



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

T H E S A M A R I T A N S.

GRADUATION THESES

by

Harry Levi.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

March 1, 1897.

microfilmed 4/14/77

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION

Ch. (I)	The History of the Samaritans.	1- 56
Period. (I)	From the Transportation to Samaria to the Expulsion of Manasseh 432 B. C.	1- 21
Period (II)	From the Erection of the Temple of Gerizim to the Roman Asecendency.	22-32
Period (III)	The Samaritans under Roman Sway.	32-56
Ch. (II)	The Samaritan. of the New Testament.	57-65
Ch. (III)	The Samaritan of the Talmud.	66-102
Ch. (IV)	The Samaritan Pentateuch.	103-139
	(I) The Time of its reception.	103-117
	(II) The Variants of the Samaritan Pentateuch.	118-135
	(III) Its Relation to the Septuagint.	136-139
Ch. (V)	Doctrines of the Samaritans.	140-148
Ch. (VI)	Customs of the Samaritans.	149-162

P R E F A C E.

In the preparation of this thesis, the following works have been consulted. Those bearing directly on our subject have been studied in their entirety. Of Histories etc. Pertinent portions have been thoroughly examined.

- Bleek ----- Einleitung in das Alte Testament.
- Brigham, Chas. H. The Samaritans. Unit. Rev. IV 141-159.
- Coblens, Gilbert - The Samaritans Jewish Comment Sept. 96.
- Cowley A. ----- Some Remarks on Samaritan Literature and
Religion (Jew. Quart. Rev. (96)
- Colenso Bishop J.W. The Pent. and Book of Joshua critically
examined.
- Driver ----- Introd. to Lit. of the Old Testament.
- Ewald ----- History of Israel Vols. IV, V.
- Frankel Z. ----- Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen
Exegese auf die Alexandrinische Hermeneutik
- Frankl. L. A. --- Nach Jerusalem.
- Geiger A. ----- Judaism and its History I. (Transla. by
Mayer). Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel. Zeit-
schrift I 98- 140, 174-185.
- Geiger L. ----- Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften
Der. Samaritanische Pent. (Nachgelassene
Schriften 1876 Vol. IV 54-37.)

Gesenius G. -----De Pentateuchi Samaritani Origine Indole
et Auctoritate.

Graetz-----Geschichte der Juden (Vols II-VI of
II Vol. Edi.)

Grove George ----Nabloos and the Samaritans (Vacation
Tourists 1861)

Hamburger (Real Ecyclc.) I Die Samaritaner.

Text der Bibel.

II Die Samaritaner.

Holzman -----Hand Commentar zum Neuen Testament I-II

Josephus

Jost-----Geschichte des Judenthums und Seiner
Sekten III. Geschichte des Israelitischen
Volkes (2 vol. Edit.)

Kautsch (Herzog R.E.) Die Samaritaner.

Keil -----Introduction to the Old Testament.

Kirchheim -----כרמי שומרון
מסכת כותים

Kitto -----History of Palestine.

Kuenen -----The Religion of Israel Vols. II-III.

Michaelis-----Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek
Vols III-V.

Millman -----History of the Jews. Vol III

Munk-----Palestine (Translated into German by
Dr. M. A. Levy.)

Nutt J. W. -----A. Sketch of Samaritan History Dogma and
Literature.

- Pick. B. (Mc.Cl. and Str. E.) The Samaritan s
 The Samaritan Pentateuch.
 The " " Liturgy
 The " " Literature.
 The " " Sects.
 The Modern Samaritans.
- Robinson -----Biblical Researches Vol. III.
- Schrader -----Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testa-
 ment (translated by Whitehouse.)
- Schürer -----The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus
 Christ (translated by Macpherson.)
- Smith W. R. -----The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.
 The Samaritans (Article in Britannica.)
- Stanley -----Sinai and Palestine.
- Strack und Zockler ---Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften
 den Neuen Testament.)
- Torrey -----The Composition and Historical Value of
 Ezra and Nehemia.
- Wescott-----Introduction to the Study of the Gospels.
- De Wette -----Einleitung in die Kanonischen und apokry-
 phischen. Bucher des Alten Testaments.
- Winer (R.W.B.)--Die Samaritaner.

I N T R O D U C T I O N.

It seems to be a generally accepted opinion that the Samaritans occupy so small a place in the history of mankind and religion, as to deserve but little attention and study. It seems further more to be the common view that all that we know concerning the Samaritans, could be well set forth in an essay of very brief form. Previous to the 17th century, such views represented fact and reality. For the part that the S. had up to that time played in the drama of life, was known to but few, and the records of the importance of the sect were confined to old musty documents relegated to the dark corners of imperial chambers, and libraries. Since the seventeenth century however, it has become increasingly evident that the S. occupy a more important position than has generally been believed. Their continuous relation to the Jews, a relation now harsh, now friendly, yet never without its influence upon Israel, especially during the early centuries of the life of this people, lends to their history and life an importance, which as far as we are concerned, would not otherwise have been accorded them. We should therefore consider the S. as far as possible in their relation to the Jews. It should be our aim to direct attention to the main features of the life of the S. as they manifest an inclination toward Judaism or an opposition to it. This we have attempted

to do in the following pages.

To understand any people, the history of this people must be understood. A seeming truism and yet Mr. Cowley in lecturing on the S. (Jewish Quar. Rev. July 98.) states that though he intends (confessedly in an inadequate way) to tell us who the S. are, he will say nothing of their history, since he will be but repeating twice told tales. How we are to know what a people is and what position such a people occupies in the history of the world, without a clear understanding of this people's own peculiar history, is beyond comprehension. Furthermore, as far as we have been able to discover, there exists no thorough and complete history of the S. What one authority presents, another omits. To Jost and Kircheim especial commendation is due for the work they have done in this line. Yet neither have presented such a history in anything like complete form. Ch. I of this thesis does not pretend to offer a thorough history of the S. It claims to present as complete a list of historical facts concerning the S. as could be gathered from all the sources at the writers command. Furthermore where necessity demanded (and such has often been the case) arguments have been presented either to prove claims, or disprove current opinions. We have been entirely impartial in our consideration, and we find justification for our presentation of Ch. I in its necessity for any understanding of the S.

A treatment of the History of the S. necessitates an

VI

examination of the position which the S. occupied with regard to Christianity, and of the light in which they are held by the devotees of the latter faith. From the relation existing between the Jews and the Christians before and after Christianity. became a state religion, this examination should prove interesting to us. And yet something further is needed. The New Testament, claiming as it does to represent fundamentals of Christianity and the attitude of this faith toward other religious bodies and sects, presents us with the Christian conception of the S. a conception different from that held at any other time. This conception and the attitude of Christ's followers toward the S. seem to have been based on a corresponding yet contrary attitude toward the Jews. Hence a presentation of the S. of the N. T. should give subject matter of interest especially to us. IN Ch. II we thus show the position assumed by the writers of the N. T. toward the S. and present what we consider to be the cause for the assumption of such a position viz: hostility toward the Jews.

By far the larger portion of historic notices concerning the S. which are to be found in Jewish sources, is in the Talmud. Here the S. are known by the name Cuthim. as the colonists transported by Sargon from Cutha, formed the greater part of the entire number of people settled in Samaria by this ruler. Interpreting the word Cuthim as referring to the Christians, censors often replaced it by the word Nochri, and sometimes by Zaduki. At times Cuthi

occurs where many argue that Nochrī is in reality meant. The difficulty of a study of the S. of the Talmud, is thus evident. Aware of the fact that the views of the Rabbis concerning the S. are of great importance in our present study, likewise aware that these views have not received systematic presentation, and that the most that has been done in this direction has been to refer now and then to a Talmudic saying concerning the S. aware of all this. the necessity for giving a treatment of the S. of the Talmud, becomes manifest. In Ch. III we give such a treatment. We show what was the attitude of the Talmudists toward the S. Recognizing the fact that every lenient expression meets rigorous opposition, we endeavour to exhibit the opposite views of the Rabbis. A general tendency of Rabbinical inclination or opposition to the S. is not to be found in the Talmud. Since here the Gethim have as many enemies as friends. We therefore arrange the Talmudic references to the S. according to subject matter, so that the conception of the S. as held by the Jews from 300 B.C.-500 C. E. and the privileges granted or refused the S. in matters of importance, can be seen at a glance. In this way the S. of the Talmud becomes a definite exact personage, subject to the same leniency or harshness on the part of the Jews, that is evidenced in many other directions.

The basis of S. religious life was and is the Pentateuch. A question of primary importance immediately presents itself. "When did the S. receive their Pent?" The answer to

VIII

this question we present in the first part of Ch. IV. To our best knowledge the S. received the Pent. about 432 B. C. at the time of the expulsion of Manasseh by Nehemia. Many other theories have been presented which theories our study has forced us to reject. Now recognizing the fact that making the Pent. the foundation of their religious life the S. necessarily had to change the text somewhat to make the Pent. conform to those views of theirs in which they differed from the Jews, We present in part II of Ch. IV a treatment of the variants of the S. Pent. An inquiry into the value of the text of the S. recension, leads us to the conclusion that not much reliance is to be placed on said text. Ch. IV concludes with a brief examination of the relation between the S. Pent. and the LXX, a relation which has been made the basis of a great amount of discussion.

As previously mentioned, the S., due to the influence exerted upon them by the Jews, and due furthermore to the reception of the Pent. as the foundation stone of their daily life, greatly resemble the Jews in faith and customs. Further evidence of this is produced in Chs. V and VI, where we treat of the creed and customs of the S. Conservative to an extreme degree, accepting only unconsciously anything characteristic of a progressive age, the S. today are centuries behind time, and present to us in their every day life, their manner of existence^{of} by-gone days. Reform movements among the S. though not unknown (Cf. their sects)

IX

never found a large following. Strict adherence to Pentateuchal prescriptions was necessary for a support of the S. claim of descendancy from the ten tribes, and such adherence is seen in the life of the S. in Nablus today.

But it is an adherence which begot a life of literal obedience, yet of disinterested, unfeeling, heart-less devotion to a past principle. Reduced in numbers to about 150 persons, retaining the traditions of their past, and defending them zealously the S. still live in Nablus. Their entire disappearance is however a matter of but a few decades.

(THE HISTORY OF THE SAMARITANS)

(First Period)

From thir transportation to Samaria to the expulsion of Manasseh 432 B. C.

The first mention we have of the Samaritans is in II Kgs. XVII24 F. Here we are told that after the ten tribes had been led into captivity, " The King of Assyria brought men from Babylon, from Kutha, from Ava, from Hamath and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria, instead of the children of Israel, and they possessed Samaria and dwelt in the cities thereof. (V24)

Note:

Here in the very first account which we have of the origin of this people whose history we are now to study, we are confronted by a number of questions, answers to which are absolutely necessary for a clear understanding of the after life of the Samaritans.

When was Samaria captured? Who is the King of Assyria here mentioned? Who were these new settlers thus brought to Samaria? and when were they thus deported from their homes? The greatest possible confusion has in general characterized the answers given these questions. In the first place, until the investigations of Schrader, the date of the capture of the Capital of the Northern Kingdom was not exactly

2

known. Thus Jost (Gesch. D. Isr. Volkes 2 Vol. Edit. I 374) gave 718 as the date; Nutt (Sketch of S. Hist. etc. pg.1) 722; Kuenen (Religion of Isr. II 206) 719, Kautsch (Herzog's Real. Encycl. Art. The S.), Sometime later than 722 etc. In a similar manner is there a divergence of opinion as to who was the King, Who thus captured Samaria, Some asserting that it was Salmanassar, others being equally certain that it was Sargon. The repeopling of Samaria is likewise attributed by some to Salamanassar³²⁴ (Note II Kgs. 17 It is evident here that VV 3 24 refer to the same King. Indeed Ruenen (II206) goes so far as to argue that VV7-23 were inserted by the final redactor, since they seem to interrupt² the narrative,) Ezra 4 attributes the deportation of the Samaritans to Esarhaddon II (ascended the¹⁰ throne 680 B. C.); Ezra 4 to Osnappar. Some authorities identify Osnappar with Esarhaddon, some with Sardanapalus, while others again assert that he was simply an Assyrian military Governor. Some identify Sargon with Esarhaddon II. From these few points it can be seen how much, authorities are at Variance in their views of this early history. Schrader (Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Test.) has however given a definite answer to many of these questions by proving the following points. Salmanassar reigned 727 - 722. He undertook an expedition

against Tyre and against Samaria, on which expeditions he besieged Samaria. Owing to his death however, before the city was captured, the siege was continued by his successor Sargon. The latter it was therefore who exiled Israel in 722 B. C. He it was also who repopled Samaria with the conquered inhabitants from Babel, Kutha, Ava, Sepharvaim and Hamath sending them to Samaria at different times during his reign (Cf. Schrader, Cuneif, Inscript. and O. T. translated by Whitehouse 1888 I 257-277) Schrader likewise points out that all that is known from inscriptions concerning the transportation of people by Esarhaddon, is that he transferred Eastern populations into Syria (Cf. II 31) Schrader likewise adopts the view of Gelzer that Osnappar (720/19 X.

Asurbanipal, successor of Esarhaddon, and also thinks that Asurbanipal = Sardanappalus of Berossus. This would give to the deportation referred to in Ezra 10 a much later date than is usually assigned to it. A further question of importance is the location of the cities mentioned in the above quotation from Egs. Kutha and Sepharvaim are in Babylonia (Cf. Schrader I 271-274) and Jost (Gesch des Isr. Vol. I p 374) says Kutha Ave and Sepharvaim are in Mesopotamia Josephus (Ant. IX 14.3.) says Cutha is a country in Persia, Kirchheim (117 מ' ש' מ' 117)

quotes Makrizias saying that there are two cities called Cutha in Babylonia. Inscriptions show that Sargon defeated the King of Hamath and took from him 200 Chariots and 600 horsemen (Cf. Schrader I p 273)

The early history of the Samaritans (if there be any history in the narrative related of them in 2 kgs. 17) seems to have been a checkered one. After being placed in Samaria, they continued their former idolatrous practices until many of them were killed by lions. (Joseph Ant. IX 143 & XII 5. 5 says it was a plague by which many of the Samaritans died) Attributing this to the fact that they had continued their former religious observances and had not adopted the religion of the land in which they now lived, they send a request to the King of Assyria, to be taught to this new worship (2 Kgs 17:26) whereupon there is sent to them a priest of deposed Israel " who taught them how to fear the Lord " (V28)

Note:

On this account the Samaritans were often called by the Jews " lion Proselytes (Cf. Kidd 75b, *Jebamoth* 24b Baba Kama 38b Aboda Sara 26 a & B & Nidda 56 b Cf. further " The S. of the Talmud)

As noted above, Josephus says it was a plague by which the new colonists suffered. The Samaritans themselves (Abulfatach quoted by Kirch p I) argue that it was a sort of famine, there being no rain

crops and animals dying etc. Attributing this to their idolatry they request to be converted. Therefore the priest is sent (Joseph. Ant IX 14. 3 says several priests were sent)

What now becomes the condition of the Samaritans?

