arrangement did not operate during the Era of Favour. During the Era of Favour seventy chosen Elders constituted the sages of the community' (6:6).

As an introduction to the episode of the Mişpahath Haşsi'am, the above passage is clearly intended to provide the background to the latter's claim to authority, in the form of a custodial right to the historic judicial office of Ziqenim.
Baba's drastic re-organization of the Samaritan administration would have given the Mišpāḥāh their chance to press a claim to hereditary authority. His refusal to take account of the classical structure of seventy 'Elders' must have greatly frustrated the Mišpāḥah Haššib'îm, dashing their hopes of renewed prestige. Hence the rivalry between the two groups, and the zealous maintenance by the Mišpāḥāh of their own independent administration.

There is one problem, however, that still requires to be resolved. Does not the claim of a 4th cent. clan to have been the hereditary heirs of the 'Seventy Elders' of the classical "Era of Favour" sound rather fantastic? To have based a right to independent government upon that tenuous basis alone seems even more outrageous!

Before presuming to deal with this problem, one aspect of it has to be stated, and that is that if the evidence of the Chronicle, regarding their wealth and autonomy, is trustworthy, then it is highly inconceivable that all this influence, power and substance would have accrued to them purely as a practical concomitant of their claim to be the descendants of the Seventy Elders. The only alternative is to assume that they were not just a band of frustrated dreamers, harking back to a bygone era, some millennium before, when their ancestors had enjoyed leadership as Zêqēnîm, but rather that these were the descendants of a group that had wielded actual authority and leadership during the centuries immediately preceding Baba Rabbah, when the power of the High Priesthood was at very low ebb.
During the second and third centuries A.D., the Samaritan community lost much of its cohesion, in the face of intensified Roman persecution. This was especially grievous during the reigns of Commodus (180-192) and Alexander Severus (222-235). This resulted in a migration of Samaritans into the 'diaspora'. New locations were sought, and new avenues for trade and prosperity were discovered. By the 4th century, Samaritans were located in the coastal cities of Palestine, in Caesarea, Dor, Joppa, Ashkelon, Akko and Yavneh Yam. With the loosening cohesion of the community, the authority of the High Priesthood would inevitably become weakened. Under the repressive conditions — under which the High Priests themselves often bore the brunt — their ability to exercise control over such an extended, and ever widening, community, is very doubtful.

From the sociological point of view, no pioneering, religious community can function without some embodiment of its traditional authority. It is the presence of a traditional authority which gives it its sense of identity and continuity. The religious administration of the "diaspora" communities must have been entrusted to some authority which commanded the respect of the pioneers. This respect is more likely to have been earned by reason of wealth and influence, rather than by spiritual qualities alone. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the High Priest did, in fact, find it necessary to devolve his

1 Tolaidh, p.439.
2 Montgomery, p.143f.
authority to the emerging leadership of the new communities. This social and political situation would reflect very closely the similar devolution of authority that was going on at the same time in Judaistic circles. There, the Patriarch Hillel II had to surrender the most zealously guarded prerogative of his central office to the diaspora communities, namely, the independent right to regulate the calendar of the religious year. The same social and political pressures were at work upon both communities, and we may safely assume that the Samaritan High Priest was forced to make similar concessions to existing circumstances, in the form of devolved authority.

We should perhaps note here the fact that we are obviously trying to reconstruct a situation for which very little external or internal evidence exists. The paucity of internal information regarding the social history of the Samaritan community in the early Roman period is attributed by them to the persecution of Commodus, who destroyed the records of the community:

"He took many books, sacred scrolls, and many books of the Chronicles, as well as other books of hymns, and 'Books of the Sages' which were in their possession, and burned them in fire. Very little of that literature remained'.

(fol. 351, Unpubl.)

The expanding diaspora community suggests, as we have observed, the inevitability of a secondary authority to administer these areas. We suggest that this took the form of an assembly of "Elders". This assembly would have comprised the wealthy and powerful families who had moved into the coastal cities in order to involve themselves with trade
and banking. The "Elders" would have initially assumed their responsibility and authority under the aegis of the High Priest of Shechem. Ultimately, however, as their wealth and autonomy increased, they would have come to view themselves as a separate community with hereditary title to self-government. This would explain the reference in the Chronicle to 'their own localities and cities' (7: 3). Again we would have here a counterpart to the familiar Judaistic situation of tension and rivalry between the "Spiritual Centre" and the growing and flourishing diaspora.

The term "Haššibh'îm" was probably a later, apologetic appellation, justifying the rival authority, and investing it with undisputed status by giving it a hereditary link with the Seventy Elders of the Era of Favour.

As the diaspora developed, the power and leadership would presumably have become concentrated in the hands of influential "families"; hence the use of the term "Mišpāḥah". (We have an echo here of the Tobiad familial situation in early Judaea) We detect, in fact, a polemical note against this situation underlying 6: 9, which harps back to the structure of the organisation of the Seventy Elders in the Era of Favour:

'Now this rank was not to be an inheritance from father to son; but if one elder died, they would choose another in his place'.

We detect here a polemic against the power-structure of the Mišpāḥah Haššibh'îm which perpetuated itself precisely through wealthy families — 'from father to son'.

The Chronicler is making the point that if the Mišpāhāh der, in fact, derive its authority from a claim to uninterrupted lineage back to the Seventy Elders, then such a claim is refuted by the fact that the traditional "Elder" of the Era of Favour was not a hereditary office, and consequently no individual or clan could ever lay claim to it by inheritance.

There is an abstruse reference (7:6) to the Mišpāhāh sending matnōth ha-pahārōth to Baba. We have suggested (see Commentary ad loc.) that the meaning of the phrase might be "earthenware gifts," for use on the Sabbath. These were to replace metal utensils which might, inadvertently, be purified — in violation of the Sabbath — if they became unclean. If our interpretation is correct, we might conjecture that a donor who sees fit to send just such gifts would have a special sensitivity for the Sabbath day and the rigid laws controlling it. The Dositheans were, as we know, especially strict in regard to Sabbath observance. Might it not be conceivable, therefore, that Baba’s opponents — religious schismatics, with their own High Priest and sacerdotal hierarchy — were none other than an entrenched Dositean group?

The attempt of Baba Rabbah to limit the authority and independence of the Mišpāhath Haššibhim was an important part of his programme of centralizing Samaritan authority, and unifying the community. His efforts in that direction were, as we have seen, not wholly successful.
13. **BABA RABBAN AND THE CULTURAL ETHOS OF THE MEMAR MARQAH.**
The heading of this chapter was inspired by a recent study, conducted by A. Broadie, entitled "An investigation into the cultural ethos of the Samaritan Memar Marqah with special reference to the works of Philo of Alexandria (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Glasgow Univ. 1975)." Broadie deals extensively with a number of philological and theological motifs which recur in the Memar and which reflect a Hellenistic outlook or a polemical rejection of Greek philosophical ideas.

