*Reconsidering the Distinction between the Pre-Samaritan and Samaritan Layers in the Samaritan Pentateuch*

In our last meeting, we have elaborated on the pre-Samaritan tradition, discussing the hermeneutical processes that the pre-Samaritan texts underwent. Our discussion was set in the broader context of other ancient Pentateuchal manuscripts, illuminating the fact that the pre-Samaritan texts and SP offer a fundamental source of evidence for early interpretation of the Pentateuch, as well as a comparative source for the study of the Rewritten Pentateuch manuscripts.

My talk today will focus on the so-called ‘sectarian’ or Samaritan layer in SP. This layer consists of changes that pertained to the centralization of the cult site on Mount Gerizim. Until recently, there was a widespread agreement between scholars that these changes were interpolated into the Jewish pre-Samaritan tradition. This model stems mainly from the presumption that the Torah is a Judaic work, and, therefore, the Samaritans must have been taken it at some point and modified it to a sectarian document that accords to the ideology of the sect. However, archeological and epigraphic findings that shed new light on the origins of the Samaritans, as well as textual reconsideration of the so-called “sectarian layer” in SP, have been eroded at this hypothesis, and, as a consequence, the accepted model for the textual development of SP has to be re-examined.

This talk starts with a discussion on the origins of early Samaritanism in light of archeological and epigraphic evidence from the region of Samaria dated to the Persian period. The evidence points to the existence of a Yahwistic group in the province of Samaria at the age, that had significant religious and cultural ties with the Yahwists of Judea. The understanding that the Samaritans are descendants of the Yahwistic Samarians influences the answer to the question of how and why the pre-Samaritan tradition was transmitted by the Samaritans. I the second part of my talk, I shall introduce the readings in SP that are associated with the Samaritan layer, as well as recent scholarly that undermine the identification of these readings as purely Samaritan. Then I will move to my research on the pre-Samaritan 4QpaleoExodm that suggests that this scroll included the Gerizim commandment, the most typical sectarian change in SP. I will then complete with a reflection on how blurring the boundaries between the pre-Samaritan and Samaritan layers in SP influences the concept of the SP’s history of development.

*1 Early Samaritanism*

The Samaritans are often called a “sect” and, therefore, the variants that reflect the Samaritan ideology are classified as “sectarian”. Nonetheless, the use of the term “sect” with respect to the Samaritans is problematic, as it bears a connotation of deviation from the Judaic community and its beliefs and practices. In other words, the term “Samaritan sect” implies that Samaritanism is an offshoot of Judaism. This position was dominant for many years. However, the scholarly consensus has recently moved away to the view that early Samaritanism was an independent form of YHWH worshippers. As I have mentioned, archeological and epigraphic findings point to the existence of Yahwists in the province of Samaria from the Persian period.[[1]](#footnote-1) The evidence for the northern Yahwism includes the presence of the Yahwistic temple on Mount Gerizim as early as the mid-fifth century BCE.[[2]](#footnote-2) In addition, Yahwistic names have been found in the fourth-century Samaria papyri and Samarian coins dating to the late Persian and Hellenistic periods.[[3]](#footnote-3) The collective evidence suggests, therefore, that the majority of the population of the Samarian province in the Persian period was Yahwistic.

The ties between the Samarian and Judean communities in the Persian period were not limited only to the worship of the same God. The inscriptional evidence suggests that two groups used the same scripts and languages as well, that is, Hebrew and Aramaic.[[4]](#footnote-4) Moreover, the Elephantine documents from the fifth century BCE reveal that the community of Elephantine, located in southern Egypt, applied for assistance in building a temple for both the leaders of Judah and Samaria. The Samarians were an address for cultic issues, as same as the Judeans. In addition, the Elephantine document suggests ongoing ties between the leaders of the Judean and Samarian communities as well.[[5]](#footnote-5) The material culture of both provinces, therefore, reveals a mutual cultural-historical influence between the two communities. Thus, the Pentateuch shared by the Samarians and Judeans, and later by Jews and Samaritans, is a part of a broader mutual influence system between the two communities.