Having as they now thought fortified themselves against the influences of plagues and injury by the adoption of the dominant religious system of the land, The various peoples constituting the newly formed community combine with this new worship their old religious practices, and we find Jahwe being worshiped at the side of Succoth-Benoth and Nergal and Ashima and Nibhaz and Tartak, and Adramelech and Anammelech (Cf 2 Kgs 17, 19-41) For these deities Cf. Schrader I 274-277)

Another important consideration now demands our attention. Are the Samaritans of pure or mixed origin? Did they, upon reaching and settling in the cities of Samaria form a community by themselves, or did they join with individuals or communities whom they found already dwelling there? The answer to the question involves a conclusion as to whether all the Israelites were exiled in 722 previous to the transportation of the new settlers. A definite answer to this question will greatly simplify matters for us in the further history of the Samaritans, by presenting to us certain premisses which from the logic of their presentation and the probability of truth marking them, will give us an explanation of later phenomena, and will present

us with a basis for other conclusions. At all events the question is one that has proved a bone of contention to historians. Some arguing for a pure, others for a mixed origin of the Samaritans. Admitting that in a question of this nature absolute certainty for the present at least is impossible and that therefore definite and positive assertions are out of place, it seems decidedly the more probable that all of the ten tribes were not carried away. (The principle exponents of this view are Kuenen, Grätz Geiger, Hamburger, Jost, Nutt, Gesenius, Wincker, Rawlinson Bleek) Various reasons may be assigned for this conclusion, reasons which though individually they prove nothing, together render great probability the assertion above made.

In II Chr. 34.9 Hezekiah sends a letter to " all Israel and Judah " (VI) inviting them to come to Jerusalem to observe the Passover festival (note also VII) In II Chr. 9

34 Levites gather money for the repair of the temple. This money is gathered from Manasseh and Ephraim and all the remnant of Israel, and all Judah and Benjamin. Further: 15 Josiah's reformatations (Isaiah 33 & II Kgs. 23) in the north, were most likely among the Israelites dwelling there, whether in small communities^{or} among individuals scattered throughout the land. At this time the Samaritans were subjects of Assyria. Josiah would not therefore attempt reformation among them. Furthermore in Jer 41 we read of eighty men coming from Schechem. Shiloh and Samaria, to bring offerings and incense^{to} the house of God

7.

at Jerusalem. These were certainly Israelites. Assyrian inscriptions assure us that ^{Sargon} when he captured Samaria (for we accept him as the conqueror of the city) carried but 27280 people into captivity (Cf. Schrader I 257-277. The following are the two most important inscriptions. " The city Samaria I beseiged, I captured 27280 of its inhabitants I carried away; 50 Chariots of them I took for (myself) their remaining effects I caused (my subalterns) to take: my viceroy I placed over them. " This is from an inscription of Sargon. The second is from the " Annals of Sargon " (I beseiged and captured the town of Samaria 27280 of its inhabitants) I carried away 50 Chariots I took as my royal share (among them away) in place of them (the deported) I assigned abodes to the inhabitants of countires taken (by me). I imposed tribute on them like Assyria) These 27280 people certainly did not constitute the entire Israelitish community of the north. The manner in which the Assyrians were accustomed to treat conquered cities presents also an argument in favor of the view there advanced. Rawlinson (5 Great Monarchies I 304 n) says that the custom was to allow a great part of the inhabitants to remain behind. A parallel drawn from the later experience of Judah, lends further emphasis to this view. When Judah was exiled, the poorer element was left behind (2 Kgs 25 ¹²) It is very probable that a similar plan was pursued in the case of Israel. The poor dependent class was of no use to an Assyrian conqueror.

For these reasons we conclude that all Israel was not exiled, but that even after the deportation of the greater part by Sargon, there still remained Jews in the northern Kingdom. As a consequence, when the new peoples are brought to Samaria they do not constitute the entire population. Now does it seem that this fact was without its influence upon these people whom from the fact of their dwelling in Samaria we call Samaritans. When we come to Talmudic times, though we find some authorities desirous of having the Samaritans (there called) Cuthim) treated as Gentiles (though such authorities are but few in number) these Samaritans are never considered Gentiles (Cf. further " The S. of the Talmud) In the New Testament likewise, though a sharp distinction is drawn between the Jews and the Samaritans, still the latter are treated rather as Schismatics from the former, than as Gentiles proper. (Cf. ⁵ Matthew 10 and further " The S. of the N. T. ") As a consequence we may conclude that such a consideration of the Samaritans on the part of the Talmudists and New Testament authors arose from the recognition of the fact that by their time the life and customs and beliefs of the Samaritans had become not only tinged, but deeply colored with Jewish characteristics. That this was so, there is no doubt (Cf. further " The S. Pentateuch) To be sure many would argue that this Jewish coloring of Samaritan life was due to their reception of the Pentateuch and their adherence to its laws, but the very fact as we shall see

9
of Manasseh and many other Jews leaving Jerusalem and joining the Samaritans, even more the very fact that Zerubabel though refusing to allow the Samaritans to take part in rebuilding the temple accuses them not of idolatry, nor denies their right to be called Jewish proselytes (and according to Josephus even gives them permission to come and pray in the temple when it shall have been finished Cf. Joseph Ant. XI 4.3), All this but points to the conclusion that the Samaritans far back in Jewish history, had already adopted many Jewish customs and views, and though still clinging to much of their old life, had in great part adapted themselves to the newly accepted faith. Nor is it probable that this was entirely due to the efforts of the Israelite priest sent them by the King of Assyria. Much more likely is it that settling so near the remnant of Israel dwelling in the northern kingdom (even possibly among them) and thus ever coming into contact with them, they had, consciously or unconsciously taken much from Judaism (such Judaism as existed in the north) and had inserted it into their own life, possibly in a modified form, and yet in very definite shape after all. To be sure, an inconsistency in Samaritan life results, and we find as mentioned before that " they feared Jahwe and worshipped their own Gods " (2 Kgs 17) Such inconsistency, from the character of the conversion, was to be expected.

Among the Jews in Jerusalem immediately after their return from exile, the Jahwe belief pure and simple was the

basis of religious life and thus the basis of all life.

To them as a consequence any and every infringement of the commands to worship God, the God of Israel alone, would be sufficient cause not alone for exile, but even for death.

When therefore, upon the Jews receiving permission from

Cyrus to rebuild the temple, the Samaritans offer their aid in the erection of the house^{of} worship (Ezra 4:2)

Zerubabel in behalf of the people refuses such aid on the ground that the permission had been given to the Jews

alone (Ezra 4:1-4) That the Samaritans were sincere in

their desire to aid in the rebuilding of the temple, we

have no reason to doubt . The sincerity of Zerubabel's

excuse however, we have great reasons to doubt from the

fact that it is so weak. He and the people certainly took

the stand that was taken, from a fear lest by allowing these

half and half Jews (the Samaritans) these lion proselytes,

to participate in the rebuilding of their sacred structure

and by permitting them thus to come into contact with the

Jews, the holy religion of Israel might become defiled, and

the integrity of the Jewish faith be weakened, by the in-

fluence and income of foreign elements.

Note:

Ewald to support the view that the Samaritans

earnestly and sincerely offered their aid, argues

that the expression, "the enemies of Judah and Benjamin"

((עֲרֵב יְהוּדָה וּבִנְיָמִן) Ezra 4:1) as referring to the

Samaritans is an interpolation, coming from a later

time when the relations between Jews and Samaritans

See how weak
the
Ib 86

11
were sufficiently strained, and the attitude of the latter toward the former, sufficiently hostile to justify the expression. Jost however (Gesch. des. Jud. u. seiner Sekten I p50) urges that the Samaritans desired to aid in the rebuilding of the temple in order to secure a basis for their claim of being true Jews, and not transplanted foreigners.

At all events the Samaritan offer of aid is refused. Indignant at this refusal, the Samaritans determine to use all the resources at their command to interfere with the progress of the building of the temple, and if possible to put a thorough stop to the same. Their efforts are not in vain. By impressing upon Cambyses (Cyrus seems to have been killed before any complaint was made) the necessity of opposing "every manner possible, the increasing strength of the people, who, in the near future might become one of the most powerful enemies to the Persian dynasty and most likely by showing the King that, should the new temple be allowed to reach completion, the Jews would have a place about which to rally, and within which restoration, and Messianic hopes might be nourished, the Samaritans succeed in having the progress of the rebuilding

checked (Ezra IV) For sixteen years as a consequence no further work on the temple is done, until the reign of Darius, who in 520 B. C. gives to the Jews the privilege formerly granted them by Cyrus. The work is then continued and the Temple is completed in 516 B. C.

^ But these sixteen years are counted from the time when Darius was still reigning

Note:-

Peculiar is it that about the year 520, Haggai and Zechariah still speak of the existing ruins of the old temple, without referring to any ^{earlier} unsuccessful attempt at rebuilding. The rebuilding therefore, as begun cannot have advanced to any considerable extent, even though a few years elapsed from the time of the permission given by Cyrus to the interruption through the agency of the Samaritans. According to Esdras 5 ⁷³ the building was stopped for only two years. This would render still more unaccountable the silence of the two prophets. It seems an established fact however that the interruption lasted sixteen years. In Ezra VI.7 f. is given the content of the document or decree made by Cyrus concerning the building of the temple. Here we are told that not only was permission given the Jews, but the Samaritans (and others) are commanded to pay tribute for the temple, and its sacrifices. Josephus Ant. XI 4. 9 attributes a similar decree to Darius after his promulgation of the decree of Cyrus, as found by him, had proved futile. Not much credence is to be placed in the relation of such a statement. That the Samaritans should be commanded to refrain from further interference with the Jews is likely enough, but that they should be bidden pay tribute to the Jews, this can be but a fiction, produced

13
by a Jewish pride, to show the superiority of the Jews, and the degrading depths to which the Samaritans were (or rather in the Jewish mind ought to have been) reduced. In fact not much reliance is to be placed in the detailed accounts of these decrees as given.

It was not to be expected however that the Samaritans, from now on the most hostile of enemies to the Jews, would sit idly by and see the latter prosper. Failing in their attempts to frustrate the building of the temple, they direct their attention into a different channel, and endeavour, by all means at their command, to prevent the completion of the walls of the city of Jerusalem. (Cf. Neh. IV 8, VI 1- 14) That they were partly successful in this endeavour, seems evident from the fact that the walls remained in ruins until the time of Nehemiah. Through his energetic efforts however the Samaritans are again frustrated, and the city of Jerusalem is completely walled, the breach between the Samaritans and the Jews as a consequence widening.

Note:-

A difficulty is immediately observable in a study of Ezra IV. The first five verses have reference to the Jewish refusal of Samaritan aid, and the resulting efforts on the part of the latter to hinder the building of the Temple. In verses 6 - 23 we have an account of the Samaritans opposing the building of the walls of Jerusalem, while V 24 adds that the work on

14

the temple was stopped owing to the success which marked the Samaritans' opposition. What are we to make of all this? That the walls of Jerusalem were not built ^{1,2} were in a ruined condition immediately preceding Nehemiah's visit to the city seems evident. (Cf. Neh I,3. II,3, 5, 13, 17. III,34. IV,3, 11.)

Ewald Vol. V conjectures that Ps. 89 & 132 were written during the time immediately prior to his visit, as they portray such conditions as seem to have existed then) It is the rebuilding of the walls therefore, with which Nehemiah is particularly concerned, and he, bemoaning the fact that they lie in ruins bends all his energies to their erection. To Ezra likewise this necessity must have presented itself. Why had he not fortified the city and rendered it secure from the enemies without? That his measures made enemies without, and that he did not fortify Jerusalem seems evident. There seems to be but one explanation for this, an explanation which at least does away with some of the difficulty above met with. Ezra most likely did make an attempt to rebuild the walls, but through the opposition offered by the Samaritans and others, failed to accomplish his purpose. The narrative of Ezra IV 7-23 (taken from an Aramaic Source Cf. Driver introduce to O.T. 514-515) refers to this, and is therefore out of place in its present position, Verse 24 showing that

that the building of the temple and not of the walls is the subject of concern (Cf. also opening verses I - 4) Now Ezra is said to have arrived in Jerusalem 458 B. C. hence during the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus (465-425) Note that the incident in Ezra (IV 7 - 23) is said to have occurred under Artaxerxes Cf. VV 7 and 23) As far as Chronology therefore is concerned, our interpretation of this event is correct. Further more, the statements made by Nehemiah about the ruined condition of the walls, and this eagerness and zeal to rebuild them (445 B.C.)

are thus due to the failure on the part of Ezra, to fortify the city. Harmony is thus restored. Kuenen

(Relig. of Isr. II 224) supposes that the breaking out of war prevented the completion of the walls

during the time of Ezra. Such a supposition is, according to the above explanation, unnecessary, the interpolated portion of Ezra IV, showing that the influence of the Samaritans (and others) was sufficient to hinder Ezra from erecting the walls.