An analysis of the religious philosophy of Baba Rabbi, as reflected in the Chronicles, and its relationship to ideas and teachings in the Memar Marqah, is crucial to any discussion of the extent to which Baba's ideas and reforms foreshadowed and influenced the thinking of succeeding generations, and especially the 4th cent. religious and literary renaissance which found expression in the foundation of the Deftor and the development of such theological systems as that of the Memar Marqah.

Broadie quotes a number of passages illustrative of the Memar's idea of divine love, mercy, and compassion, and also of the tension between these concepts and that of divine justice (pp. 215-226). Broadie noted a kind of *leitmotiv* in the Memar, that the God of the Samaritans lacks arbitrariness or capriciousness in his dealing with men, being the author of a set of immutable laws of justice from which, for metaphysical reasons, no man can successfully seek exemption (p. 215). This doctrine apparently stands squarely opposed to the concept of divine mercy and compassion, which suggests a "capricious" decision by God, in chosen circumstances, to set aside the severe decree and grant a reprieve to erring man.
The solution to this problem lies, according to Broadie, in the specific circumstances under which the divine compassion is displayed. Divine love or compassion — according to Marquah — is only shown as a concomitant of an earnest expression by man of his true love of God. 'Divine love is a recompense for godly deeds' (p.225). 'God's love, mercy, compassion and pity are not merely gratuitously bestowed on men. They have to be earned, and are earned by living a godly life' (p.224).

Throughout the speeches of exhortation uttered by Baba Rabba to his compatriots we detect this awareness that divine mercy and compassion have to be earned and justified by the actions of the community. There is never an isolated appeal to divine justice for its own sake, unaccompanied by a well-reasoned and fully-argued "case", justifying the showing of mercy and proving it to be more than well-deserved and well-earned. To take but one example:

God's mercy is always conditional; it is only displayed as a response to man's effort to secure it. Mercy, for its own, or for God's, sake is irrational; it cannot be synthesized with the conception of a divine brand of justice that has already taken account of the merciful consideration and woven it into the warp of his immutable justice.

Baba constantly calls for special and unique devotion to God; devotion of the kind that could wrest the desired compassion
from Him, it is nothing short of נָאַפְת ("zeal") that is expected of them. This נָאַפְת is spelled out to the community in the clearest of terms. It is of the same quality and intensity as that which motivated Simon and Levi, 'two brothers who displayed zeal for the Lord' (2: 1), in destroying all the men of Shechem. It is the zeal of the tribe of Levi at the time of the Golden Calf (2: 3), and of Phinehas 'who was zealous for the Lord his God' (2: 6). It is the zeal of all the forefathers (2: 9) who have ever distinguished themselves through being the agents through whom divine mercy was channelled to the community in its hours of peril.

The quality of נָאַפְת being especially efficacious in the lives and activity of these former leaders, the Chronicler emphasizes the fact that Baba was qualified to aspire to leadership, and to undertake his heroic and unparalleled exploits, only by reason of the fact that he was, himself, uniquely endowed with a superabundance of that same ingredient of zeal: 'Zeal for the Lord was continuously in his heart, and he was endowed with holy spirit' (1: 5). This same quality of נָאַפְת is attributed to Levi, Baba's nephew, enabling him to perform deeds of great valour, and especially to effect the destruction of the Roman kings and their armies on Mount Gerizim: 'And Levi arose with great qin'ăh' (19: 57). The very concurrence of God in Baba's plan for the deliverance of his people was secured only ' on account of the great zeal he revealed in communing with the Lord, his God' (1: 9).

There was, however, a subtle distinction between the zeal displayed by Levi (and others) and that possessed by Baba Rabbah.
In the case of the former, it was an inherited qin'ah, a national characteristic, implanted through the traditional teachings and a keen sense of loyalty and love for the ancestral faith. In the case of Baba, it is suggested that he was, in fact, the recipient of an actual revelation of the very essence, or hypostatization, of qin'ah. This is disclosed by Baba in his very first speech to the people — ראה הכנור espresso — 'The spirit of zeal communed with my heart' (1: 11). Baba's qin'ah was an external agent, force or spirit, which possessed his heart and controlled all his activities from that moment onwards. It is conceivable that this appeal to a revelatory qin'ah-spirit was essential in order to re-inforce Baba's claim to authority. It must not be overlooked that, according to the accepted norms of Samaritan succession, Baba's prospects of assuming leadership of the community as his High Priestly prerogative were fairly remote. His father Netan'el, the High Priest, was a young man. He actually lived until the last days of Baba himself — traditionally a period of forty years. Baba's action in assuming leadership and sole authority would, quite naturally, have been regarded as a usurpation and a gross act of filial rebellion, calculated to alienate rather than win over the masses. The disclosure, however, that he had been "called" by revelatory qin'ah-spirit, silenced all opposition. None could quibble with such a claim.

The Chronicler makes it clear that this zeal was not merely nationalist in colour. Baba's intention was not just to restore the fortunes of the Samaritan community but, first
and foremost, 'to restore the Israelite faith' (H1, 1: 12), or 'to establish the law of the Prophet Moses' (H2, 1: 11, 16: 24). Baba, in deed and word, established thereby the principle that compassion and mercy, as well as reward, cannot be expected of God until the community, as a whole, is able to wrest it from God by the strength of their spiritual resolve and faith.

Thus, the *leitmotiv* which Broadie highlighted in the Homar, that God's love or mercy is awarded neither arbitrarily nor without good reason, is clearly and forcefully foreshadowed in the exhortations of Baba Rabbah. Baba represents, in fact, an even more extreme viewpoint on this issue of the exact quality of relationship with God which requires to be displayed and pursued by man in order for him to become the recipient of divine mercy. For Marqah, 'God's love for man is in return for man's love of God' (Broadie, op.cit., p.224); for Baba, God's love for man is in return for man's zeal for God. The zeal, or *gin'āh*, is a more positive, intensive, even aggressive determination not only to love Him, and to enter into a close personal relationship with Him, but to go onto the offensive, and to be zealous in eradicating any antagonism to Him and to His law on the part of others. Hence the exemplification by Baba of heroes of the ilk of Simeon and Levi - who eradicated harlotry - and Phinehas and the tribe of Levi, who smote even their own brethren after the idolatry of the Golden Calf. It is not merely in one or two areas of religious and moral expression that *gin'āh* is called for. Baba calls upon the community to become, in effect, a community of zealots, namely, to develop *gin'āh* as a national characteristic. This is the import of the expression 'לְשׁוֹרֵךְ לְעֹנְךָ מִצְצָמָיו לְנוֹخذָה' (2: 14).
This qin'āh-characteristic might well be an expression of imitation Dei. In one passage in the Chronicle, God is actually invoked as qin'āh (3:35), the (embodiment of) zeal, a term inspired by the the reference to God the Decalogue as '31 Qanna' (Ex.20:5; Dt.5:9).