The separation of the ways of the two communities was probably only in the second century BCE, after the destruction of the Gerizim temple by the Hasmonean John Hyrcanus, in 111 or 128 BCE, who was the leader of Judah and at the same time the High priest of the temple in Jerusalem.[[6]](#footnote-6)

The question that arises is how best to explain the affinity between Judah and Samaria in the time of the fifth to the second century BCE. Gary Knoppers highlighted that the destruction of the northern kingdom of Israel was not so traumatic as the fall of the southern kingdom of Judah 150 years later. Knoppers mediates between what he calls the ‘Maximalist’ position, which claimed that the destruction of the northern kingdom was so devastating, that one cannot assume any continuity after 722 BCE, and the ‘Minimalist’ position that claimed that only a small group from the higher strata of society was deported and replaced by a small group of imported inhabitants.[[7]](#footnote-7) Knoppers, based on archeological excavations conducted up to the beginning of the present century, emphasized that while there is evidence of some destruction in the region of Samaria, there were also signs of continuity of settlements and growth of population. In this view, the remaining significant part of the Israelite population, as well as of importing a small group of foreigners, was the background for rising the Yahwistic group in the province of Samaria in the Persian period. Thus, in the words of Pummer, “The Samaritans are not a sect that broke o from Judaism, but rather a branch of Yahwistic Israel in the same sense as the Jews”.[[8]](#footnote-8) This acknowledgment of the origins of the Samaritans gives us a helpful framework for the understanding of the textual development of the pre-Samaritan tradition and SP.

*2 The So-Called ‘Sectarian’ Layer*

As stated, many scholars share the view that the Samaritans choose one exemplar of the Pentateuch and interpolate into it ideological changes that are concerned with the veneration of Mount Gerizim as the sacred place of worship.[[9]](#footnote-9) Three prominent readings are identified with the so-called ‘sectarian’ layer:

(1) The reading “Mount Gerizim” rather than “Mount Ebal” in Deut 27:4, where the Israelites are instructed to build an altar of stones and to start having offerings after they have crossed the Jordan. MT’s reading seems doubtful, as the instruction to make a cultic worshipping in the Mount of the course makes no sense. Moreover, SP’s reading receives support from a Greek papyrus (Pap. Giessen 19, which unfortunately has lost in the Second World War and only its image is available) and a manuscript of *Vetus Latina.* Thus, on both internal and external grounds, the Samaritan reading is the most likely to be the preferable one.[[10]](#footnote-10) The subsequent change to “Ebal” in MT is to be explained as anti-Samaritan polemic.

(2) The use of the perfect form בחר, “has chosen”, rather than the imperfect יבחר, “will choose”, in the cult centralization formula of MT-Deut: הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר יְהוָה, “the place where the Lord will choose.” The book of Deuteronomy does not specify where the chosen place lies, neither in MT nor SP. MT-Deut consistently uses the imperfect form יבחר in the cult centralization, possibly because the Israelites did not arrive yet to the Land of Canaan.[[11]](#footnote-11) Yet, Deuteronomy significantly consists of a section that might be read as an implicit reference to Mount Gerizim as the chosen place. If the reading “Mount Gerizim” in SP-Deut 27:4 is indeed preferable, then Mount Gerizim is the first place where the centralized cult should be conducted after crossing the Jordan. Therefore, the centralization cult formula in SP-Deut that uses the past tense, “the place that the Lord has chosen,” might be referring to Mount Gerizim.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Adrian Schenker has demonstrated that the use of the form בחר is not uniquely documented in SP. He observed that there are manuscripts of the Septuagint, the *Vetus Latina*, the Bohairic, and the Coptic that support the use of the past tense in the centralization formula.[[13]](#footnote-13) Since it is highly unlikely that these manuscripts were influenced by the Samaritan tradition, one may conclude that the reading בחר is not a Samaritan ideological change.

(3) The most significant reading that is considered sectarian is the Gerizim commandment. The Gerizim commandment, also known as the Samaritan tenth commandment, is a composite text that incorporates material from Deuteronomy 11 and 27 and includes the command to build an altar on Mount Gerizim. This passage is repeated in both versions of the Samaritan Pentateuch’s Decalogue and establishes the veneration of Mount Gerizim as an integral part of the laws revealed on Mount Sinai.