Within the city of Jerusalem, previous to the arrival of Nehemiah, the conditions of the Jews from a religious standpoint were by no means highly satisfactory. Intermarriages with the foreign element present in the city were frequent, (Cf. Ezra Ch. X & Neh. X 18f.) even among the most distinguished families (Graetz V 117 says this was done to avoid unpleasant relations with the surrounding

But see Bristle's note saying that the destruction of the walls was the result of the hostile Samarians

peoples). When therefore Nehemiah arrives in Jerusalem he finds plenty room for much needed reform. Naturally, he, as did Ezra in 458 (Cf. Ch. X) directs his attention to the suppression of these mixed marriages, thinking thereby to insure the integrity of Judaism. As successful as Ezra seems to have been in this opposition to intermarriages, the very fact that Nehemiah finds so much opportunity for change in this very direction, is proof positive that the Evil had not yet been uprooted. Accordingly, when Nehemiah reaches Jerusalem (on his second visit about 432 B. C. his first visit of twelve years 444 - 432 [Neh II I] having produced no stringent measures against the presence of the foreign element, with whom many Jews had joined) he immediately forbids intermarriage, all who had already been joined in wedlock ^{to any of the surrounding peoples being commanded} to dissolve such marriage. Among those whom these orders affected was one of the Priestly family son of Joiada, and grandson of Eliashib, who had contracted marriage with Nicaso, daughter of Sanballat, who was most likely the governor of Samaria (the same most probably with whom Nehemiah had had so much trouble Cf. Neh. II 10 F. IV 1f, VI 1f,) This son of Joiada, Manasseh, refuses however to obey the orders of the new reformer. Driven as a consequence, from Jerusalem by Nehemiah (Neh. XIII 28) about 432 B. C., he conspires with the Sanballat above mentioned (who seems to have been an honest proselyte) to oppose the Jews in every manner possible, and the opposition thus fostered is by no means insignificant.

For leaving Jerusalem, Manasseh had gone to the people among whom his influence, due to his high family connection (being in the priestly family, and being son-in-law of Sanballat) would be felt, viz. The Samaritans. Among these people owing to their hatred of the Jews of Jerusalem, he as an exile would receive a hearty welcome, as such an increase of Samaritan numbers meant a proportional decrease of Jewish numbers, and Manasseh was by no means alone in his peculiar position. In addition to the fact that there were many in Jerusalem who though they had not intermarried, still opposed the measures of Nehemiah (Ct. Kuenen II 213, 249 f.) The fact of one of the priestly family linking himself to the Samaritans (note likewise the priests, Levites etc. who during Ezra's time had done the same, Ezra Ch X) seems evidence of the fact that such intermarriage was not looked upon with horror, was possibly not even strongly opposed, and that many must have taken advantage of this passive permission. At any rate, when Manasseh leaves Jerusalem, he no doubt is accompanied by a number of the dissatisfied Jews who swell the numbers of the Samaritans (According to Josephus (Ant. XI 8, 2 & 7), Sanballat also enticed to Samaria numbers of Jews, by offering them money, lands, and homes, likewise were profaners of the Sabbath, and those who had eaten forbidden things in Jerusalem, welcomed by the Samaritans) Strengthened thus, Sanballat determines forever put an end to any hope of amicable relations between his people and the Jews.

18

To accomplish this purpose, and at the same time to give to his son-in-law a situation befitting his position, he determines to erect a Samaritan temple, which shall prove a formidable rival to that at Jerusalem, shall afford a means whereby the Samaritan opposition to Jerusalem may assume more concrete form, and shall lend to the Samaritan claim of Jewish descent a more probable coloring. Permission is accordingly secured from Darius Nothus, and the temple of Gerizim is built.

Note:-

Josephus (Ant XI, 8, 3f and XIII, 9, I) places the building of this temple during the reign of Darius Codomanus and Alexander the Great, and narrates that Sanballat, by deserting Darius, and joining Alexander, in addition to bringing to the latter 8000 soldiers, succeeded in securing his permission to build the new temple. Josephus must thus make Manasseh a brother of Jaddua. Torrey (Composition and origin of Ezra and Nehemiah in Beiheft zur Zeitschrift fur die alttest. wissenschaft) argues that the book of Nehemiah (with possibly the exceptions of Chs. I - 5) were written by the Chronicler after 300 B. C. and that the Manasseh event occurred during the time of Alexander, the affair being assigned by the Chronicler to the time of Nehemiah, as it represented a reform movement, and Nehemiah was a reformer. He likewise adds that no historical value can be attributed to Neh. V- XIII This view, as can be seen is

in the main a support of Josephus. That the Chronicler wrote Ezra and Nehemiah is acknowledged by almost every one (Cf Driver Introd. 517 f. Smith O. T. in the Jewish Church p 140) In fact the Chronicles^{were} at one time most likely one with Ezra and Neh. II Chr. now ends in the middle of a verse, which reappears complete at the beginning of Ezra. Such a conclusion however does not prove the falsity of the statement in Neh XIII 28, that the son of Joiada was driven out by Nehemiah, for refusing to separate from his wife, Nicaso, daughter of Sanballat. Taking into account the time in which the Chronicler lived, and that in which Josephus wrote, we see no reason why the account given by the former, from the fact that he lived^{so} near the time of Nehemiah, should not be more correct than that given by the latter. Furthermore should it be objected, that^t the Chronicler is often fictitious, so can we argue the fictitious character^{of} much of Josephus' accounts. Especially untrustworthy is Jos. for these times (Jost Gesch U.Sekten 48 n I) It would have been a simple matter for the latter to have confused Joiada, Darius (Nothus) and Sanballat of Nehemia's time, with Jaddua Darius Codomannus, and another Sanballat of Alexander's time, and so have placed the event about a century too late. (Cf. Wellhausen Hist. of Isr. and Judah 135 -136: Jost Gesch d. Juden u. Seiner Sekten I

48 N. 2. Smith O. T. in Jewish Church 73 & 398 also
Art. " The S. " IN Brittanica, Keil Introd. 303 etc.)
To argue as does Torrey, that Nehemiah probably wrote
no account of his doings, proves nothing. Harmonists
have however not been found wanting. Bleek (Einleitend
147-8) suggests that the expulsion of Manasseh may
have taken place during Nehemia's time, but that the
temple was probably built at the time of Alexander,
Kautsch (Art. Die S. in Herzog's R. Encycl.) urges
that though the Manasseh event happened under Nehe-
mia, the building of the temple on Gerizim occurred
during Alexander's time, but that the later Jews,
desiring to lower the reputation of the Samaritans
and of their temple, attributed its erection to an
apostate Jew, a disgraced exile, the Manasseh above
mentioned. Kirchheim however caps the climax, when
he says (Carme Shomron p 4) that Nehemiah cannot
be wrong in his account, nor can Josephus. Therefore
there must have been two events of this kind in which
a Manasseh took part; one at the time of Nehemiah,
the other at the time of Alexander: that in the for-
mer case the Samaritans asked Darius Nothus for
permission to build a small house of prayer (בית תפלה);
in the latter case, they requested permission of
Alexander to build the temple on Gerizim. The Samari-
tans themselves (Bk. Josh. quoted fr. Kirch p 19)
claim that Joshua, the servant of Moses, whom they

call his standard bearer, built the temple on Gerizim after getting possession of the land for Israel. Compare altogether, the erection of this Gerizim temple with the erection of the temple in Egypt by Onias. In the latter case however no ban was pronounced, from the fact that the Egyptian Jews still recognized Jerusalem as the holy city, and because the temple at Jerusalem was then destroyed (Antiochus Epiphanes)

2

(SECOND PERIOD)

From the Erection of the Temple on Gerizim to the Roman Ascendency:---

With the erection of the temple on Gerizim the Samaritans enter upon a new career, as it were, distinctly separated from everything and everyone connected with Jerusalem. Having a temple of their own, and instituted worship based on the Pentateuch (which we think they received at this time (Cf. further The S. Pent) such worship having been introduced by Manasseh, they were enabled to make their life, and their religion, henceforth peculiarly their own. They were thus enabled to maintain themselves distinct from the Jews, and by their new faith, lay claim to being not Assyrian Colonists, transported to Samaria, but true Israelites, the descendants of the ten tribes of Joseph of Ephraim, and of Manasseh. The temple at Jerusalem is considered far inferior to their own and is called בית מכאס and ארורי עלם Jerusalem proper being styled בית קלל (cursed Salem)) while their own temple and mount receive the Epithets הר צדק (Mt. of Blessing) and הר קדש *blessed mount*

הר קדש (Holy Mt.) (Cf. Joseph Wars V 8, I. Ant. XI 8, 8. Midrash Bereshith Rabba 32, 18 & 8I, 3, also Dt. 34, 10 Rabba 3, 8;) At all events we have now reached a point where the Samaritans enter upon a life of their own. No longer however does Samaria remain their leading city. For with the erection of the temple on Gerizim, Schechem now

Note:-

A certain later Samaritan poet in Egypt, Theodotus wrote a history of Schechem. He says the name is derived from Sikimios, Son of Hermes. This however is but a Greek myth adopted by Theodotus (Cf. Schürer " The Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ " translated by Macpherson III Part II 224 - 225)

For almost a century however, from the time of the erection of the Gerizim temple to the time of Alexander, the history of the Samaritans is shrouded in darkness. That they assisted Alexander in the siege of Tyre seems very probable (Joseph. Ant. XI 8, 3). As a consequence, they might have expected certain privileges to be granted them (Joseph. ibid makes the permission to build the temple, their reward.) No such privileges materialize however, their request to be exempted from paying tribute during the Sabbatical year being refused (Ant. XI 8, 5) Indignant anger follows. Their rage is further increased by the fact that their hateful enemies the Jews, were granted these very privileges (and more) which were refused them. (Joseph. ibid) Roused to fury by this ingratitude on the part of Alexander, they determine to wreak vengeance. Accordingly, when Alexander left for Egypt, appointing as Governor of Syria and Palestine, one of his favorites, Andromachus, the Samaritans refuse to submit to him, and when later this governor takes up his residence at Samaria, those Samaritans who lived in the city, set fire to his home, he perishing in the flames. Upon returning from Egypt, Alexander

avenges the death of his favorite, by putting to death all who had participated in the outrage, by banishing from the ^{city} great numbers of the Samaritans who dwelt there, replacing them with a colony of Macedonian Soldiers, and by annexing Samaria to Judea (Cf. Rollins Ancient Empire of also Jos. III 222 where authorities are quoted) The expelled colonists went their way to Schechem, their Chief City, and thus increase the Samaritan Community already there.

After the death of Alexander (323 B. C.) the condition of the Samaritans assumes a different aspect. The territory of Alexander is divided among his generals, the only one with whom we are concerned, Ptolemy son of Lagus, getting Egypt as his portion. In his conquests, he captured Jerusalem, and likewise brought the surrounding territory under his sway. Upon his return to Egypt, he thus brings with him a large number of Hebrew and Samaritan captives (Joseph. Ant XII I, 1) who soon adjusting themselves to their surroundings, made their Egyptian stay, their Egyptian homes, produce lasting results.

Note:-

That the Samaritans as well as the Jews were in great numbers in Egypt seems evident. During Alexander's time, many must have come, in addition to the garrison of Samaritan soldiers which Alexander sent there upon his visit to Palestine (Joseph Ant XI, 3, 6) That many later emigrated thither is not so improbable. Kircheim (Carme Shomron p 6) says many went there through fear of Antigonus, who defeated Ptolemy and thus secured possession of Palestine (314 and

301 B. C.) Abulfatach the Samaritan Chronicler
is likewise quoted (ibid) as claiming that when
the LXX was translated, there were among the trans-
lators some Samaritan scholars, whose intellectual
superiority was easily recognized by Alexander.

It seems that there was a good sized community of
Samaritans in Egypt, especially in Alexandria, a community
which soon borrowed of the enlivening spirit character-
istic of the Alexandria of that day. Living thus again in
close contact with the Jews, it is not at all surprising
that there should have been continual debates between the
two peoples, concerning the authenticity of their Pentateu-
chal texts, concerning their religious differences etc,
Such debates awakening their religious zeal all the more.
In fact it would be surprising, were not such the case.
Accordingly we are not astonished to hear of such a debate
occurring during the time of Ptolemy Philometer.

Note:-

The cause assigned for the discussion, as well as the
substance and results thereof differ with different
writers. The Samaritan Bk. Joshua Ch. 46 (quoted
Fr. Kirch. Carme Shomron 6+7) tells us that through
a desire to find what constituted the differences
between the Samaritan and Hebrew texts of the Penta-
teuch, Ptolemy had certain representatives of each
people assemble before him, and defend their respec-
tive versions. The Samaritans thereupon argued con-
cerning Gerizim, defending its legitimacy and there-
fore its presence in the disputed verses of the bible

(Cf. Further The S. Pent.) Arguing that since the custom^{of} sacrificing had existed very early, a place must have been chosen for such sacrificing long before Moses, (The Samaritans in their Pent. always changed ^{and} referring to the choice of a place for sacrifice, to ^{and}) and that this chosen place was Gêrîzim. They likewise defended their non acceptance of the Prophetical books, by referring to Dt. XIII, I "Whatsoever I command you, that shall ye observe to do Neither add thereto, nor diminish therefrom " The discussion touched various other points. The samaritans won and were sent home, loaded down with presents, expressions of Ptolemy's satisfaction, 36 of the Jews being killed for having lost in the argument. Such is the Samaritan version of the debate. What have Jewish sources to say on the subject? In Joseph Ant. XIII 3, 4, the reason assigned for the debate is that both sides desired Ptolemy to settle the genuineness of their claims. The account as given, there, relates that the Jews in the presence of Ptolemy accused the Samaritans of having for-sworn Judaism and of confessing themselves to be Sidonians (Cf. Joseph Ant. XII 5, 6) The Jews likewise pointed to ^{long line of high priests from the time of Aaron to their own} their own_A time. The Samaritans lost the debate, Sabbaeus and Theodosius their representatives being accordingly killed, in accordance with the compact made between the two sides. It can be seen at a glance

27

that this account is as prejudiced as that given by the Samaritan authority above. The arguments were to be based on the Bible. With this as can be seen the Jews did not comply. Nor did they even bring arguments. There seems however no reason to doubt that such a debate did take place, and that such debates frequently occurred. That the results were those stated by either Jew or Samaritan historian, or that the debate even took place in the presence of Ptolemy, seems however very doubtful. Graetz (Gesch III 47) suggests as a reason for the debate, the fact that the Samaritans were enraged at the translators of the LXX for omitting " Thou shalt build an altar on Gerizim " which the S. Pentateuch has (Cf. further The S. Pent.) Having influential friends at Court, they succeeded in getting Philometer to consent to the debate. Cf. also for historical value of accounts of this debate Graetz (III 49 & 50 and note p 634), Kuenen (Relig. of Isr. III 184) thinks Samaritans and Jews simply became involved in a quarrel, and that Ptolemy interfered, deciding in favor of the Jews, among whom he had friends. The names Sabbaeus and Theodosius (mentioned in the account of Joseph) occur in Midrash Tanchuma to ב' פ' ו' ע"ב שלחו לכם את דוסתאי ואת סביא ולמדו אותם (הכונים) בכנס) though it is to be noticed here that Theodosius has taken the form Dositheus, Dustoi (Cf. Graetz in above ment. place.) Even in this century the Samaritans continued their

But why do you not mention that in the Midrash H. & G. are the teachers of the Samaritans.

arguments concerning Gerizim and their Pent. (Cf. 28

Robinson Bibl. Researches. III 105.)