That Baba's theology should have become diluted, and divested of some of its martial quality when taken into the Marqan system, is not surprising. Its influence in Baba's own day would have been in consonance with the militaristic zeal required by the need of the hour. Once the armed insurrection, and Samaritan efforts at securing their own independence, had been thwarted, the concept of "a community of zealots" lost its appeal and charisma. Baba's thinking nevertheless left its traces in the Memar; and the qin'āh of Baba's system gave way to a doctrine of positive and vigorous spiritual achievement as a prerequisite to divine mercy. In Marqah this assumes the proportions of a leitmotiv, which denies God's mercy to those who have not earned it.

But this doctrine is not to be regarded merely as a uniquely Marqan innovation, introduced in order to fill the gap left by the abandonment of the qin'āh doctrine. In fact, the denial of God's mercy to those who have not earned it finds an even clearer and blunter expression in our Chronicle than in the Memar itself:

'Lord God, if our iniquity is too great for you to bear, do not chastise us for this together with the wicked. Rather let us be taken into your presence by the agency of death, than that
those wicked ones should brutally achieve our destruction. If it is our guilt that has prevented Your being close to us, and Your salvation from reaching us, let not the enemies of Your law have dominion over us' (3: 18-19).

There is no humble or desperate plea here for divine mercy to be shown where it is clearly unearned. Baba could not entertain such a notion, if the transgressions of the community ever merited its destruction, that would be immutable justice. Baba's only plea, under such circumstances, would be that the instruments of their death should not be such as are even more unworthy than themselves (3: 19, 22).

This theology is not merely conceptual thinking, but translates itself into a practical approach to certain conditions of life. Since immutable divine justice demands that the quality of compassion cannot arbitrarily be dispensed, except when it is fully-deserved and truly-earned (when it ceases, in fact, to become compassion, but rather justice), so that it "is impossible for pity and compassion to serve as a motive for divine action" (Broadie, p.220), and since divine action is the only true model for humans to emulate, it follows then that where violence has been perpetrated, with no subsequent expression of unsolicited remorse, then justice will have to run its full course, with no place allowed to compassion or mercy. (This is expressed graphically by the Kesar: 'If the Prophet Moses himself were to pray for us when we were in evil, his prayer would not be accepted' (1, 67; 11,107).
This alone explains what, at first glance, appears to be a rather heartless and ruthless attitude of Baba Rabbah in dealing with his enemies. In section 16 of the Chronicle we have an account of the abortive attempt by the inhabitants of Homara to attack Baba on the Sabbath day. When the attempt fails, the hapless conspirators make a full and spontaneous confession of guilt, and an admission of the righteousness of Baba Rabbah. Their undoubtedly sincere remorse finds no quiver of compassion, however, in the breast of Baba. 'There is no obligation upon me (ittī 'āyn hayāḥ) to spare your lives', he tells them (10: 29). The import of the Hebrew phrase is that it would necessitate a religious directive, specifically prescribing and insisting upon mercy, before he would be permitted to exercise it.

The phrase hayāḥ 'āl occurs elsewhere in the Chronicle (14: 22) in the identical sense of a 'binding obligation to make a gesture of response to an action of another party', this time an obligation to reciprocate benefits conferred by God by a reciprocal gesture of praise, prayer and thanks. It is used to convey the idea of an imperative about which there can be no discussion or concession. Baba is saying, in effect, that it is not in his hands to dispense anything other than stern judgement, namely a suitable punishment to fit the gravity of the crime. Hence his decision to slay every single adult, male and female, even though the latter took no part in the attack.
Broadie (op.cit.p.206), referring to the Marqan doctrine of repentance, quotes a passage from the Nemas which speaks in denunciation of those who turn aside from the light of the law of Moses. The passage concludes, 'they call upon Him but He does not answer' (1,97). Broadie explains this surprising assertion of Marqan, that God makes Himself deaf even in the face of an expression of sincere remorse ('They call Him'), by suggesting that a distinction is made, in the eyes of Marqan, between the true penitents and those who go through the motions of prayer by uttering, but without sincerity, the appropriate formulae (p.207).

The merciless attitude of Baba Kabbah towards the people of Nemara is in line with the above teaching of the Nemas. The protestation of remorse, uttered by the townspeople, was not regarded by Baba as true repentance, because it was induced by fear of the consequences of their action, and was, consequently, devoid of the nesfruth (cf.3:10, 4:7 et al.) — pure sincerity — which Baba insists upon in all relationships. It was tantamount to going through the motions of prayer by uttering religious formulae. As God 'does not answer' such a call, so Baba felt unable to respond to the remorse of the people of Nemara.

It is apposite to note that Baba did not expect his enemies to deal with him other than along the lines dictated by immutable justice. When the realization dawned upon him that his stay in Constantinople was, in fact, an imprisonment, he did not carp or plead for mercy:

רָכְבָה הַשָּׁכֵל וְאֶרֶץ גְּדוֹלָה לָא צִבְּרָנָה עַל הַשָּׁכֵל גְּדוֹלָה הָאָרֶץ
Baba accepted the king's right to dispense immutable justice, and he accepted it with dignified resignation.
Again, we may refer to the account of Moses' death in the
Nemar (book v.), and especially the reaction of Moses to the
divine announcement of Moses' impending death. Moses responds
with praise and worship: 'Thou dost not show partiality, not
to prophet nor righteous man.' God's justice is immutable,
for it is indistinguishable from His mercy, and inseparable
from it. Baba propagated such ideas, and acted according to
their practical implication (Cf MacDonald, Theology, pp.114-5).

Notwithstanding the above exposition, which explains Baba's
violent treatment of the men of Nemara in the context of his
specific ideology, the Chronicler was, nevertheless, rather
sensitive on the issue of their wholesale slaughter. Hence
his attempt to justify Baba's action in the light of Pentateuchal
law: 'And he slew them and burned them in fire, acting in
accordance with the word of the Lord in His holy law,"And
you shall do to him as he sought to do to his brother".'
(Dt.19:19).

It need hardly be pointed out that this law deals specifically
with the crime of perjury, testifying falsely in a court of
law. The extension of this law, in order to insist on 
with all cases where a physical attack on another is planned
or perpetrated, and to justify thereby the rejection of mercy
in all circumstances, is to violate the sense of the biblical
text and the spirit of the Mosaic law.

Whether Baba was motivated by personal feelings of outrage
and hatred against the people of Nemara, or whether he was
indeed strictly applying his fundamentalistic viewpoint on
the theological issue of divine justice versus mercy, remains
an open question.
In terms of cosmology (or concepts of creation) we find close points of contact between the terminology of the Chronicle and ideas on this subject current in the Margah.

One of the clearest statements on the subject of creation, found in the Chronicle, is contained in 3:10:

חלה יהוה אלהוה גוראם אברעם העדן ודיין זכריהו

Basically, it is the design of creation - that which is within human comprehension and experience - which concerns Baba. His philosophical thoughts, as preserved in the Chronicle, are not presented as part of a theological or philosophical exposition, but rather in the context of prayers and meditations. They consequently employ the terms with which his non-sophisticated contemporaries would have been familiar.