The accordance of this section with the Samaritan ideology on the one hand, and its absence from the pre-Samaritan texts, on the other hand, have led scholars to conclude that the Gerizim commandment belongs to a layer of Samaritan ideological changes. However, this conclusion has recently been questioned.

Several scholars have observed that the redactional process that resulted in the composition of the Gerizim commandment shares many textual characteristics with the scribal tradition that produced the major editorial changes in the pre-Samaritan texts.[[14]](#footnote-14) Like all major pre-Samaritan editorial changes, the Gerizim commandment includes only material found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, forming a composite text that aims to create an explicit text.

Molly Zahn demonstrated that the text of the Gerizim commandment shares content and linguistic elements with the last two verses of Exod 20 that deal with an altar law. In the semantic level, one should mention the recurrence of עולות, “burnt offerings,” and שלמים, “salutation offerings,” ברכה, “bless,” מזבח אבנים, “altar of stones,” and the roots בנה, “to build,” and נופ, “to wave.” These similarities between the Gerizim commandment and the altar law raise the possibility that the scribes saw a connection between the two sections. Nonetheless, the fact that the altar law does not provide a specific location for the altar, and probably refers to altars in general, contradicts the instruction in Deuteronomy to build an altar in a specific place. Hence, the insertion of the Gerizim commandment before the altar law clarifies that the latter refers to one specific altar that, according to SP-Deut 27:4, should be built on Mount Gerizim.[[15]](#footnote-15)

In this view, the Gerizim commandment seems less sectarian than scholars often describe it.[[16]](#footnote-16) Indeed, based on the similar scribal practices reflected in the Gerizim commandment and the pre-Samaritan editorial changes, Stefan Schorch recently argued that the Gerizim commandment was penned by the same scribal circles that were responsible for the pre-Samaritan major expansions in Exod 20.[[17]](#footnote-17) Put differently, this commandment is not a Samaritan ideological change but rather belongs to the pre-Samaritan tradition.

*3 The Gerizim Commandment and 4Q22*

The association of the Gerizim commandment to the pre-Samaritan tradition is supported by a study of the material philology of 4QpaleoExodm. 4QpaleoExodm (4Q22) is a copy of Exodus from Qumran, dated paleographically to the second or first century BCE, that attests to most of the major editorial changes known from SP-Exod.[[18]](#footnote-18) Consequently, 4QpaleoExodm was classified as a pre-Samaritan scroll, that is, a scroll that belongs to the textual tradition on which SP is based.[[19]](#footnote-19)

The question of whether or not the Gerizim commandment is a Samaritan addition was highly influenced by the question of whether or not it originally appeared in 4QpaleoExodm. This question cannot be explicitly resolved, since the Gerizim commandment is not documented in the extant fragments. However, this fact does not support nor contradict the appearance of this section in 4QpaleoExodm, because the columns that consist of the Decalogue in the scrollare highly damaged, preserving only numerous fragmentary lines of text.

Based on the material reconstruction of 4QpaleoExodm, Patrick Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, Judith Sanderson, the editors of the scroll in the DJD series, proposed that the Gerizim commandment was not a part of the scroll’s text.[[20]](#footnote-20) They placed the fragments that are securely located due to material signs, mainly a top and bottom margins, and estimated the amount of the missing text between them. The editors concluded that there is too much room between the fragments for the text of Exod 20:1–21:6 as in MT, but too little room for the expanded text of SP, a text that includes the Gerizim commandment and two additional major editorial changes that deal with the people’s request that Moses acts as mediator at Sinai (drawn from Deut 5:24–27) and God’s response to the people’s request (drawn from Deut 5:28–31). Therefore, the editors suggest that 4QpaleoExodm originally included only the two insertions that deal with the people’s request, but not the Gerizim commandment.

Although the editors did not proceed to full detailed reconstruction, their assertion highly influenced many scholars, who mostly used their conclusion without reevaluation of the material reconstruction. The exceptional absence of the Gerizim commandment from 4QpaleoExodm was explained by its classification as a ‘sectarian’ reading. This explanation led to a general consensus, until recently, that there are two distinct layers in SP: the pre-Samaritan layer and a thin so-called ‘sectarian’ layer of variants concerning the veneration of Mount Gerizim. This layer was interpolated into the pre-Samaritan text when it was adopted by the Samaritans as their authoritative text.