Let us return now to the Samaritans of Palestine, and especially of Schechem. That they had not been unmoved by the warfare going on about them, during and after the time of Alexander, we have already seen. Nothing further is heard of them however, until the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. When he came against Jerusalem 168 B. C. and oppressed the Jews, determining to do away with their religion and their worship, the Samaritans desiring to be free from any ill-treatment at his hands, wrote to him a letter in which they claimed to be Sidonians " aliens from the nation and customs of the Jews " (Joseph Ant. XII 5, 5) The Samaritans had acted similarly at the time of Alexander, assuring him that they were Sidonians dwelling in Schechem (Joseph ^{Ant.} XI 8, 6) The action at the time of Antiochus was prompted by the fear lest, resembling the Jews so closely as they did, the King who had oppressed Israel in order to spread his own religious views, might treat them as he had the inhabitants of Jerusalem. At any rate the Samaritan request seems to have been regarded by Antiochus, who requested Nicanor the governor of that part of the country to see that they were not harmed.

Note:--

Joseph (Ant XII 5, 5) states that in the letter which the Samaritans sent to Antiochus, they agreed upon condition that no harm be done them, to allow their temple to be named " the temple of Jupiter

Hellenius " and that this was done. That Antiochus
 should have so named their temple seems not improba-
 ble. None the less improbable were it, that in the
 presence of such superior forces, the Samaritans
 should have yielded to such a proceeding. That they
 should have suggested the action however, seems stran-
 gly inconsistent with the fanatical zeal which they
 always evidenced in behalf of Gerizim, and its tem-
 ple. During the Roman times, as we shall see, even
 after being prohibited from visiting their sacred
 Mt. they disobeyed the prohibition again and again,
 despite the punishments continually inflicted upon
 them for so doing. In II Maccabees VI2, the state-
 ment is made that Antiochus devoted the temple of
 gerizim to Zeus, nothing being said of the Samari-
 tans suggesting it. Furthermore Josephus is always
 very bitter in his denunciations of the Samaritans,
 accusing them of almost everything cowardly and mean.
 All this leads us to the conclusion that possibly the
 statement concerning the temple attributed by Joseph.
 to the Samaritans, may be purposely so colored, as to
 bring contumely upon the Samaritans. Michaelis thinks
 S. are Sidonians and points to Targum. Yonathon to Gen 35
 (606X) where וַיִּבְנוּ is translated by בְּנוֹת. For a beauti-
 ful poetic account of the action here portrayed
 Cf. Longfellow " Judas Maccabaens " Act I Sc. 2.

The very fact however of the Samaritans denying that

30

they were Jews, after having for centuries urged their claim of Jewish descent, could not but have impressed the Jews at Jerusalem very unfavorably, could not but have emphasized the opinions they already entertained of this people. The relations between the Samaritans and Jews at this time were of the most hostile nature. Pursuing each their own course, from the time of the erection of the temple on Gerizim, contact between the two peoples was ever marked by discussions, and such had been the case in fact since the time that the proffered aid of the S. was refused by Zerubabel. Accordingly, when after the Syrian yoke had been thrown off by the Jews, immediately after the death of Antiochus, Hyrcan makes an expedition against Syria (about 130 B. C.), We are not surprised to hear of his capturing Schechem and of his destroying Gerizim. (Joseph Ant. XIII 9, I) , thus at one stroke giving almost a death blow to Samaritan hopes of future glory and superiority to Jerusalem.

Note:--

Jost (Gesch d. J. u. Seiner Sek. p70) assigns 120 as the date of this occurrence, though most authorities agree on 129 or 130. Graetz (Gesch III 76) says Schechem was also destroyed. Of this we have no account. Talmud Yoma 69 a, places the destruction of the temple of Gerizim in Alexander's time, ^{The temple being well known in the time of} Such cannot have been the case. The Jews on this occasion 17th of Kislev, instituted a half feast day (יום חצי חג) * Mt. Gerizim day * on which neither mourning

nor fasting was allowed. This day was to be fittingly observed each year.

To the Samaritans the destruction of the temple was a most grievous calamity, one from which their relation to the temple hitherto would lead to suppose, they would find it difficult soon to recover. It needed however but some such action on the part of the Jews, to fan into a blaze the embers of hatred which they (the S.) had always nourished against them. And so it is not long before the Samaritans endeavour to pour out upon the Jews the full measure of their pent up animosity. In 109 B. C. an opportunity presented itself to them of returning the compliment given them by the Jews. In Marissa was a colony of Hebrews, confederate to the Jews in Jerusalem. This colony the Samaritans attacked. Hyrcan accordingly leads his forces against Samaria, but after besieging the city, and building ditches and walls around it, he entrusts the command of the siege to his sons Antigonus and Aristobulus. The Samaritans in despair call in the aid of Antiochus Cyzicenus and Ptolemy Lathurus, but in vain. After a year's siege, the city is forced to surrender. As a punishment to the people, Samaria is destroyed, and the inhabitants scattered, some going to Schechem, some to Syria, some to Damascus etc. (Cf. Joseph Ant. XIII 10, 2 & 3)

Note:-

The Jews made this day (25th) of Marcheshvan) also a day of rejoicing. Samaria from now on is often

called Ir Nebrecht (עיר נבֶּרֶחַת) Canal City.

32
from the statement (in Joseph Ant XIII 10, 3) that
Hyrcaan dug ditches throughout the entire city that
it be no more inhabited. Graet'z comments on this
point Gesch (III 83 and especially Note I IV pp
604 - 605) are very interesting .

As a settled community of any importance, the Samari-
tans from the time of the destruction of their temple, and
from the destruction of Samaria, disappear. Scattered
throughout the then known world, in Schechem, Gaza, Caes-
area, Damascus, Alexandria, Thebes and other cities, they
console themselves for their thus far sad fortune, with
the hope that the future may bring them opportunities of
venting their spite upon and showing their hatred for their
now worst of enemies, the Jews: determined never-the-less
to preserve intact their faith, their religion, based upon
letter of the Law (as interpreted by them). The little
animation that in most instances here^{to}fore characterized
their life, seems to have left them. They form a sort of
lifeless mass, now and then awakened from their death-like
lethargy by their hatred for Jews and Christians and by
Re^snaissance movements about them.

The Samaritans under Roman Sway.

Beginning with the time of Roman ascendancy in Palestine, the history of the Samaritans is a checkered one. They formed to be sure but a small community, but they escaped none the less the eagle eye of the persecutor. From now on they have two enemies for whom their hatred is intense, the Romans and the Jews. When Christianity becomes the State religion, it becomes the foe of the Samaritans as of the Jews. While Gabinius, one of Pompey's lieutenants is governor of Syria, he has Samaria rebuilt, and re-peopled. Whether however Samaritans returned thither or not, we are not told (Jos. Ant. XIV 6, 2,) though some assert that such was the case. Cf. Graetz IV 226. He also claims that by the time of Severus it was the leading S. city. Later Herod beautified Samaria, giving it the name Sebaste (Augustus) in honor of Augustus. (Jos. Ant. XVIII, 5) Under this name of Sebaste, Samaria is mentioned in Mishna Erachin 3, 2 כְּמִקְרִישׁ הַיְּרֵמְיָהוּ הַגָּדוֹל

The first incident concerning the Samaritans proper, of which we hear in the new Era, is one that occurred in Jerusalem in 7 A.D. As Joseph. relates it, (Ant XVIII 2, 2) during the time of Caesar, when Judea was under the procuratorship of Cyrenius and Coponius, the Samaritans secretly entered Jerusalem, and while the Jews were celebrating Passover, threw dead men's bones into the cloisters of

34

the temple. (The gates of the temple being opened just after midnight) As a result the Jews henceforth excluded the Samaritans from the temple " which they had not used to do, at such festivals "(Jos. ibid).

Note:-

This last statement agrees with the statement of Joseph. (Ant. XI 4, 3)) that when the samaritans offered to aid in building the temple, though Zerubabel refused their aid, he never - the - less gave them permission to enter the temple and pray therein. The existing relations between Jews and Samaritans at the time of the above mentioned incident (7 A.D.) were such as to warrant us in placing confidence in the truth of the account. The Jews had destroyed Gerizim. The samaritans could in no way retaliate more effectually, ^{an} ~~then~~ by desecrating the Jewish house of worship. I make mention of this, from the fact that it has been argued, that the incident above narrated could not have occurred, since the Samaritans (at least those most religious and strict) considered contact with a dead body (hence with bones thereof) as rendering one unclean (Cf. Jost. Gesch d.J.u.s. Sekten I 7 I). ^{an} ~~That~~ The Samaritans do today, and did far back in history, strictly observe the laws of cleanness, there is no doubt; that some did not, there is also no doubt. But that the Samaritans should have adopted any means of retaliating upon their most

35
hated enemies the Jews, is very probable, even though
the means were such as those mentioned above.

As with other peoples and religions, so with the Samaritans, pseudo-messiahs are bound to make their appearance, Messiahs who propose to revolutionize existing conditions. So we hear that during the procuratorship of Pilate (fifth governor or procurator of Judea, Samaria and Idumea) a Samaritan arose (about 35 A.D.) who called himself a Messiah and who promised, after leading the Samaritans to the summit of Gerizim to show them the vessels buried there by Moses. The report spread throughout the country. The Samaritans being now in almost a menial condition (as far as freedom and prosperity were concerned) were eager to grasp an opportunity of raising themselves of their religion, and as a consequence placed full faith in the promise of the " Messiah ". They accordingly assembled, armed, at Tirathaba, a village near Schechem, preparatory to advancing and ascending Gerizim. To Pilate however, the entire matter seemed a preconcerted plot to rebel, and so he put an end to the hopes of the Samaritans by sending thither his troops. Many Samaritans were killed, many wounded, and many taken prisoners. (Cf. Joseph^{Ant} XVII 4, 1).

Note:-

The accusation of worshipping images hidden on Gerizim, was often made by the Jews against the Samaritans. That a pseudo - messiah should have arisen among the Samaritans, and that he should have made

36

Gerizim the basis, the site of his operations, is very probable. It is not at all likely however, that these later accusations of the Jews are true. In Jer. Aboda Sara V44 d. (Krotashin Edi) the Samaritans are accused of worshiping the images hidden on Gerizim by Jacob. (Gn. XXXV 4). Similarly Bereshith Rabba SI, 3. The Samaritans were similarly accused by the Jews of worshiping a dove on Gerizim (Aboda Sara V 44 d and Chulin 3 a.) Cf. further The S. of the Talmud) In the S. Bk. Joshua 42 (quoted from Kirch p 24) it is related that the highpriest Ozi had, at the command of God, concealed in a cave (or hole) on Mt. Gerizim, the holy vessels. This was done 330 yrs. after the Jews entered Palestine.

The Samaritans however, were not to accept such treatment without murmuring. They therefore complained of Pilate, to Vitellius governor of Syria, who ordered Pilate to Rome to explain matters, Marcellus being appointed to Pilate's position. (Jos. Ant. XVII 4, 2.)

The animosity between Jews and Samaritans had by no means ceased to exist, and we soon again find them at swords points. It was customary for the Galileans, in visiting Jerusalem for the festivals, to pass through the territory of the Samaritans. About the year 48 A. D. when some Galileans thus journeying to the holy city, had reached Ginea, a small town in Samaria, the Samaritans attacked them, killing many of them. Cumanus the procurator (having been bribed by the Samaritans) allowed the affair to pass

37

unnoticed, and ignored the complaint of the Galilean and other Jews. The latter therefore, determined to take the matter in their own hands, and attacked and plundered many villages of the Samaritans.. It was now the Samaritans who with wild cries begged protection of Cumanus. He, arming the Samaritans themselves, in addition sent troops to aid them. The Jews however were not to be outdone, and so complained to Quadratus governor of Syria, before whom representatives of both peoples were ordered to appear. Quadratus seems to have been in a quandry, in endeavouring to decide which side was in the right, each accusing the other of attempting to revolt from Rome. After punishing first the Jews, then the Samaritans, the matter was still without a solution. Accordingly Quadratus sent the chief representatives of Jews and Samaritans to Rome, to plead their causes before Emperor Claudius. Through the influence of Agrippa, the younger, who was then at Rome, Agrippina the wife of the Emperor urges the decision against the Samaritans. Claudius therefore, after putting to death the Samaritan ring-leaders, deprives Cumanus of his office of Procurator (Joseph. Ant. XX6, I).

Note:-

For journeying to Palestine through the territory of the Samaritans cf. Luke XVII 11, John IV4. In Luke IX 52 likewise in a manner similar to that portrayed in the above incident, the Samaritans are said to have refused to receive Jesus, because he seemed to be journeying toward Jerusalem. In still another way however the Samaritans annoyed the Jews. Knowing

that the Rabbis at Jerusalem communicated to their Correligionists in otherlands, the time of the coming of the new moon, by lightning beacon-fires on the hill tops, The Samaritans used to deceive the Jews outside of Jerusalem, by lighting such fires a day earlier. On which account the Rabbis stopped the beacon signaling and sent messengers instead. Cf.

(Cf. ^{Hashons} Rosh Mishna II 2 and Gemara ibid. 2b. Some Samaritans must have dwelt at Rome around the time at which the deputations from Palestine reached there. A certain Thallus, a Samaritan, is mentioned as lending money to Agrippa I (Cf. Schurer Vol. II part II 24I) The S. had a temple in Rome, also after 493 A.D. (Cf. Robinson III I22 N. 3.)