We may assume, therefore, that the ideas underlying the terms in the above passage were part and parcel of the generally accepted conception of God in Baba's time, possibly even enjoying the status of a catechism.

Margah frequently refers to God as 'the Creator and the Fashioner', language which Broadie (p. 263ff.) regards as suggestive of the philosophical distinction between "form" and "matter" of the res creata. "Creator" would then refer exclusively to the creation of matter; "Fashioner" to the act of giving a form.

In the above-quoted passage from the Chronicle (3:10) we have an even clearer formulation of this distinction between "matter" and "form". The phrase חלה יהוה אלהוה is pregnantly indeterminate. Its sense is 'He brought into
existence that which was endowed with existence" — a clear reference to "matter". But "matter" requires a "form" in which to express its existence. Consequently — Baba continues — and fashioned it (the 'matter') with wisdom'. The transition from the plural (םהט), familiarity) to the singular (םה) further supports the conclusion that Baba had "matter" in mind.

For Baba, the creation of "matter" was effected by God's נון. The providing of the "form", however, was through the agency of His יִהוּד. These attributes are not used arbitrarily. נון occurs only once in the Pentateuch and not once in the book of Joshua. We can therefore be quite sure of the context that suggested its usage to the Chronicler, namely 1K 3:2: 29. This passage speaks of God 'riding the skies' through the instrument of His נון. The word does not suggest "pride" or even "majesty" — the usual renderings of the translations — but, rather, "mastery" (of the cosmos), "supremacy" (over matter), or "creative power". This nuance clearly underlies the root-meaning of נון, "to rise up", suggestive of "pre-eminence". That the concept of God 'riding the skies' was popular as a synonym for the pre-eminence of God is clear from a number of passages in Harqah. In hymn xi,20 we read: 'O Rider of Heaven, the world is under Thy power'. It is clearly in that sense of "power" that נון is to be understood.

Thus it was the possession of "divine mastery" or "power" that enabled Him to effect the creation of matter. But to give "form" required a different attribute. This was an artistic activity, and consequently needed the employment of Hokmah.
This is not merely "wisdom". It is essentially the same technical term as used in Ex. 28: 3 (-rich hokmah) to
denote the prerequisite skill for designing the appurtenances
of the sanctuary. The artists who are to be deputed to the
task of designing and fashioning the vessels of the sanctuary
all have one thing in common: they are all hokmah liwhn
(Ex. 28: 3; 31: 6; 36:1, 2). Bezalel, the chief designer, was
filled with the spirit of God, with ( hokmah ) wisdom.
(Ex.35: 31). Thus, we may conclude that when Baba refers
to God as having "fashioned" matter with hokmah, he has
in mind specifically the concept of giving (artistic) "form"
to the res creat.  

We may now make an observation pertinent to the thorny
question of 4th cent. Samaritan opinion regarding the doctrine
of creation ex nihilo. The passage from our Chronicle (3: 10),
quoted above, side-steps the issue by referring to the "acts"
of creation and fashioning, rather than to the origin and
nature of the material out of which creation was effected.
Broadie (op. cit.266-7) asserts that 'since Marqah employs
so many expressions in the course of referring to the
divine creative activity, and since so little is known of the
precise conceptual distinctions Marqah indicates in using
this rich vocabulary, it seems at the present stage of
Samaritan research rash to attempt to conclude ... that
Marqah espoused the doctrine of creation ex nihilo'. All
this notwithstanding, Broadie himself inclines to accept
the view that Marqah did espouse that doctrine, admitting
that 'the weight of evidence in the Nomer and also the
Better hymns appear to provide support for it.

A passage from our Chronicle provides, we believe, an important piece of evidence to support the thesis that the concept of creation *ex nihilo* was indeed developed in Baba's time. Baba refers to God as "the non-existence before creation", i.e. the "state" of things before the act of creating was effected. The preposition *אֵּל* is, however, problematic in this sense. According to Cowley's interpretation we should rather expect a preposition of time, such as * יהוה or *היה", providing a rendering 'And existence emerged after non-existence'. The preposition *אֵל* is, in this context, suggestive rather of material "from which" the world was created. The above passage from the Chronicle would substantiate this, since its sense is clearly 'God...who created the existing things *out of* that which lacked (existence), namely, *ex nihilo*.'

The early Samaritan Chronicler understandably found the idea of *ex nihilo* creation difficult to express in the Samaritan Hebrew or aramaic. From another (unpublished) passage in Chronicle II, we have supporting evidence, however, that this was the notion he was struggling to enunciate:

פּוֹלַש

(Fol. 349)
The use of the verb "םַמֵּא" together with our crux phrase "רְבּוּיָה" leaves us in no doubt that it is not "pre-existence" that is being highlighted - as Cowley would have it - but rather the concept of creation "אַלְם נָהֵלָה". Had Brodie been aware of the occurrence and significance of this phrase, his uncertainty on the issue of whether or not 'God created the world by informing a pre-existent matter which came from nothing' (op. cit., p. 265) would have been resolved. The phrase "רְבּוּיָה" is clearly intended to convey not only the distinction between "matter" and "form", but also the idea that the creation of the former preceded the latter.
14. **THE LOCATION OF BABA'S SYNAGOGUES ACCORDING TO THE ACCOUNT OF THE CHRONICLER**
THE LOCATION OF BABA'S SYNAGOGUES ACCORDING TO THE ACCOUNT OF THE CHRONICLER.

The location of Baba's Synagogues is given in 8:11-18. Seven Synagogues are referred to, each bearing the name of the village or town wherein they were built. An eighth Synagogue is referred to as having been built by Baba Rabbah, but the Chronicler admits that Samaritan tradition has not preserved details of its location.¹ H1 quotes an oral tradition, however, which identifies the eighth Synagogue with the 'Stone Kinâ' which once stood 'between Elôn Môre' and Mount Gerizim', and whose site was still known in the Chronicler's own day.² H2 is apparently unaware of such an identification.

There is agreement in the Chronicles regarding the names of the Synagogues, although various orthographic, possibly dialectal, variations do occur.

Archaeology is of limited help in identifying the exact location of all these Synagogues. Even the survival of similar sounding Arabic village names is no guarantee of an exact location, though it frequently serves as a useful guide, at least to the area where an identification might be hazarded. Some of the information regarding the location of the sites, as contained in our Chronicle, is patently conflicting. The best we can do is to assemble

1 See 8:18.
2 Ibid.
the source material and other references regarding the individual locations referred to in the Chronicle, and attempt to reconstruct, on the basis of this disparate material, the map of Baba's Synagogue sites and the significance of the particular arrangement of the Synagogues which emerges from the geographical scheme.

Baba's first Synagogue was built in the town of Ḥmartāh. H2 calls the town ˁabhūrtāh, and other orthographic variants are ˁabbartāh, Ḥmartāh, Ḥabhūrtāh and Matʾabbartāh. The latter form suggests that the original name was derived from the word maʾābhar² or maʾbārāh, a ford, pass.³ The Talmud makes reference to Matʾabbartāh Sel Kūthim ('Matʾabbartāh of the Samaritans'),⁴ where Apostomos is supposed to have burned scrolls of the Torah.

