THE JUDGE SHAMGAR.

What our Biblical dictionaries and commentaries are able to say about this man I do not wish to discuss or repeat (see Sayce in *D. B.* iv 475; Cheyne in *E. B.* 4424 ff; Moore in *I. C. C.* on Judges 104 ff; the same in *S. B. O. T.* p. 59). Moore points out that some authorities of the Septuagint place Judges iii 31 after xvi 31, and thinks it perhaps not too bold to conjecture that this is the original position of the brief account of his exploit; further that in v 6 Shamgar ben-Anath, with his foreign and heathenish name, was not a deliverer but an oppressor of Israel (Comm. p. 143). What the same scholar wrote in the *Journ. Amer. Orient. Soc.* 19, 159 f is not at my disposal.

Now compare with these two points (Shamgar of Judges v as oppressor of Israel and the original place of the judge after Samson) the chronological work published by Lagarde as far back as 1892 in the second part of his *Septuaginta Studien* p. 21 ff.

'deinde indicavit eos Aoth (= Ehud) ambidexter annis octoginta (Judges iii 30) . . .

d'einde servierunt regi Semegar (= Shamgar) annis 20. hic occidit ex alienigenis in aratro bourn octingentos viros et defendit filios Israel.'

Here we have a combination of iii 31 with iv 3, 'twenty years', and v 6 Shamgar as oppressor of Israel (servierunt regi S.).

After the other judges the chronicler comes to Sampson:—

'Deinde Sampson filius Manoe . . . qui plus occidit in morte sua quam quod in vita sua. deinde Samera iudicavit eos anno uno. hic percussit ex Allophylis sescentos viros praeter iumenta et salvum fecit et ipse Israel. deinde pacem habuerunt annis xxx.'

This chronicle originated in the Vandalian Church of Africa in A. D. 463; see Lagarde, p. 44.

But its statements are much older.

The chronicler Q. Julius Hilario (or Hilarianus) writes in the year A. D. 397 in his *Chronologia sive de mundi duratione* (better title: *de cursu temporum in Chronica minora*, ed. Frick, Teubner, 1892, p. 164):—

'Samson qui victis allophylis iudicavit annis xx. Mortuo eo iudicavit Semegar anno I. Post hunc fuit populus in pace . . . per annos xxx.'

As H. Gelzer has shewn (*Sextus Julius Africanus* ii 1 p. 125): 'the one year of Semegar and the thirty years of peace are taken over from *Africanus*.'

The chronography of Africanus is lost, but just about the one year of Shamgar after Samson we are quite certain; see Gelzer, i p. 90, who
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gives from Leo Grammaticus, Theodosios Melitenos, and Georgius Cedrenus the following list, going back on Africanus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ξαμψων</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ξαμανη</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άναρχα</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εληφηα</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still more explicit is the statement of Syncellus (331, 13), that the Apostle Paul gives to the time of the Judges 450 years, which fill out the period from the year of the world 3902 to the first year of Eli: ενὸς ἐτους ἑπολεμημένου ἀπερ Ἁφρωνικὸς τῶν Σεμεύγαρ λέγει κρατῆσαι τῶν Ἰσραήλ, τῆς γραφῆς οὐκ εἰσοόρης χρόνων. Thus it is quite certain that already Africanus (+ after A.D. 140) placed Shamgar after Samson and gave one year to him.

The one year is in agreement with Jewish tradition; see Josephus, _Ant._ v § 197 καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον (Ἰούδας = Ἐθόδις) Σανάγαρος (vart. Σανάγαρος, Σανάγορας, Σανάγορας, Σανάγαρος, Μαναγαρ, Μανασσαρ) ὁ Ἀνάθον παῦς αἱρεθεὶς ἀρχεῖν ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἔτει κατάστρεψε τὸν βίον. After Samson Josephus immediately goes over to Eli (§§ 317, 318). Whether Julius Africanus was the first who placed Shamgar after Samson, and whether he was followed by Lucian—for it is Lucian's recension of the Septuagint which has Shamgar after xvi 31—I do not know. When Moore writes: 'Differences in the translation show that it (the verse on Shamgar) was not brought over to this place (xvi 31) from iii 31 in the Θ text, but was found here by these translators or revisers in their copies of Ψ', I cannot see the cogency of the latter part of the conclusion. A reviser (say Lucian) may have read it in Hebrew at iii 31 and may have brought it over in his own Greek to xvi 31. As far as I know there is no copy which omits iii 31; even Lucian read the verse there, without ἐν τῷ ἀφοργαπαῦτι, which is an intrusion in the codex Alexandrinus.

Our result is, therefore, that both modern assumptions about Shamgar were anticipated in the early Church; the one that his right position is after Sampson as early as in the second century by Africanus; the other that Shamgar was an oppressor of Israel, in the fifth century, though in strange combination with his recognition as Judge.
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