During the trouble incident upon the siege of Jerusalem by Vespasian, the Samaritans did not escape sharing misfortunes with the Jews. Taking advantage of the disturbed state of affairs in lower Palestine, they assembled and took possession of Gerizim. Once more their holy Mt. is theirs. The feelings which they had ever had and evinced for Gerizim and their religion, seem to have been intensified to such a degree, now by the actual possession of Mt. Gerizim, as to make them determined to brave all, rather than submit to their opponents. To Vespasian, the threatening aspect of this gathering on Gerizim brought forebodings of revolt. He therefore determined to prevent the movement from assuming undue proportions, and so sent Cerialis one of his generals to uproot the revolt. After many 2

39
81

Samaritans had deserted the main body, and after many ineffectual attempts had been made by Cerealis to induce the Samaritans to surrender, he makes an attack on them and 11300 are reported to have been killed about 87 A. D. That so many were present must have been due to the Importance of the movement, the capture and retention of Gerizim the all-in-all of the Samaritans (Joseph wars III,7, 32) The death of so many of their number was not the only punishment, it seems, that was inflicted upon them. The city in which they had dwelt so long, The city connected vitally with their fondest thoughts, with Gerizim, was no longer to be known by its famous name Schechem, but from now on becomes Neapolis (The New City) being in great part rebuilt by Vespasian and peopled with Romans. To be sure , the importance of the Samaritans continually wained. Neapolis assumes an entire Roman aspect, becomes imbued with Roman culture, and the small community of Samaritans in the city soon become Romanized. (In a similar manner must Macedonian influence have been felt among them, when Alexander placed 8000 Macedonians in their midst. In that case however, the number of the Samaritans was greater, and they were better able to withstand outside influence.)

Note:-

It seems evident that Vespasian simply rebuilt a great part of Schechem and changed its name. Many urge however, that he built an entire new city, Neapolis, some short distance from Schechem, and that thither went many of the Samaritans from the latter city. (Jost Gesch d.j.u. Seiner Sek. I 72) Epiphanius

40
 is quoted (by Robinson III II3 & II9 Also by Kitto
 Art. Schechem in McCl. and Strong) as identifying the
 two. ἐν Σικίμιος τούτ' ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ νυνὶ Νεαπόλει (Adv. Haer. III
 1055) Most writers agree upon this point (Cf.
 Schürer II I 123. Graetz V 15.) The name Neapolis
 first appears on Coins of Vespasian. The city was
 known also by the name Mabortha (Cf. Joseph Wars
 IV 8, I) The modern Nablus is simply a corruption
 of Neapolis. The name is found in Midrash Bereshith
 Rabba 8I, 3: 32, 16. Dt. Rabba 3, 8: and Bamidbar 10
 Rabba 23, 14 where it is identified with Schechem
 שכס בהר אפרים זהו שכם

From the time of Vespasian to that of Hadrian, no men-
 tion of the Samaritans is made. Still the relation between
 them and the Jews during that time can be easily conjec-
 tured, from the fact that when we again meet them, we find
 this relation rather harmonious than otherwise, at least
 during Hadrian's reign. Yet they often show themselves of
 a peculiarly vacillating nature, that at times seems to jus-
 tify the harsh criticism of Josephus, when he said con-
 cerning them, " when the Jews are in adversity, they deny
 that they are of Kin to them, but when they perceive that,
 that some good fortune hath befallen them (the Jews)
 they immediately pretend to have communion with them saying
 that they belong to them " etc. (Cf. Joseph Ant. IX I4,3
 XI 8, 7.) Such inconsistency we have already observed.
 During the time of Hadrian it seems to have been empha-

41
sized. We have seen that during the first century A.D. they were most hostile to the Jews. To find them aiding the Jews against the Romans in the second Century, were almost an anomaly. Yet such seems to have been the case during the Barkochba rebellion (132-135) It seems likewise that they were punished as were the Jews.

Note:-

A great deal of obscurity hovers about the relations between Jews and Samaritans, and Samaritans and Romans during the Barkochba rebellion. Frankel (Uber den Einfluss der palästnischen Exegese 1851, p.245) denies that Hadrian in any manner oppressed the Samaritans, and points to Jer. Kidd. IV 65 d (Krot. Edi)

על שער עיריית יתקשו וכותים למי שהם, arguing that Hadrian.

Accordingly, he claims the Samaritans did not aid the Jews in the Barkochba^{Revolution}. From the fact that we know not to whom עמ refers, (Frankel's view being but a conjecture without any argument) such a statement means nothing, and proves nothing pro or con. The Samaritans and Jews during Hadrian's time, as far as we can learn from Jewish sources, seem to have been on friendly terms with each other. So. Graetz IV 303 attributes the little attention given R. Meir's decision that the Samaritans were to be treated as heathen, to the fact that the Jews were favorably inclined toward the Samaritans. Furthermore it is significant that Akiba the leading spirit of the

of the revolution was one of the Most, in fact the most liberal Rabbi in matters concerning the Cuthim the Samaritans (Cf. further The S. of the Talmud) That he was so friendly to the Samaritans because they aided in the rebellion in which he was, heart and soul, is not improbable. Again the Samaritans themselves (Bk. Josh. Ch. 48, quoted from Graetz IV 138) speak of having had to worship a dove which Graetz (ibid) interprets as the punishment inflicted on the Samaritans for their participation in the rebellion. At any rate there is authority for the statement that a temple to Jupiter was built on Gerizim. (Ibid)) Such an action would correspond to the doings of Hadrian at Jerusalem, and would represent the true character of this ruler. It was his desire to uproot every faith excepting his own. Therefore his hostile attitude toward the Jews. The Samaritans strongly resembled in religion and customs the Jews. This most likely would form an additional incentive to punish them, as he had the Jews. All this leads us to the probable conclusion that the Samaritans did aid the Jews in the Barkochba rebellion, and at its failure, were punished as were the Jews. The Jewish account that Bethar fell through the treachery of a Samaritan (Cf. Graetz IV 132 and especially note 16, pp 458-462) may at first sight seem antagonistic to the above conclusion,

43

It but shows however that that there must have been Samaritans among the Jews in Bethar, since an outsider would not have known of the secret passage-way through which it is there asserted, the Romans were led by this Samaritan. Abulfatach (The S. Chronicler) claims that Hadrian's wife was was a Samaritan, and that therefore the Samaritans were treated well by Hadrian (Cf. Kirch p II) Barkochba and Akiba are even claimed as Samaritans. (Cf. Jost. Gesch d. j.u. Seiner Sek. I p 75) Note the significance of this statement for the view above presented. None but the most harmonious relations could beget such a claim.

Passing through the reign of the Antonines seemingly unnoticed, at least unharmed, the Samaritans for some reason or other incur the displeasure of Commodus (180-192 A. D.) by whom they are punished. How and why however, we know not.

Note:-

Kirch p 12 quotes from Abulfatach concerning the conditions of the Samaritans during the reign of Commodus. He says a debate arose between Levi, the then high priest of the Samaritans, and the philosopher Alexander Aphrodisius concerning the creation of the world, and that Galen, friend of Commodus had the Emperor punish the Samaritans, because Alexander Aphrodisius was his (Galen's) enemy.

42

Under Septimius Severus (193 - 211) we again find the Samaritans in sorrow and woe. It seems to have been their lot to have their lines fall in unpleasant places. For, in most of the instances in which they attached themselves to others in a contact with a third party, they found to their sorrow that they had made a wrong choice. When they joined the Syrians against the Jews, the latter were successful, when they aided the Jews against Hadrian, he gains the ascendancy, and they reap a sorry reward. And now when a contact between the Romans proper occurs, they again find their choice wrong and become the victims of the victor. Septimius Severus, made emperor by the legions on the Danube, makes his position secure by crushing his two rivals for the throne, Pescennius Niger and Clodius Albinus, the former having been proclaimed emperor by the troops on the Rhine, the latter by those on the Euphrates. The Samaritans to their sorrow took up the cause of Pescennius Niger. When therefore Niger is overcome by Severus, they find themselves a special object of persecution by the latter, by whom citizenship is denied all the Samaritans in Neapolis.

Note:-

For authorities Cf. those quoted by Robinson III 122 n.2. also Graetz IV 225-6. Jost (Gesch. d. j.u. Seiner Sek. p.95) does not think any persecutions took place during the reign of Commodus and Severus. He argues that the Samaritans in their accounts (Cf.

450

Abulfatach in Kirch p.12) confuse dates and names and refer persecutions by the Christians back to Commodus and Severus. There is no basis however for such a view. In fact Jost seems to contradict himself, since in his Gesch. d. Isr. Volkes (II 128) he says the Rabbis sought entirely to separate themselves from the Samaritans, since the latter aided Niger and thus brought upon themselves the hatred of Severus. Schurer (II I 123) claims that from the time of Severus the importance of Sebaste (Samaria) declined, and that of Neapolis increased. In the first place, I fail to see the connection between Severus and ^{the} decline of Samaria. Secondly, the punishment of the Samaritans of Neapolis by Severus, if anything, tended to lessen the importance of the city.

For almost two full centuries we again hear but little if anything concerning the Samaritans. Under Diocletian, (if we are to rely on Talmudic sources) they were forced to idolatry, while the Jews alone were exempted from the emperor's decrees.

Note:-

The Talmudic reference occurs in Aboda Sara V 44 d.

בבב סליק דיק ליסיניס מלכא להבא גזר ואמר כל אומיא (Krot. Edi)

ינסכון ברין יוראין ונסכון כותיא The attitude of Diocletian

towards the Jews, shows that there is historical truth in the quotation, as far as the Jews are concerned.

(Cf. Graetz IV 302 and especially n.2. ibid.)

46
At this time already, the Samaritans are spoken of as but a weak community, which will soon disappear entirely. The persecutions inflicted on them are bringing their natural results. And yet, small as was the number of the Samaritans, we hear of decrees being passed against them by Constantine and Constantius, though they were better off under the former than under the latter.

Note:-

Cf. Jost Gesch d.j.u. Seiner Sekt. 75 where examples of the persecutions are given. The high priest of the Samaritans was deprived of his property, the sons of two priests were killed, and 38 others were crucified for not accepting Christianity. The Samaritans have a legendary account of a certain Baba Raba who, aided by his nephew, who had been brought up among the Christians, threw off the Roman Yoke and for a while secured independence for the Samaritans. (Cf. Jost. Gesch d.j.u. S. Sekten 75 & 76. Also Frankel (Einfluss 251)

During the Reigns of Julian, Valentinian and Valens, the condition of the Samaritans seems to have improved somewhat. Their quiet however is not to remain long undisturbed. From the time of the Roman acceptance of Christianity as a state religion (under Constantine 303-337) we may expect the edicts issued against all non-Christians. (not for a time specifically mentioning the Samaritans) soon to be directly applied to this small sect. Strange it is indeed,

that we do not hear of Roman-Christian persecutions of the Samaritans and decrees against them sooner than we do. This may be due to the fact, that the introduction of the new religious system into the state was of such a momentous and revolutionary character, that it took several years before the Romans fully adapted themselves to their new religious environment. As a consequence, immediate crusade against non-Christians was impossible. At all events, the first mention we have of decrees passed against the Samaritans during the new regime, is under Theodosius (379-395) who in 391 forbade them marrying Christians or Circumcising their servants (Although they were permitted to hold official positions, such as the magistracy, and to receive the honors connected therewith. (Codex Theodos. de Judais) Honorius (395-423) however, the first emperor in the west after the final partition of the empire, advances farther, and while emphasizing the prohibitions above mentioned, forbids them holding state offices (404 and 418 A. D.) (Codex Theod. de Judais.) (cf Jost Gesch. u. Sekten. I 76)

In the East after the final division of the Empire/the condition of the Samaritans does not seem to have been better than at anytime previous. That Theodosius forbade them building synagogues and likewise prohibited them from testifying freely, is an assured fact. (Jost Sekten 76 and authority quoted ibid) Assuming now that rebellions and revolutions are in most cases, the results of tyrannical

48

treatment of a people by a ruler, the next move on the checker board of Samaritan history would seem to testify to us, of the harsh treatment this people must have been receiving in the times immediately preceeding. During the reign of Zeno (474 - 491) while Christians in Neapolis were celebrating Pentecost, the Samaritans hurriedly assembled, and made an attack on the Christian Church in which services were being held, killing many of the churchmen therein, maiming the Bishop Terebinthus. Upon complaining to Zeno the emperor at Constantinople, troops were sent against the Samaritans, the leaders of the movement being killed, all the Samaritans being henceforth prohibited from even approaching Gerizim. On the summit of the Mountain was built a church dedicated to Virgin Mary (Cf. Robinson III 123 & 124 Kirch p.15 Jost^{Sekten} 177)

Note:-

nr3

Millman in his history of the Jews (Vol.III) makes the fantastic suggestion that Terebinthus in his complaint to Zeno reminded him of the language of Christ to the Samaritan woman (John IV) showing that this prophecied the time of a purer worship on Gerizim. This it is said urged Zeno to send his troops against the Samaritans. Kirch p.15 says that no new church was built on Gerizim, but that the ^{הבית} the house of prayer which the Samaritans had there, was changed into a Christian Church. If the Samaritans had such a house of prayer there, all well and good. Of this

49

however we have no account. Prayer at the ruins of their old temple, were more likely among the Samaritans. Modern travelers are in doubt as to what the stone piles or ruins on the Mt. are remains of. (Cf. Stanley Sinai & Palest p 245. Frankel Nach. Jerus 417-428.)

To the Samaritans, for whom as we have seen Gerizim stood for so much, by whom it was regarded as the symbol of all that was most holy, as the Mt. from the Earth of which Adam had been created, on which Abrahams trial (sacrifice of Isaac) had occurred, the Mt. which God had chosen as the place whereon to build His Holy Altar, as the burial ground of Eleazar, Ithamar, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb and the 70 Elders chosen by Moses, as a part of the land bought by Jacob from the Schechemites, as the Mt. which alone towered above the flood, and on which Joshua had built his first altar, as the first resting place of Abraham (Gn. XII 6), as the first settlement of Jacob (Gn. XXXIII 19) as the center of the world, (such are the legends which the Samaritans have Cf. all modern travelers to Schechem. Cf. Frankl Nach Jerus 417-428. Stanley Sinai & Palestine 233-245; Robinson Bibl. Researches III 95-116; Kirch. Carme Shomron 13-28 etc. Also further " The Beliefs of the S. " to the Samaritans, I repeat, to whom Gerizim represented so much, the decree passed by Zeno, proved almost a death blow. They had been forced to behold their sacred temple laid in ruins, and (very probably) their sacred Mt.