The town was known in antiquity as an important historical site, both in Judaean as well as Samaritan tradition. It is identified, in both traditions, with the 'Hill of Phinehas',⁵ and, as stated in our Chronicle,⁶ is the traditional burial-place of the sons of Aaron, the Seventy Elders and many other High Priests. Chronicle

1 See 8:11.
2 Gn.32:23.
3 Jos.2:7.
4 T.B. Ta'anith 4,5.
5 Jos.24:30.
6 8:11.
Adler adds to this list the name of 'Abhišū ben Phineḥās, great grandson of Aaron, who is supposed to have written the ancient Torah scroll in the possession of the community to the present day.

'Amartāh's location, according to our Chronicle, is given simply as east of Shechem. It lies more exactly about 6 kl. south-east of the city, and it was the administrative centre of the Samaritan High Priests for centuries. Baba made his headquarters there,¹ and most of his religious and diplomatic activity was conducted from there. This explains why 'Amartāh is placed first in the list of Baba's Synagogues, indicative of its significance as the seat of government, second only to the Holy Mount. Its proximity to Shechem enabled the Priests and inhabitants of the city and surrounding areas to pay weekly courtesy calls on their leader.²

The spiritual significance of 'Amartāh is emphasised by a number of Samaritan writers. In a 14th cent. piyyut, 'Abhišū becomes idealised as one of the four pillars upon which the Garden of Eden is supported.³ There is an echo here of the Aggadic significance woven around Jerusalem in Jewish tradition.

Baba's Synagogue was still standing at the beginning of the 13th cent., as evidenced from the colophon of a

1 See Chr.ii, 15:4.
2 15:8.
3 Cowley, p.512.
Torah scroll, written in the year 1215 by one Aaron ben Levi ben Isaac 'of the priests of Ḥaburah'. I. Ben Zevi believes that the Samaritan settlement in the town came to an end at the time of the rupture of the chain of priests from the seed of Aaron. The last priest was Solomon ben Phinehas, who died in 1624, and when the Levites were summoned to take over the priestly duties they probably left Ḥamarsah and moved to Shechem.

The second Synagogue is referred to as Beth Nimrah by H1 and Beth naamrah by H2. Chronicle Adler, however, places the Synagogue of Qryth Harah second in the list, after Ḥamarsah, and makes Beth Nimrah the third in the order.

The identification of the town is uncertain. It is referred to again by the Chronicler in his account of the period of Mēran ben Alhakim (684-5). It is related that the high Priest 'Aqbon went to Transjordan where he drowned in the waters of the Jordan. He was taken to the town of Beth Nimrah and buried. This suggests that the town was situated close to the Jordan.

A town by the name of Beth-Nimrah is listed in Josh.13:27. It is identified in rabbinic literature with a place then known as Nimrin. The latter is identified with the Arab village of Tal al Bleibil, 40 km. east of Bethel, which

1 S.H. p.65.
3 Shabbith 9,7; Ketūbōth 2,7; Tal.Rosh Hashānāh 57b.
would, indeed, place it on the south-east boundary of Samaria. From the account of the attempt by the inhabitants of Nimrah to assassinate Baba Rabbah\(^1\) we learn that it was a town inhabited by both Samaritans and Jews, which would further suggest a town on the border of Samaritan territory. Baba's son, Levi, settled in Beth Nimrah and was buried there.

The third Synagogue in our Chronicle's list is that of Qryth Ḥagāh. Its identification is problematic, as is the etymology of the name. A.P. Löw refers to the Aramaic word Ḥagāh\(^2\) (Mandaic Ḥagia, Arabic ءاج) as the name of 'a prickly desert plant, camel-thorn, *hedysarum al hagi*.\(^2\)

Ḥ1 tells us that Ḥagāh was still standing 'until this very day'. Unfortunately the Hebrew is ambiguous, and the phrase might refer to the city and not to the Synagogue. The difficulty is intensified when we come to the directions referred to in both Ḥ1 and Ḥ2 in order to identify the location of Ḥagāh. Ḥ1 states that Ḥagāh is in a southern direction opposite the town of ʕSkor.\(^3\) Ḥ2 states that 'it is south of Shechem in a northerly direction, leading to (text difficult) Mahnayim'.\(^4\) The difficulties inherent in both of these definitions are obvious. Ḥ1's 'southern direction' has no point of reference. We must assume that

\(^{1}\) See 15:19.


\(^{3}\) והרא את הגבעה אשר היא_leא מועד קירית עטריר. On ʕSkor, see Mont.,p.20

\(^{4}\) Ḥ2 version: מיון בּוּבֶבִּים לֵא צָלֵל אוּתָנוֹּת לֵא חֵלִים.
'southern' is in relation to Shechem, as in H2. The H2 version seems to contradict itself. Sense can be made of the statement, however, if the phrase בהר הגן, 1 (rendered above 'leading to Mahnayim') is interpreted in the sense of 'in relation to Mahnayim'. H2 would then be identifying הָֽגָ֥ה as 'south of Shechem and due north of Mahnayim'.

Even on the above interpretation some area of doubt remains regarding the identification of the site, since there are two places, each bearing the name Mahnayim, on the same latitude just south of Shechem. The Samaritan Mahnayim is a mere 4 km. south of Shechem, and the biblical city of Mahnayim is 35 km. due east. While the Samaritan location would seem to be the one referred to, we cannot rule out the possibility that Baba erected Synagogues near the River Jordan to serve the outlying communities. This is also suggested by the location of one other Synagogue along the eastern boundary, that of Beth Nimra. 3

Baba's fourth Synagogue is called תֵֽירָּא, in H1 and 'Al-Ṭirāh in H2. An Arab village bearing the latter name is situated 30 km. west of Nablus.'Al-Ṭirāh was thought to be the relay station Mutatio Betthar, mentioned by the 4th cent. Bordeaux Traveller. Under the Namluks (14th cent.) it was a wayfarers' inn (khān). 4

1 8:13 (H2).
2 See notes ad loc.
3 See above, p. 1150.
Baba's fifth Synagogue was built in the town of Sabarin, or Sabrin according to Adler. The identification of this location is facilitated by the additional information provided by H1, that 'it is one of the towns of the Shephelah. From the Samaria Ostraca\(^1\) we have been able to identify a place called by the modern Arabic name of Saffarin (Spher), about 7 km. west of Samaria, which suits exactly the Shephelah identification of H1.\(^2\)

The sixth Synagogue was built in the city of Sâlem. Its location is fairly certain, being identified with the Arab village of Salîm, 8 km. north-east of Shechem. Chronicle Adler adds, 'but its name was Êî originally'. If the biblical Êî is meant here, it is an impossible identification. Kefar Sâlem is referred to in the Talmud\(^3\) as a Samaritan village.