Nevertheless, in a recent paper, I have shown that the editors’ conclusion is based on an inaccurate approximation of the missing text between the fragments in the relevant columns in 4QpaleoExodm (cols. XX–XXII).[[21]](#footnote-21) I proceeded with a full reconstruction of these columns, using advanced digital tools. The initial step of the reconstruction was to place the closest extant fragments that preserve top or bottom margins in a digital canvas that simulates the scroll prior to its deterioration (fig. 1). Afterward, I reconstructed the missing text between the fragments using a font that simulates the scribe’s script. The textual reconstruction enables to locating of additional fragments. Surprisingly, this process revealed that there is room for the Gerizim commandment in 4QpaleoExodm. Figure 2 shows the full material and textual reconstruction of columns XIX–XXII. The three major SP editorial changes in Exod 20 are colored in red. One may see that the long text of SP fits well between the extant fragments, *including all three major expansions in SP-Exod 20.*[[22]](#footnote-22)Hence,the reconstruction indicates that 4QpaleoExodm did originally include the Gerizim commandment and it should not be classified as a Samaritan reading, therefore.

Despite the fact that slight changes in the reconstruction are inevitable and due to minor textual variants and different techniques of paragraph division and orthography, the fact that the Gerizim section includes a significant amount of text enables to conclude in a high level of certainty that it was originally a part of 4QpaleoExodm.

*4 Implications for the Textual Development of SP*

Based on the attribution of the Gerizim commandment to the pre-Samaritan layer, as well as previous claims regarding the non-Samaritan nature of other so-called ‘sectarian’ readings, this study undermines the existence of a Samaritan layer in SP. Blurring the boundaries between the pre-Samaritan and the Samaritan layers bears implications for both the origins of the pre-Samaritan tradition and the history of the textual development of SP.

As is well known, the major editorial changes in the pre-Samaritan texts are not an accidental product. Instead, these are the product of scribal circles active in the late Second Temple period.[[23]](#footnote-23) If the Gerizim commandment was indeed penned by the same scribes responsible for other pre-Samaritan major editorial changes, it may reveal the physical location and social affiliation of these scribes.

Sidnie Crawford identifies the base, or one of the bases, for the pre-Samaritan tradition in the Temple on Mount Gerizim.[[24]](#footnote-24) As stated, this temple is traced back to the fifth century BCE, and probably, similar to the temple in Jerusalem, was a center for activity of scribes and priests. Crawford suggests that the Samaritans, who are descenders of the Yahwists Samarians, have inherited the pre-Samaritan tradition from their predecessors. However, Crawford also raises the possibility that the pre-Samaritan tradition might has been generated in the temple in Jerusalem as well.

This study provides evidence for the origins of the pre-Samaritan tradition in the scribal circles associated with the Gerizim temple. It is most likely that a textual tradition that interpolated into the Decalogue a command to build an altar on Mount Gerizim has been generated among the scribes and priests of the temple found in the same place. Therefore, the view that the Samaritan adopted a Judean textual tradition is misleading. Instead, the Samaritans inherited a textual tradition with which they were already familiar and took part in its development, rather than passively transmitted it.[[25]](#footnote-25)

Finally, this study has implications on terminology, and specifically on the use of the term “pre-Samaritan”. This use of this term is problematic in light of the new findings presented above because it acquired the connotation of the two-layers model for the textual development of SP. Instead, my claim is that SP is one exemplar of a *Samarian* textual tradition of the Pentateuch, in the same way that the “pre-Samaritan” manuscripts from Qumran are exemplars of this tradition. Put differently, SP, as well as 4QpaleoExodm, 4QNumb, and 4QExod-Levf, are all texts that belong to a group or family of texts, which I call the Samarian textual tradition. This tradition was developed and transmitted by northern scribes in the Persian period and later by the Samaritans. SP and the Qumranic manuscripts do not represent different stages in the growth of the text, but rather different copies of the same textual tradition. These copies show a high degree of overlap but are not identical to each other.
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