50

deseccrated by the presence of idolatrous peoples. But that they should be forbidden to ascend its height and revisit the place hallowed by legend and belief, this was almost too much for the Samaritans. They determined not to accept such a state of affairs forever, and so though biding their time, came to a firm agreement to rebel at the first opportunity. Accordingly, during the reign of Anastatius, under the leadership of a woman, a second Deborah, the Samaritans made a combined attack on the soldiers guarding the Mt. They were however easily overcome. (Robyins III I24 Jost Sekten p.77 Kirch p.15)

Still, though again ^{defeated.} they are not to be silenced, but continue to display an obstinate courage that manifests itself in oft repeated rebellions, on every occasion, fruitless in results. Conquered, subdued, oppressed, the spark of bitter hatred, which they nourish for their enemies, now and then kindles into a luried flame which but consumes their own strength, and adds additional lustre to the victories of their opponents.

In 529, during the reign of Justinian, the Samaritans, led by a certain Julian ben Sabar, whom they called King, again rebelled, killing many Christians, and destroying much property. Overcome however by Justinian, many were killed, many others sold as slaves to the Persians and Indians, the rest being exposed to all sorts of oppressive laws of Justinian. First all the Christian churches destroyed had to be rebuilt. Unless the Samaritans converted

to Christianity, they were not to be allowed to transmit (or inherit) property. The property of a deceased Samaritan, who had not converted, went to the State. The Samaritans were forced to occupy Magisterial offices without, receiving the dignities or privileges connected therewith viz. Exemption from flogging and exile (Graetz ^{Gesch.} V 18)

In mixed marriages (between Christians and Samaritans) the Christian religion was considered paramount. * Unbelieving parents who have no other well grounded cause of complaint against their believing children, are bound to leave them their property, to afford them a maintenance, to provide them with all necessaries, to marry them to true believers (i. Christians) to bestow on them dowries, and bridal presents, According to the decree of the prefect or bishop * (Justinian Code. Cf. Millman III 229-230). Samaritan children, who had converted to Christianity, were to receive from their unbelieving parents, their full share of inheritance, as if the parents had died intestate. In litigations between S. and Christians, Samaritan testimony was inadmissible. Such in the main were the Justinian decrees against the S. (Cf. Graetz ^{Gesch} V 18-21 also Note 6 pp. 388-390, Millman III 220-230 Robinson III 124-125 Jost Sekten 77-78 and Gesch d. Volkes Isr. 190-194) Later however (541) through the intercession of Bishop Sergius, the Samaritans were granted the privilege of transmitting property, of making wills, of manumitting Slaves, and of transacting all business among themselves. Children of

52

mixed marriages believing in christianity, however were to get all of the property of their father if he dies intestate, and five-sixths of it, if a will were made.

Note:-

Some historians assert that the Samaritans offered to make a league with the King of Persia against Justinian. Cf. Graetz V note 6 pp 388-90, where this is refuted, and the reason for the mistake explained. Graetz ibid, presents well the position of the Samaritans under Justinian, showing however ^{that} the Jews took no part in the Samaritan rebellion, as many assert. Gibbon (5 vol. Edi IV I45 6 vol. Edi. IV 337) gives the number of Samaritans killed in the revolt as 20,000 and asserts that 20,000 more were sold as slaves. The numbers are large to us. They seem exaggerated, which view is emphasized by the fact that he likewise (ibid) asserts that 100,000 Romans were killed in suppressing the revolt. The Jews were exempt from many of the laws passed against the Samaritans (Cf. authorities ment above.)

It can be easily seen that under such circumstances, the lot of the Samaritans was by no means an enviable one. Despised and condemned by all, as Gibbon says (IV I45) " rejected as Jews by the pagans, by the Jews as schismatics and by the Christians as idolators " they had no alternative but to become baptized or continue to fight, and fight they did. To be sure some must have converted (so

says the Chron. Paschal Cf. Robins III 125 n.4) possibly 53
in the manner said to have been adopted by others of their
people in preceeding decades, hypocritically, in order to
escape the persecutions aimed at them. It is at least
asserted that many thus after adopting Christianity, grad-
ually returned to the Samaritan fold. Let it not be ima-
gined that the bulk of the people converted. The contin-
uous rebellions and decrees, are proof positive of the fact
that the main body of the Samaritans ever maintained an
independent and rebellious attitude toward the Romans, and
received the advances of Christianity with the sword,
rather than with the hand of welcome.

In 553 during a chariot race in Caesarea, we hear that
the Samaritans, there present, aided by some hot headed
Jewish Youths, fell upon the Christians, killing many of them
and destroying some churches. Among those killed was Ste-
phanus governor of Palestine. After a short struggle, the
Samaritans were over-come, many being crucified, others
being sold as slaves, others again having their property
confiscated. The former decrees of Justinian against their
property rights, being rigidly enforced, we now find very
many Samaritans giving up their trades and becoming money-
changers, the name Samaritan thereafter becoming synony-
mous with money traders. (Cf. Jost. Gesch d. Isr. Volk.
II 192- 193)

During the reign of Justin II (565-578) nephew of
Justinian I, the decrees of the last named were carried out

54

to the letter. The Samaritans were further forbidden to keep Christians as slaves. Only those, who had taken a two years course of study in Christianity, were to be allowed to enter a Christian Church.

Note:-

Finlay history of Greece I 297, claims that these last decrees, combined with the enforcement by Justin of his uncle's rigorous laws, practically exterminated the Samaritans. This seems to be a fact, since from that time (572) we hear but little more of this people.

The income of Arabian (Mohammedan) rule however put an end to such conditions. Henceforth nothing but a small poll-tax was demanded of the Samaritans. During the next few Centuries but little mention is made of this now vanishing sect.

Note:-

Jost Sekten I 97 attributes the paucity of historical facts concerning the Samaritans under Mohammedan sway, to the fact that Mohammed himself (and his disciples after him) did not consider the Samaritans worthy of attention, while they on the other hand, would have nothing to do with the ^{Mohammedans} Samaritans, holding contact with others, as unclean. Ibid. N 2 are given authorities who claim that the Sameri mentioned in Koran XX as the maker of the golden calf, means a Samaritan. The reference there is as follows. " Moses

said unto Al Sameri "what was thy design, O Sameri"

He answered " I saw that which they saw not, wherefore I took a handful of dust from the footsteps of the messenger of God, and I cast it into the molten calf, for so did my mind direct me " Moses said " Get thee gone for thy punishment in this life shall be, that thou shalt say unto those who shall meet thee " Touch me not. "

During the Crusades, Nablus was plundered by Saladin 1187 From the fact that Benjamin of Tudela who visited Nablus in 1165 speaks of the Samaritans (Cuthim) while Ebn Batuta, who likewise went thither in 1326 does not do so, it seems that Saladin's capture of Nablus, meant some harm to the Samaritans (Cf. Jost Sekten 79 and Pick Art. The S. in Mc. Cl. and Str. Encyclop.) In 1244 Nablus was captured by Abu Aby, since which time the Samaritans in that city have remained under Mohammedan rule. In the 14th C. we hear of a decree compelling them to wear red turbans. From the sixteenth century, to the present, due to a great deal of correspondence between the Samaritans, and Europeans, (Della Valle, Maundrell, Morison, Scaliger, de Sacy Bishop Gregoire, Barges), and due also to the reports of travelers who have visited Nablus, (Robinson, Herschell, Schultz, Frankl, Huntington, Munk, and others) we have heard considerable about the Samaritans. This we have endeavoured in brief form to embody into the chapters on The Samaritan Beliefs, and Samaritan customs, which will be

56

presented further on. There are at present about 150 Samaritans in Nablus. Of the Communities which existed in Gaza, Cairo, Damascus, and throughout Syria (14-17th C. Cf. Jost Sekten 82-83 and Robins III 133) nothing further is known.

The Samaritan of the New Testament.

In our survey of the history of the S. we have avoided as far as possible references to the S. of the N. T. even though such references might with advantage have been introduced in Period III "The S. under Roman Sway." We have had however a definite purpose in view. To be sure we have already seen the relation of the S. to the Jews in Pre-Christian times. We have also noted the position they occupied during the Era of the Christian Emperors. We shall here treat briefly of the S. of the N. T. For, though we may not find here, much that is of historic value concerning the people who form the subject of our study, we shall at least be able to discover what were the conceptions which the writers of the N. T. had formed, concerning these people, and their relation to Judaism and Christianity. This should certainly be interesting to us as we have here the advocates of Christianity, commenting from a religious standpoint, on the religious conditions and views of their mother religion, and one of its rivals.

Now we have already seen that the relations between the Jews and S. during the centuries immediately preceding the Christian Era, were not in general of the most harmonious nature, though at times a mutually friendly attitude seems to have been maintained. Hostility was however the

58

rule. The writer^{of} Ecclus (Sirach. written about 200 B. C. Cf. Driver Introd. 447 note) no doubt presents us with the popular Jewish view of the S. in the late centuries of Pre-Christian times, when he says (Ecclus) " There are two manner of nations which my heart abhorreth, and the third is no nation: they that sit on the Mt. of Samaria, and they that dwell among the Philistines, and that foolish people that dwell in Schechem." Now during N. T. times this relation between the Jews and S. seems to have continued, and so in John IV 9, the S. woman addresses Jesus with the words, " How comes it that thou, a Jew, askest drink of me who am a S. woman? " Furthermore in John VIII 48 The Jews in answering Jesus used the peculiar expression, " Say we not well that thou art a S. and hast a devil "? Again in Luke X 51-56 the S. refuse to receive Jesus because he appears to be journeying toward Jerusalem. /X

Now we desire it to be distinctly understood, and from the above it can already be seen, that in the N. T. a definite and sharply defined distinction is made, between the S. and the Jews. They are not both treated as a single body of Mosaic venerators and Monotheists who refused to adopt the newly introduced faith, and against whom, as representing the faith from which Christianity arose, decrees should be directed. Despite the fact that the worship and faith of the S. and Jews were in the main identical, (at least as far as a belief opposed to that of Christianity was concerned) and that the S. were known to claim

57

descendancy from the ten tribes, (Cf. John IV 12.) the S. and Jews are never-the-less in the N. T. separated^{at} entirely one from the other. In Matthew X 5-6 though the disciples of Jesus are forbidden to enter any city of the S. they are told to go to the House of Israel. In John IV 9. the Jews and S. are most specifically contrasted. " How is it that thou a Jew askest drink of me, who am a S. woman?" In acts I 8. Jesus tells the Apostles that they shall be his " witness both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and Samaria."

We above made mention of the fact, that the attitude of the Jews toward the S. seems to have been a hostile one during N. T. times. How are the writers of the N. T. disposed toward the S. and how do they picture the relations between Christians and the S.? In Matthew the harmonious relations existing between these two, as pictured elsewhere in the N. T. are not so evident. And so in Matthew (X 6) Jesus bids his disciples " Enter not into any city of the S. but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel " In Strack Zöckeler (Kommentar to the v.) attention is called to the fact, that as twelve disciples were chosen according to the tribes of Israel, so Israel was to be the aim or goal of the efforts of these disciples. Why they should be forbidden to enter the cities of the S. seems inconceivable from the standpoint of John and Luke. We might attribute the prohibition to the insignificant light in which Matthew thinks the S. held, as though they were

2

undeserving, even of the conversion efforts of Christianity. Such is most likely not the case. Matthew simply and purely is hostile to the S. Why we know not.

Now in Luke, John and the Acts, an entirely different attitude of Christianity toward the S. is observable. In order to understand this, we must notice briefly the relation of Christianity and Judaism. We have already seen that as soon as Christianity became a State religion, the Jews were made the special object of persecutions and attacks and decree upon decree was passed against them. The anti-Jewish feelings of the Christians before such a state religion was introduced, can be easily conceived. Not at all illogical was this attitude toward the Jews, an attitude, that as we have seen begot, the most awful cruelties against the Jews. For, from the standpoint of the Christians, if Christianity were the best and only saving religion, then all others should embrace it, be forced to embrace it or suffer the consequences. The Ethics of the age seemed to demand such conduct. Such at least was the tendency of thought dominating the early centuries C. E. In the writers of the N. T. is to be seen this hostility of attitude toward the Jews. It were but natural to expect a similar hostility marking the Christian attitude toward the S. But here our expectations fall short of fact, or at least are not full-filled according to N. T. accounts as contained in Luke, John and the Acts. The intensity of hatred of the Christians against the Jews, seems to have brought

61

about an equal degree of friendship of the Christians toward the S. Recognizing as did the followers of Christ, the fact that the S were schismatics from the Jews and rivals of them, they could manifest their utter contempt for the Jews, in no more powerful manner, than by evidencing an interest in the S. and by maintaining an amicability of attitude toward them. Luke shows this spirit, and takes this position twice . In X 33 f. Jesus tells the lawyer the account of the man beaten by robbers. While the priest and Levite pass by the wounded man refusing him aid, the S. alone was " moved with compassion, and came to him and bound up his wounds, pouring on them oil, and wine " (V 34) The question next addressed the lawyer, and his answer, show the purpose of the story " Which of the three thinkest thou proved neighbour unto him that fell among the robbers? " " He that showed mercy on him " In Luke XVII 11-19 is given the account of Jesus healing the ten lepers, while on his journey through Samaria and Gallilee (V 12) The only one to return thanks was the S. Jesus accordingly commends him for his faith (V 19) (Cf. Hand Commentar Zum N. T. I 82-3. for an examination of this incident. Attention is here called to the distinction between the feelings of the Christians and the Jews toward the S.) The incident related in IX 51-56 gives us no idea of the relations existing between the S. and the Christians. The S. refuse to receive Jesus, because they think him a Jew, as he appears to be traveling to Jerusalem. We have already directed

62

attention to such doings on the part of the S. (Cf. Jos.
Ant. XX 6, I.)