Baba's seventh Synagogue was erected in the town of Bêth Dârân. The name occurs in Jos.19:27, as well as in Assyrian inscriptions\(^4\) as one of the cities conquered by Sennacherib. It is mentioned together with Joppa as belonging to the king of Ashkelon, and may consequently be identified with the Arabic name Beit Da'jan, 10 km. south-east of Joppa. The geographical location given in the Chronicle — 'north-east of the holy mountain' — is therefore inaccurate. It is, in fact, north-west!

\(^{\text{References}}\)
3 P.Tal.'Abhôdah Zarah, 5,4.
At the beginning of this chapter we referred to the eighth Synagogue which Baba is supposed to have built, but whose site was unknown to the Chroniclers. Whereas Chronicle II states that 'some say' that it was the Stone Synagogue (kindath 'Abhnathah) which once stood between Elôn Môre' and Mount Gerizim', Chronicle Adler states categorically that the name of the eighth Synagogue was K'nîsath 'Abhnathah.

What exactly this name signifies appears problematic at first. It could hardly be a distinguishing characteristic, highlighting the material out of which the Synagogue was built, since we are informed that all Baba's Synagogues were made of stone — 'Not one of them was of timber'. It seems clear then that it is a special 'Stone' that gave its name to the eighth Synagogue.

The proximity of Elôn Môre to Shechem — if not the identity of the two places — is first stated in Gen.12:6. Dt.11:30 mentions Elôn Môre as being next to Gilgal. According to Ju.9:6 Abimelech was crowned king 'beside the old propped-up terebinth ('Elôn) which is in Shechem'. The actual terebinth was an ancient shrine, and Gn.35:4 records that Jacob buried all the idolatrous objects of his household 'under the terebinth ('Elâh) which is near (tim) Shechem'.
It is from Jos.24:27 that, we suggest, the name 'Abhnathah ('The Stone') derives. In that verse we are told that Joshua, having made a covenant of spiritual rededication with the people at Shechem, 'wrote its terms in a book of the Law of God. He then took a great stone and set it up there under the terebinth (Allāh) which was in the sanctuary of the Lord'. It is more than likely that the Synagogue which was later built on the site of the sanctuary took its name from the stone which Joshua had buried on the site. Alternatively — unless the traditions emanate from a common source — we may explain the association of the stone with the one which Jacob placed beneath his head\(^1\) and which he later set up as a masṣēḇāh\(^2\) which he designated as the cornerstone of the house of God.

The 'Stone Synagogue' seems to have had a long history, Samaritan priests having ministered there for centuries. According to Yusuf b. Salama (11th cent.), on the thrice-yearly Pilgrim Festivals the High Priest, after blessing the people, would repair to the 'Stone Kīnṣa'.\(^3\) According to J. Bowman 'this probably refers to Baba's Synagogue, which stood from the 4th cent. until the Crusades'.\(^4\) However, the 'Stone Kīnṣa' seems to have still been standing towards the end of the 15th cent.

\(^1\) Gn.28:11.
\(^2\) Gn.28:18.
This is apparent from the ascription דוֹמִין כֹּהָנִי הָאֶבֶּחָן given to one Jacob b. Joseph, who made a copy of a Torah scroll in the year 1496. Baba's Synagogue survived, therefore, for a period of some eleven hundred years.

H1 (alone), in its description of the eighth Synagogue of 'Abbnáthâh, states that 'it contained three hundred and sixty rooms, corresponding to the days of the year'. The legendary character of this tradition goes without saying. The number 'three hundred' is suspicious, as, if a true correspondence were desired with the length of the year, then the exact number of rooms should have been constructed, namely three hundred and fifty four, to accord with the lunar year observed by the Samaritans.

Furthermore, had any Samaritan Synagogue been built to such dimensions, it would have become a national monument, known and referred to in their historical and liturgical writings. It would not have been a once-mentioned and obscure tradition, and it would, undoubtedly, have been described by travellers and writers.

Again, had Baba decided to construct one such edifice, he would have been most likely to have chosen יִבְּנַרְתָּה, his own religious and administrative headquarters! Such a magnificent showpiece would also hardly have been placed last in his list of Synagogues!

Finally, it goes without saying that no such Samaritan

1 Chr.11, 8:18.
2 See Montgomery, p.34.
or even Judaeo-Synagogue of such proportions has ever been discovered in Palestine. Quite the contrary, as S. Baron has noted, 'Archaeological investigations have proved beyond question that the Synagogues of Israel were small'.

One may only speculate as to how such a fantastic tradition may have arisen. The eighth Synagogue is clearly the one Baba built on the sacred mountain. This is notwithstanding the description of its location as 'between 'Elon More' and Mount Gerizim Bethel'. The name 'Abhnathah, as we have observed, refers to Jacob's stone or Joshua's stone — both of which were associated with the sanctuary. In this context we may quote the comment of J. Bowman, referring to the Samaritan pilgrim procession up Mount Gerizim:

Then the pilgrim parties start out reading Deuteronomy, until they reach the stone...

The identity of the stone is not clear, but it may be the stone of testimony that Joshua set up at the Beth ha-Miqdash at Shechem (Josh.xxiv, 26). It is obviously an important place, for at no other place where they stop on the pilgrimage on the way up do they read any of Deuteronomy. In al-Kafi, in the section on prayer, reference is made to Jacob's pillar, as if it were on the

1 S. Baron, *The Jewish Community*, 1, p.92.
2 Bowman's italics.
lower ridges, and it is true the lower ridge is called Jacob's Pillar, Stone of Israel ... However, at the foot of Gerizim there is a place called the "Pillar". The modern Samaritans regard it as the true site of Joshua's Stone by the oak (Josh. xxiv, 26).  

We see from this extract that medieval Samaritan tradition associated the 'Stone' or 'Pillar' of Jacob with that of Joshua, and at the same time associated the site of both the biblical events not with Shechem or its environs, but with the slopes or lower ridges of the Holy Mountain itself.  

If the name 'Synagogue of the Stone' does refer to the Synagogue on Mount Gerizim associated with the famous 'Pillar' of Jacob or Joshua or both, we may wonder then at the rather general or vague reference to it as simply 'The Stone' (I'Abhnathah). Of course, it might be explained as a superlative, The Stone, par excellence. On the other hand, the absence of any reference to Jacob or Joshua might be explained as originating from the Dosithean denigration of Gerizim, and their substitution of prayer services in any Synagogue for pilgrimage and sacrifice at Mount Gerizim.  

A Dosithean glossator would not have wished to invest the Synagogue of Baba on Mount Gerizim with any unique

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

1 J. Bowman, op. cit., p. 23.

2 This association would in fact do justice to the biblical references to 'the House of God' (Gen. 28:17, 18) and 'the Sanctuary of the Lord' (Josh. 24:26, 27) in connection with 'The Stone'.