John shows the amicable attitude of Christianity toward the S. in the story which he relates in Ch. IV. This conversation between Jesus and the S. Woman is altogether an interesting one, as it emphasizes some of the characteristics of the S. which we have already presented, and shows us their attitude toward the Jews at the time. We have already taken occasion to notice how V⁹ depicts the strained relations between the S. and the Jews. Peculiar is it, that the words " For the Jews have no dealings with the S. " is omitted in some MSS (Cf. Marginal note) They may form a later addition intended to convey more fully and completely the idea contained in the preceding words, but really picturing conditions of a different time. (That the Jews ever had no dealings with the S. is not true. The purpose of our chapter on " The S. of the Talmud will be to dispel the view of those, whom Pick. Art. the S. In Mc Cl. & Strong, represents, when he says that everything touched by the S. was declared unclean by the Jews. and furthermore to refute those who hold that the Jews had no dealings with the S.)

Verse 12 " Art thou greater than our father Jacob, who gave us this well, and drank thereof himself and his sons, and his cattle? presents us with the S. belief in Jacob, a belief maintained by them to this day, while it likewise shows us the S. confidence in the fact that the well now

63
found near Schechem, is in reality the one dug by the patriarch, (Cf. Robinson B. R. III 107- 113) This leads us to V. 20 where we are told of the S. belief in Gerizim as the holy Mt. a fact which we have already frequently mentioned.

In V. 25 the S. woman is presented as acknowledging Jesus to be the Messiah. The writer evidently intends us to understand that as far back as the early Christian centuries, the S. believed in a personal Messiah. All accounts which we have of the S. views on the Messiah are of late origin.

In Acts VIII Simón is represented as being looked upon by the S. as a sort of Messiah (We shall speak further of him in the next paragraph.) We have already presented the historic incident of the rise of the Pseudo -Messiah among the S. about 35 A. D. (Cf. Hist. of the S.) who promised to take the S. to Gerizim, and show them the vessels buried there by Moses. We shall discuss this Messianic belief of the S. more fully in " The Beliefs of the S. "

Note:-

We above advanced the view that Christian amicability toward the S. was due in great part to a corresponding hatred for the Jews. Now Baur and others (Cf. Strack u. Zöckler Commentar) referring to the chapter of John above discussed, claims that there is no historic worth or truth in the account of the incident there narrated, but that it was written to show that though the Jews didnot accept Christianity, the S.

64

did. He claims that as here the S. woman is taken simply as a type of all the S. so is Nicodemus. (John III I, VII 50) taken simply as a type of all the Jews. Note how this forms a further basis for the view above presented by me. Strack himself in referring to John IV 39 " Many S. believed in him " (Jesus) calls attention to the fact, that this emphasizes the fact that the S. accepted Christianity; The Jews did not. This idea concerning the conversion of the S. to Christianity, we will examine in the next paragraph. The incident narrated in John IV is said to have taken place in Sychar, a city of Samaria " (V 5) Munk (Palestine 94 note) and Robinson (B. R. III 119) claim that this city = Schechem. John (B.A.) thinks likewise and says Schechem was called Sychar (from שכר), Lightfoot & others claim that Schechem received this name from the reference in Is.

XXVIII יסכר (Since the S. claim to be descended from Ephraim) and that, Zockler Co., to V. 5 Also

Nutt 12 n. 1) Others again contend that Sychar, thus named by the Jews, is derived from שָׁכָר (Hab. II 18

(עורק שָׁכָר) (Cf. Robinson B. R. III 118 N 7 and Nutt 12 n. 1) Sychar however has been proven to be identical with the Arabian Ascar and the Talmudic שְׁכֵם a small town $\frac{1}{2}$ hr. east of Nablus (Cf. Strack - Zöckler to V. Also Nutt 12 n. 1)

We recur now to what we stated before viz. that in the Acts. likewise is presented an incident, which shows the desire on the part of the author to manifest a friendly

attitude toward the S. In Ch. VIII is given the account of Simon the sorcerer, who is said to have been converted by Philip. (He afterwards became one of the disciples of John the Baptist Cf. Sketch by Nutt. 55-64) The account continues to relate that many more conversions took place in the cities of Samaria. We have already noticed the tendency on the part of the N. T. authors to emphasize the fact that many S. converted to Christianity. Historic facts for such conclusions are difficult to find. On the contrary the entire tenor of S. life and religion would seem to contradict the claim. Justin Martyr bewails the fact that so very few S. became Christians (Cf. Art The S. by Chas. Brigham Unit Rev. IV 141-150) Furthermore, it is decidedly strange that if so many of the S. converted as John (IV) would have us believe, Jesus (ibid) 33-34) should leave Schechem to go to Gallilee because " a prophet hath no honor in his own country. " Even during the times of Roman persecutions of the S. we have no facts which would lead us to infer that many, if any of the S. converted to Christianity. Some authorities identify this Simon of Acts VIII with the Simon mentioned in Jos. Ant. XX 7, 2. a Cypriot by birth, friend of Felix, who persuaded Drusilla, wife of Azizus, to marry Felix. This Simon is likewise said to have been a magician. That the identification is false has been proven by Strack (Com I 354- 6.)

But see
more
64

/

By a study of the Samaritan of the Talmud, we shall be enabled to get a good idea of the Jewish attitude toward the Samaritans, from about 300 B. C. to 500 C. E. To be sure, views expressed in the Talmud, are often individual expressions, but in general, they may be taken as representing the sentiments of a large part of, and in many instances, the larger part of the Jewish Community. Differing as do the various authorities of ^{the}Talmud on so many questions of various degrees of importance, it is not to be wondered at, that harmony of opinion concerning the Cuthim is not to be found, and we shall frequently see the Samaritans offering to the ingenious dialecticians, a good subject for debate, for heated argument. To be sure, in all the discussions presented to us in the Talmud, we find the liberal and the conservative sides well supported. That such should be the case on matters concerning the customs, the privileges, and prohibitions of Israel proper, is but natural. But when we come to treat of those outside the pale of Judaism, when the דוריתן the ס'תן the ס'רין are made the subject of consideration, ^{we}should imagine that none but the most stringent legislation would be made against these classes, that liberal tendencies would be swamped neath the

-67.

waves of popular prejudice, and that strict conservative views would rule the day. We shall therefore be the more agreeably surprised, to find that though the orthodoxy in sentiments concerning the Samaritans number among them some of the greatest Talmudists, the staunch supporters of liberal tendencies and of leniency toward these Cuthim are not few in number either.

Note:-

Of historical notices concerning the political condition of the S. during Talmudic times however, we shall find but little, if any. The references in Jer. Kidd. 1V65 d. (Krot. Edi.) Also Aboda Sara V 44 d. (Krot. Edit.) we have already noticed and discussed in Ch. I. " The History of the S."

Of primary importance is it to us, to see how the attitude of the Samaritans toward Judaism, its beliefs and its customs was regarded by the Jews. Are these Samaritans to be considered as Jews, as true proselytes, or as gentiles? Already in the 1st century (C.E.) we find the opposing forces of liberalism and orthodoxy arranged against each other on this point. Rabbi Akiba, representing the former lenient tendency, argues that the Samaritans are true proselytes. יְהוּדִי עָקֵב אֶסְטֵר כּוֹתִים הָיָה אִתּוֹ בֵּן וְכֹהֲנִים שְׁמֹנְטָן בָּהֶן כֹּהֲנִים בְּעָרִים הָיוּ (Kidd.

75b. Opposed diametrically to Rabbi Akiba, however is R. Ishmael, who in contradiction to the above liberal attitude, claims that the Samaritans had proselytised to Judaism because of the punishment brought upon them (in the form of lions)

68

(Cf. 2 Kgs. 17) and therefore they are to be looked upon
as false converts, and are called " Lion proselytes ". This
view is upheld by R. Elazar and during the 2nd C. emphasized
by R. Nehemiah רבי אלעזר סבר לה כרגי ישמעאל דאמר כותים גירי אניות הם

Kidd. 75b. and further on in the Gemara אמר ר' ישמעאל
כהנים שנשמתו בהם כהנים פסולים היו and Jebamoth 24 b. ע
ל' נסמיה אומר אחר גירי אניות ואחר גירי חלומות

The same difference of opinion existed later between R. Meir
and R. Jehuda, the former of whom upheld the view of R.
Akiba, and so was more liberal in his attitude toward the S.
(though he is at times inconsistent), while the latter
staunchly supported R. Ishmael. (Cf. Baba Kama 38 b.

אמר ר' שמאי סבר כותים גירי אמות הם Cf. also Aboda a Sara
a & b b
23 and Nidda 56

The consideration of the proselyte question however, was
not the only one on which difference of opinion existed.
Accepting the S. even as " Lion Converts ", how are they to
be treated, as Jews, or as non-Jews? In Perek 5 of Nidda,
we read that the Cuthim are treated as though they were
Nochrim. ואנשי מיום הנה הם כנכרים לכל דבריהם

(A clear distinction however is always drawn between the
Samaritans and Nochrim. Cf. Terumoth III 9 Berachoth VII. I
Demai IV 3 and Nidda VII 3 (56 b.)

In Kiddushin IV 3 a doubt is expressed as to whether the
Samaritans are to be considered members of the Jewish com-

munity or not.

ואילו בן הספיקות שמוקי' שמואל וכו' כותב

69.

Assuming that they are not, Rabbi Jehuda Hanassi goes to the extreme of regarding them (and advocating a treatment in accordance with this view) as heathen. Cf. Jer. Kethuboth Ch. III (16 b. & 27 a.)

דב' אמר כותבי כגוי'

also (Berlin Edi.) Jer. Berachoth 29 a. Demai 9 b. and

Cf. Frankel
Einfluss 250

Shekalim 2 b. It can be seen, that this but expresses the same view of R. Ishmael, R. Akiba is not however to want followers of his opinion Either, and so we hear of Rabbi Simon b. Gamliel considering the S. as the equal

of the Isrealites כותבי ישראל גמור

(Cf. Jer. Kethuboth Ch. 3. (16 b. & 27 a.)

Still again we read in Nidda IV2 of the Sadducees being regarded in the same category as the Samaritans (though this is no compliment to the Samaritans, since the equality exists only when the Sadducees do not follow true Israelitish customs.)

בנות צדוקין בזמן שנהגו ללכת בדרכי אבותיהן הכי')
בן ככותיות פשו ללכת בדרכי ישכאל הכי') כי שכאלית

A very peculiar story as regards the light in which the Samaritans as a people were held, is reported in Chulin 6 a. ' R. Yitschok is told by an old man that the S. do not observe the law. Hereupon Yitschok acquaints R. Abahu with this fact. The latter communicates the intelligence to R. Ami & R. Assi who after visiting the Samaritans, declared them as heathen. (Why they did this we are told in Aboda Sara V 44 d. (Krot. Edit.) Reaching Samaria on a Friday, no wine was found there. ON Saturday evening how-

ever, a large quantity was in the possession of the Samaritans. The conclusion was that the Samaritans must have bought it from the heathen nations, and on Sabbath. Hence the decree. Others say the decree was made because the Samaritans poured out drink offerings to Diocletian.

לבי יצחק בן יוסף עדכיה כ'אבן לאתני חמרא מבי כותאי אעכיה
 כפוא סא אמי ליה לית טאן שומרי תוכה הלך רבי יצחק וספר דברים
 לפני כ'אבן והלך כ'אבן וספר דברים לפני לאמי ו'אסי ולא וזו
 מעם עד שעעאוס עכוס (Chulin 6a)

where? In Aboda Sara. יין מפי כ'חייא ו'אסי ו'אמי שהיו עולין
 בהם המלך ונאו גוי אחד שבין משוד על יין אתון אמכון ליה קומיי אמר
 לון ולא על ידי עילא ואית דבעי מימר חדא עיובת שובג לא אישתכח חמרא
 בכל סמריטיקי בכוךי שובא איעת כחת מלייא מן מה דאיתון אנמייא
 וקבלוניה כותייא מנהון ואית דבעי מימר כל סליק דיקליטיסיוס מלכא לכא
 גזר ואמר כל אנמייא ינסכון בר מן יודאי ונסכון כותייא ונאסר יין

Note:-

The Samaritans, as is known, claimed descent from Joseph. This idea Rabbi Meir of the 2nd C. ridiculed (Bereshith Rabba 94, 6) and urges that Shimron, one of the sons of Issachar (Gn. XLVI 13) was their progenitor. Be it noticed that this however does not place the Samaritans outside the pale of Judaism.

Thus far we have been concerned with Talmudic views concerning the Samaritans as a people. We will now turn our attention to Rabbinical opinions of the Samaritans, in particular directions. Here we shall find a great deal of specialized legislation and discussion, concerning the character of the life of the Quthim, Concerning the nature

71.
of their religious belief and practices, concerning the granting or refusing of certain privileges to them, concerning the amount of reliance to be placed upon their testimony etc. And first as regards the Talmudic views of the Samaritans as observers of the law, of the Torah.

Rabbi Eliezer holds that the S. are not acquainted with the minutiae of the laws, and hence do not entirely carry them out. He therefore forbids the use of their Mazzoth.

ל'אליעזר אסר לבי שאין בקיאים בדקדוקי מצות

(Cf. Kiddushin 73 a. Chulin 4 a. Gitten 10 a.)

In the same places Rabbi Simon b. Gamliel whom we have already met as favorable to the S. urges that the Samaritans are more exact in the performance of the laws which they do accept, than are even the Jews.

כל מצוה שהחזיקו בה כותים הרבה מדקדקים בהם יותר מישראל

This same view of Gamliel is found similarly expressed, in Berachoth 47 b. and in the following form in Pesachim 3 a.

כל מצוה שהכותים נהגין בה הם מדקדקין בה יותר מישראל

Other Rabbis were fierce in their denunciation of the Cut him, on the ground that they had purposely made changes in their Pentateuch, changes with regard to customs, to commands, and to laws. As a consequence, these Rabbis would not consider the Samaritans as strict observers of the laws of Moses. So we read in Jer. Sota Ch. 7. (29^b) of Elazar b. Simon addressing a Samaritan with the words " You have falsified your law and have done yourselves no goods there-

by. (He referred to the insertion of מול in Dt. XI30) 2 72.
אמר כ' אלעזר בן שמעון נמיתי לסופרי כותים קייבתם תורתכם
ולא הועלתם כלום שכתבתם בתורתכם אצל אלון מורה שכם

Note:-

Most likely as Frankel (Einfluss p 243) points out, this Elazar b. Simon should be Simon b. Elazar mentioned below.)