3 J. Bowman, ibid.
significance, and he was probably responsible for placing it last in the list of Synagogues, instead of first, and also for the vague title *Kinsath 'Abhnathāh*, omitting any specific reference to its biblical significance.

The legend of the three hundred rooms very likely was developed in anti-Dosithean circles. The latter would have viewed the Synagogue on Gerizim as a place of special significance and pilgrimage. Indeed, pilgrimages were still obligatory when Baba established his Synagogues. The association of Baba's Synagogue with the thrice-yearly pilgrimages, and the fact that the pilgrimage liturgy formed the kernel of the Synagogual Deftar, may well explain the strange tradition in our Chronicle linking Baba's 'Stone Synagogue' with 'the days of the year'. A further flight of imagination depicted the Synagogue as an edifice with 'a room for each day of the year'.

If we plot the location of all Baba's Synagogues on a map, we will immediately detect that their sites were not randomly chosen. They seem to have been determined by the Holy Mountain. They all lie around the circumference of a circle with Shechem and 'Amartah at the epi-centre. The purpose of such an arrangement was probably two-fold: to reinforce Baba's political aspiration of centralising authority (Shechem being

.........................

1 J. Bowman, *ibid.*
the traditional seat of the High Priests and 'Amartah being Baba's own administrative centre), and also that 'Amartah should be more or less equidistant from each Synagogue to facilitate travel to each in turn, both by Baba on his tours of inspection and by the inhabitants of those towns who wished to visit their leader on Sabbaths, New Moons and Festivals.
15. WORD LIST
WORD LIST (I)

(Included in this Word List are (i) new or rare vocabulary, (ii) unusual grammatical forms, (iii) biblical words used in the Chronicle with different nuances, (iv) verbs occurring in conjugations other than those appearing in the Bible, (v) non-Biblical and Aramaic words, or forms, used in a special sense, (vi) verbs taking unusual prepositions.

The references are to the section and sentence of our Hebrew text, with asterisks denoting the H2 version. For the significance of the various forms, the commentary should be consulted. Only one reference is listed, although the particular word or form may occur more than once in the Chronicle.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יד全面建成</td>
<td>7:4*</td>
<td>22:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בעיון</td>
<td>3:11</td>
<td>1:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בニック</td>
<td>18:1*</td>
<td>21:16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ania</td>
<td>16:15*</td>
<td>20:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּאוּ</td>
<td>19:61</td>
<td>19:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דָּוִיד</td>
<td>24:9*</td>
<td>17:1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מיקום</td>
<td>מספר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בד</td>
<td>8:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מצות</td>
<td>22:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נשים</td>
<td>15:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חותנו</td>
<td>5:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_emb</td>
<td>3:1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אחתים</td>
<td>22:1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מרבה</td>
<td>15:5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ימנ</td>
<td>1:10*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מקסימים</td>
<td>2:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בחבר</td>
<td>22:15*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דינה</td>
<td>19:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אגרה</td>
<td>8:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>משה</td>
<td>19:31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ברון</td>
<td>15:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צרובים</td>
<td>21:8*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חוב</td>
<td>7:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יוחנן</td>
<td>16:11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תרזה</td>
<td>6:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רוחני</td>
<td>1:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newsletter</td>
<td>24:9*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גול</td>
<td>19:55*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כבר</td>
<td>6:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נור</td>
<td>1:11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רגלה</td>
<td>19:11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נור</td>
<td>19:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>合理性</td>
<td>11:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ומכל</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>מַעַּכֶּרֶת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>מַעַּכֶּרֶת</td>
<td>21:17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>בֵּית</th>
<th></th>
<th>חַשְׁבּוֹ</th>
<th>11:13*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:17*</td>
<td>חַשְׁבּוֹ</td>
<td>11:13*</td>
<td>1:17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>כָּלָל</th>
<th></th>
<th>מִדֵּר</th>
<th>8:2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:7</td>
<td>מִדֵּר</td>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>8:7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>יוֹלֶד</th>
<th></th>
<th>נֶבֶל</th>
<th>16:11*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>נֶבֶל</td>
<td>16:11*</td>
<td>5:11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>בֵּן</th>
<th></th>
<th>יָמַר</th>
<th>22:9*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:31*</td>
<td>יָמַר</td>
<td>22:9*</td>
<td>5:31*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>מְשֻׁר</th>
<th></th>
<th>מַדָּר</th>
<th>10:12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:12</td>
<td>מַדָּר</td>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>16:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>חֲפֹר</th>
<th></th>
<th>אֲמֶה</th>
<th>15:19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25:5*</td>
<td>אֲמֶה</td>
<td>15:19</td>
<td>25:5*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>כְּפָר</th>
<th></th>
<th>לְיָדָה</th>
<th>1:12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:14</td>
<td>לְיָדָה</td>
<td>1:12*</td>
<td>3:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>מַכֶּה</th>
<th></th>
<th>9 : 7</th>
<th>9 : 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21:15*</td>
<td>9 : 7</td>
<td>9 : 7</td>
<td>21:15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>טֹלְפַּרְיוֹן</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>8 : 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>erev</td>
<td>הגדה</td>
<td>1:14*</td>
<td>ממעז</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Дан</td>
<td>הנחת</td>
<td>23:5</td>
<td>במשמעת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קון</td>
<td>המשנה</td>
<td>15:13*</td>
<td>במשנה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בכל</td>
<td>הרכבת</td>
<td>16:3</td>
<td>רימש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בכל</td>
<td>הרכבת</td>
<td>15:19</td>
<td>בעות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בכל</td>
<td>הרכבת</td>
<td>21:10*</td>
<td>הבש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בנה</td>
<td>בצור</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>מגיד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בצור</td>
<td>בצור</td>
<td>9:4</td>
<td>צור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>בצור</td>
<td>20:12*</td>
<td>בצור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובר</td>
<td>2:19</td>
<td>10:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תבש</td>
<td>11:3</td>
<td>24:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>העיר</td>
<td>4:9</td>
<td>5:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ונח</td>
<td>24:3</td>
<td>23:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ונח</td>
<td>11:5*</td>
<td>5:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ונח</td>
<td>9:1*</td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ונח</td>
<td>2:17</td>
<td>18:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ונח</td>
<td>20:22*</td>
<td>3:37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ונח</td>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>7:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ונח</td>
<td>22:1</td>
<td>10:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ונח</td>
<td>24:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובר</td>
<td>2:11</td>
<td>8:7*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובר</td>
<td>8:6*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובר</td>
<td>19:28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עמוד</td>
<td>עמודת העלים</td>
<td>שעה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:22</td>
<td>24:5</td>
<td>11:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:4</td>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>19:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:11</td>
<td>2:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:15</td>
<td>7:6*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>1:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6*</td>
<td>16:1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:2*</td>
<td>11:14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:2</td>
<td>5:21, 5:20, 5:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15*</td>
<td>21:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paragus</td>
<td>2:4*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רומ</td>
<td>4:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בר</td>
<td>בחר/בר</td>
<td>2:12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רחק</td>
<td>20:1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זר</td>
<td>2:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מחט</td>
<td>11:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שניר</td>
<td>5:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>סיפ</td>
<td>22:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שבר</td>
<td>16:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בר</td>
<td>21:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לב</td>
<td>6:5*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שבר</td>
<td>15:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בין</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שחר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:8</td>
<td>2:11</td>
<td>שרה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שבע</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10*</td>
<td>15:9</td>
<td>שרג'ים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שבת/שבת</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:22*</td>
<td>2:15*</td>
<td>בשר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יב</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:8*</td>
<td>3:10*</td>
<td>שבתות</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שבת</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:4</td>
<td>5:8</td>
<td>שלמה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שלמה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:5</td>
<td>1:17</td>
<td>שמיר למוי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שמיר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:4</td>
<td>שמיר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שמיר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:2</td>
<td>שמיר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שמיר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:2*</td>
<td>שמיר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שמיר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:19*</td>
<td>שמיר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Word</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
<th>Hebrew Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>של့ד</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>שָלַד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָזַר</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מֶזַּר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַלְוֹח</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַלוֹח</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַדְלֵל</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>מַדְלֵل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word List (III)</td>
<td>(Abstract nouns formed with 8th-termination)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 : 12</td>
<td>תמשנה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 : 34</td>
<td>יזיזות</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 : 12</td>
<td>יכלות</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 : 10</td>
<td>ריזות</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 : 21*</td>
<td>להצלת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 : 22*</td>
<td>מגוברת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 : 8*</td>
<td>מדעט</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 : 1*</td>
<td>מחילכת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 : 1*</td>
<td>מסלולה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 : 10*</td>
<td>מסתרת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 : 14*</td>
<td>משיבת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 : 51*</td>
<td>גבירות</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 : 9*</td>
<td>ברחות</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 : 15</td>
<td>בלאות</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מס'</td>
<td>דירוג</td>
<td>يانuar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>3:19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>3:19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>21:2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>22:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>4:21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>23:2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>24:1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>3:22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>2:11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>2:10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. BIBLIOGRAPHY
BIBLIOGRAPHY*


Adler, E.N. and Seligsohn, M., "Une Nouvelle Chronique Samaritaine," REJ 44 (Paris 1902), 188-222; REJ 45 (1902), 70-93, 223-255; REJ 46 (1903), 123ff.


Aharoni, Y., Hitnahalût Shivtê Yisraêl ba-Gâlîhâ-Elîyôn, Jerusalem, 1957


Appel, M., Quaestiones de rebus Samaritanorum sub imperio Romanorum Ferstelë, Breslau, 1874.


Bîme Rômâ'Ubhîzâ'ntiyôn, Jerusalem, 1946

(Ed.) Gazetteer of Roman Palestine (GîF), in Qedem (Monographs of the Inst. of Archaeology, The Hebrew University), 5 (1976).


*In the case of Hebrew titles the original transliteration has been retained.
Barton, E.W. "The War and the Samaritan Colony,"
Etq 63, 385; 64, 489; 65 43; 70 313;
78 1.

Ben-Hayyim, Z., The Literary and Oral Tradition of
Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans,

"A Samaritan Text of the Former Prophets?"

"Piyyut Šomronî Lišmâhôth," Tarbiz 10
(1939), 351.

(Ed.) "The Asatir," Tarbiz 14 (1942-3),

"A Samaritan Piyyut from Amoraic Times,"
EI 4 (1956), 119.

"Observations on the Hebrew and Aramaic
Lexicon from the Samaritan Tradition,"
Festschrift W. Baumgartner (= S.V.T., 16),

Benz, F.L. Personal Names in the Phoenician and

Ben-Zvi, I., "Ginzê Šômrôn," Sinai 10 (1942), 104-6;
215-222; 11 (1942-3), 156-162; 12 (1943),
410-417; 13 (1943-4), 245-250, 308-316;
14 (1944), 17-20.

Sopher Ha-Šomronîm (3rd ed.), Jerusalem
1976.

"Phylacteries," TrGUCS XV (1953-4), 54.


"Samaritan Law and Liturgy" (Samaritan Studies, III), BJRL 40 (1958), 315-325.


Büchler, A., Das Synedrion in Jerusalem, Vienna, 1902.


Caplan, J., "A Second Samaritan Amulet from Tel Aviv," El 10, 255-257.

Clair, G., "The Samaritans," PEFQSt (1888), 50.


Cowley, A.E., "The Samaritan Liturgy and Reading of the Law," JQR 7 (1894), 121-140.


Crane, O.T., The Samaritan Chronicle or the Book of Joshua, New York, 1890.


Gaster, M., "Folklore of Mossoul," *PZBA* (1906), 103.

The Samaritans: Their History, Doctrines and Literature, London, 1925.


"Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions," in Samaritan Eschatology, 1, 1952


Gibbon, E., Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, London, 1854-1855.


Gotthofer, J., Bikkoret Le-Toledot Ha-Keraim, Vienna, 1855.


Jastrow, M., Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi and Midrashic Literature, Philadelphia, 1903.


Juster, J., Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain, Paris 1914.

Juynboll, T.G.J., Chronicum Samaritanum, arabice conscriptum, cui titulus est Liber Josuae, Leiden, 1848.

Commentarii in Historiam Genti Samaritanarum, Leiden, 1846.
Kahle, P., Textkritische und Lexikalische Bemerkungen zum Samaritanischen Pentateuchfragm., 1893


Kirchheim, R., Karme Shomron, Frankf-o-M, 1851.


Kohler, K., "Dosithaeus, the Samaritan Heresiarch, and the relation to Jewish and Christian Doctrines and Sects," AJTH XV (1911), 404-435.


Low, A.P. Aramaische Pflanzenamen,


Magie, D., Roman Rule in Asia Minor, Princeton, 1950


Mommsen, T., The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian, London, 1886.


Munk, E., Des Samaritaners Moseh Erzähling über den Tod Moses', Berlin, 1890.


Sonne, L., "Historical Sources," *JQR* 26 (N.S.), 150


Strugnell, J., "Quelques Inscriptions Samaritaines," 
Re 74 (1967), 555-580.

Swete, H.B., Essays on the Early History of the Church 
and Ministry, London, 1918.

Talmon, S., "The Samaritan Pentateuch," JJS 2 (151), 
144-160.

Taylor, W.R., "A New Samaritan Inscription," BASOR 
31 (1941), 1-6.

Thompson, R.Campbell, Semitic Magic, London, 1908.

Tsedaka, B., Articles under "Samaritan History", 
"Samaritan Holidays and Festivals," EJ 
14, 733-738, 741-747.

Vilmar, E., Abulfath Annales Samaritani, Gotha, 1865.


Vollz, P., Das Neujahrfest Jahwe, Tubingen, 1912.


Waxman, M., A History of Jewish Literature, N.Y. 1960

Wright, G.E., "The Samaritans at Shechem," HThK 55 
(1962), 357-366.