In Sota 33 b. the same saying is attributed to Elazar b. Yose.
לאלעזר בן יוסי בדבר זה קייבתי ספרי כותים אמרת לתם וייבתם.
תורתכם ולא העליתם בידכם כלום שאם אומרים אלון מורה שכם

In Jer. Jebamoth Ch. I, (Krotushin Edi. 3 a.) R. Simon b. Elazar ridicules the ignorance of the Samaritans, who being unacquainted with use of ה locale, translate חוזה of Dt. XXV 5, as an adjective, referring to אשת a betrothed, one who has not yet entered the home of the husband.

ישמעון בן אלעזר נמיתי לסופרי כותים מי פנים לכם לטעות דלית אתון
דכעין כל נחמיה דתני בשם ר' נחמיה כל דבכי שמיא צריך למד מתחילתו
ולא ניתן לו ניתן לו ה"א בסופו כגון לחוצ חוצה לטעמי שעיבה לסוכות סוכותה

Yet another reference to the manner^m which the Samaritans receive the Torah, is given us in Nidda Ch. 5, where we are told that the Samaritans interpret the Pentateuch literally, though nothing further is said as to what influence this has in making the Cuthim more like the Jews, or in separating them farther from them.

ידוע הוא שהם מקבלים התורה כפי פשוטה

Another question of importance now confronts us. How are the foods and drink of the Samaritans regarded by the Jewish teachers, and to what extent may they be used^{by} Israelites

73.

Even during the first century, decrees had already been directed against the Cuthim by the Rabbis, and so we hear of Rabbi Akiba, already noted as friendly in his attitude toward this people, becoming indignant at his colleague Rabbi Eliezer, for affirming that he (Eliezer) would as soon think of eating pork, as of partaking of anything made by the Samaritans.

לפני רבי עקיבא היה רבי אליעזר אמר האכל פת כותי כאכל בער
חזיר אמר שמאי (Schekith VIII 10)

And further in Gemara לא תתבכר כסעס שאסור פת כותים ובעש חזיר
The same manner of discussion and difference of opinion,

we find arising between the Rabbis as regards the Mazzoth made by the Samaritans. In Kidd 76 a. Chulin 4 a. and Gittin 10 a. we have an anonymous authority in a Beraitha, claiming that the Mazzoth made by the Cuthim may be used by Jews, and that one performs therewith his duty concerning the Mazzoth of Pesach.

מצת כותי מותרת ואדם יוצא בה ידי חובתו בפסח

In Rabbi Eliezer (in same places) an opponent to this view, is to be found. He forbids the use of Samaritan Mazzoth on the ground that the S. are not sufficiently well versed in the minutiae of the Commands.

לא יאסור לפי שאין בקיאים בדקדוקי מצות
(and Chulin 4a) קסבר לא בקיאי בשעור
Further in the Gemara (Chulin 4 a.) their Mazzoth is

compared to that of (עבדי עבירה) transgressors of the law.

Such are the divergent views concerning the Mazzoth of the Cuthim. How now about their Chometz? Here it is

interesting to note that in Jer. Pesachim Ch. 1. (3 a.)
R. Zeira informs us, that so long and so long only, as the
Samaritans make their Mazzoth with the Jews (observe
Pesach at the same time) they are to be believed con-
cerning the burning of the Chometz.

כותים כל זמן שעושין מצות עם ישראל נאמין בהן על ביעור חמץ
אם אינן עושין מצות עם ישראל אינן נאמין על ביעור חמץ

This liberal view of R. Zeira is not to remain unchallen-
ged, and so R. Jose arises (^{and} ibid) limits this view to
those cases only, in which the burning of the Chometz is
within the house. As far as such burning in the court yard
is concerned, they are never to be believed (rather they
are to be suspected). ibid.

אמר ר' יוסה הך דתמינ' גבתיס אבל בחציכות חשודין הן

Having seen the views of the Jews concerning the Mazzoth
and the burning of the chometz of the Cuthim on Pesach, let
us now turn our attention to the Jewish attitude toward
other and ordinary foods of the Samaritans. R. Elazar per-
mits the use of such foods immediately after Pesach.
לחמיק'ה בשם רבי אחא מתיר ה'ה יב' לעורר חמץ על כותים לאחר הפסח מיד
Krotushin Edit. Jer Schebiith Ch. 8 (38 b.)

In aboda Sara 45 a. (Krot. Edit.) a more complete ex-
pression of this view is found. Here we are told that the
Chometz of the Cuthim may be used by Jews under certain
conditions. From a Samaritan householder, such chometz may
not be bought until three weeks after Pesach, nor from Sa-
maritan Bakers until three days after Pesach, nor from

13.
Samaritan villagers, until after three bakings.

מאינתי חמץ כותים מותר לאחר הפסח של בעלי בתים שלש שבועות על

אפייה ושל נחתומין בכרכים אחר שלשה ימים בכפרים אחר שלשה תנאים

The Gemara (ibid) continues to discuss this matter most

thoroughly. some of the Rabbis arguing that the same law

should apply to householders and bakers, others to villag-

ers, and bakers etc. Kircheim therefore (Massecheth Cuth-

im Ch. 1) accepts as the final conclusions. " We accept

nothing from Samaritan bakers until three bakings after

Pesach nor from householders, until three weeks have passed

nor from villagers until after the third making.

אין לקחין פת מנחתום כותי במוצאי פסח אלא לאחר שלשה תנאים

ולא מבעלי בתים אלא לאחר שלשה שבועות ולא מן הכפרים אלא לאחר שלשה עשר

Such limitations were placed upon buying things from the

Samaritans immediately after Pesach, from the fact that

leavened bread made during Pesach was forbidden to be used,

and since the Cuthim (having a calendar of their own)

sometimes observed Passover at times different from those

of the Israelites, it frequently occurred that the Samari-

tans were making Chometz, while the Jews were observing

the Pesach festival. In case the Cuthim celebrated the

feast at the sametime or one day later than the Jews, the

latter were allowed to buy from the former. R. Simeon

however forbids it even in this case, on the ground that the

Samaritans know not how to observe the festival. Cf. Mass.

Cuth. Ch. 2. where to the question " When shall the above

laws be enforced " the answer is given.

בזמן שלא עשו מצה עם ישראל או עיקר יום אחר אבל אם עשו מצה עם
ישראל או עיקר יום אחר חמץ מותר וכל שאוסר יבין שאין ידעם לשמר
מצה כישראל

76.

Cf. the lengthy note of Kirch. in Massechtoth K'tanath
pp 35 & 36)

When we turn to the killing of animals and preparing
of meats by the Samaritans, we are indeed for a moment
surprised to hear that Jews are allowed to buy and use
meat of animals killed by a Samaritan.

Cf. Chulin 3 b. שמיטת כותי מותרת

Likewise ibid 3 a. ככל שחשין אפ"ל כותי (So thinks Rovo.)

(Note the emphasis here laid on אפ"ל showing us that Rovo
was aware of the fact, that so many restrictions had been
laid upon the Samaritans by the Jews. Rabbi Simon b.

Yochai has the same view (Chulin 4 b.) In accordance with
this view, R. Yochanan had no scruples about eating meat
of animals killed by a Samaritan. (Cf. Chulin 5 b.)

אני כאיתי את לי' יוסן שואכל מעומיטת כותי while the Gemara
further on adds, אף כני אסי אכל מעומיטת כותי

Let it not however for one moment be imagined, that such
liberal sentiments toward the Samaritans were without their
conditions, and limitations. If an Israelite had stood by
when the S. killed the animal, then was such meat allowed
to be used by Jews. If however such was not the case, then
the S. had himself to partake of the meat before a Jew
could buy it. Cf. Chulin 3 b. כישראל עומד על גביו אבל

ומצאו עשסט חותך כית וצותן לו אכלו מותר לאכל מעומיטתו ואם לאו
אסור לאכל מעומיטתו

Likewise with regard to a string of birds killed by a

S. Cf. Chulin 4 a. אסור לאכל מעומיטתו ואם לאו אסור לאכל מעומיטתו
מכאן קוקויא של צבוכין קוטע באעו של אחר מכן

Note:-

Very peculiar is it however, that in other places in the Talmud, the Jews accuse the S. of not believing that there is any command in the Torah concerning the Schechita of birds. Ardent defenders of the truth of this accusation were R. Jehuda and R. Isaac b. Pinchas. The accusation met opposition however among some of the Rabbis. דילמא קסרי כותים אין שחיטה
התורה לעוף מן הבהמה Cf. Chulin 20 a. 27 b. 28 a.
and Kidd 71 a.

The liberal sentiments of some of the Rabbis as above quoted, meets as usual harsh opposition, and so in Chulin 5 b, We read of a distinct prohibition against using meats of animals killed by S.

אמר ר' חנן אמר ר' יעקב בר אידי אמר ר' יהושע בן לוי משום בר קפרא
לגובית דין נמנו של שחיטה כותי ואסרוה

Concerning other foods prepared by Samaritans, we do not meet such strenuous objection. So we hear of several of the Rabbis partaking of dainties and foods prepared by the Cut him. Aboda Sara V 44 d. (Krot. Edi.)

לאחא איל לעאוס ואכל חליטן ר' ירמיה אכל חמצין ר' חזקיה אכל קמצין

Likewise are cooked foods of the Samaritans permitted to be eaten by R. Acho & Elazar. ליעקב בר אבא בשם ר' לעזר תבשילי כותים כ"י
אלו מותרין Ibid
A limitation is however (further on) placed upon this view. According to this limitation, only such cooked foods of the S. are allowed to be used by Jews, into which no wine or vinegar had been placed, since the wine of the S. is suspected of having been made unfit for use, by being

78
touched by Gentiles, the S. not being careful about this.

(Ibid) מִדָּא דְּאֵת אֶמֶר בְּתַבְעִיל שְׂאִין דְּרַכֵּן לִתְתִּי לְתוֹסֵן י"ן וְחִמְצָא

Note:-

Based on this view, Kirch (Massecheth Cuthim Ch. 2) comes to the conclusion, that the expression in Tosephta Aboda Sara Ch. 5. that pots and presses of non Jews are not to be allowed to be used by Jews, since wine and vinegar are made in them. (which wine and vinegar are suspected of being unfit for use) refers

to the S. יְעֻלְקִין וְהַכְבֵּשִׁין שֶׁלֹּס שְׂדֵיכֵן לַעֲשׂוֹת בֵּהן י"ן וְחִמְצָא אֶסְרוּן

Furthermore, very liberal is the view that permits the use of cheese made by S. As usual, a limitation is advanced by R. Simon to Elazar that this permission refers to cheese of a S. householder, there being less suspicion of anything being wrong in this case. The cheese of dealers is however to be forbidden to be used. Cf. Massecheth Cuth. Ch. 2.)
הַגְבִּינִים שֶׁלֹּס עֲוֹתֵרוֹת ר' שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר אָמַר אֶסְרוּן שֶׁל בְּעָלֵי בָתִּים עֲוֹתֵרוֹת
שֶׁל סִיטְרוֹת אֶסְרוּן

On top of all this food legislation, comes the peculiar view that an Israelite may accept food from a S. priest while the latter is unclean. When he is clean however, such privilege is not given. Kirch. (ibid) has given the following reason for this view. viz. that what the priest eats when unclean must be something common. (i.e. such food, permission to eat which is given to priests only.) While when clean, the priest eats only holy things. (i.e. such, which priests alone may eat.)

Concerning the wine of the S. we find a great deal of

77
legislation, more unfavorable than otherwise. Fr. Aboda
Sara V 44 d, We see that at first the wine of the S. was
forbidden to be used by Jews, because of their dwelling
near the non-Jews, and unclean contact between the two was
feared.

כהדא דתני בגאשונא הו אומר יינת של אוגדור למא הוא אסור מפני
כפי כגש ועל בונתה מפני בית סיריקה

Later however a modification of this law was made, so that
though the prohibition was still directed against the wine
of those peoples, between whom and non-Jews intimate rela-
tions were known to exist, it referred only, to wine in
open vessels. Such as was kept in closed vessels was allow-
ed to be used by Jews. (Cf. Ibid)

וזכור לומר פסוחה בכל מקום אסורה וסתומה מותרת

The Rabbis continually emphasized this view and made the
general law that ^{that} which is open is forbidden. (i.e. that with-
in an open vessel) that which is sealed, allowed, no mat-
ter where the vessels be. A vessel once perforated, but
now sealed, is considered as always having been sealed.

New jars of the S. are permitted to be used by Jews. Old
ones not so. Cf. Aboda Sara V 44 d. נקובת וסתומה הרי היא סתומה

חכמים אמרים פסוחה בכל מקום אסורה and Massach Cuthim Ch. 2.

סתומה מותרת נקובת וסתומה כסתומה הקנקנין שלהם חדשות מותרות וישנה אסורה

Rabbi Meir however became quite liberal, and declared per-
missible of use, all wine of the S. except that which was
open upon the Streets. ר' מאיר אומר כל יינם קותר חוץ מן הפסוחה שבשווקים

We have already quoted the incident concerning Ababa.

Ami, and Assi, in which the wine of the Samaritans was forbidden to be used because they (the S.) were suspected of intercourse with heathen nations, or of idolatrous practices. Accusations of a somewhat similar nature are not few in number, in the Talmud. In Jer. Aboda Sara V 44 d. we find a S. asking Abahu, " Since your fathers drank our wine, why do you refuse to do the same? " To which Abahu answers, " your fathers never corrupted themselves. But you have degenerated since their days.) (i.e. neglect pure religion and are half - idolatrous)

כות"א דקיסרי געו מ' אבהו אבותיכם היו מסתפקין בשלנו אתם מפני מה אינכם

מסתפקין ממנו אמר'לתן אבותיכם לא קלקלו מעשיהם אתם קיורתם מעשיכם

Further, when Simon b. Eliezer wanted to drink some S. wine, a Jew calls out to him " You have entered on a corrupt course of life." (Cf. ibid.) כדר נתקלקלו הכותים

We have noted above the fact that the pots and presses of the S. were forbidden to be used, since in them the S. used to make wine, and vinegar, which as we see were forbidden to be used by Jews.

So much strenuous legislation being directed against the S. it is very interesting to note that the S. were allowed to eat and drink with the Jews, and likewise to make the after meal benediction Cf. Mishna Berachoth VII I.

שלשה שאכלו כאחת חייבין לזמן אכל דמאי ומעשר ואשון שנטלה תרומתו

מעשי עמי ותקדש שפדו והשמע שאכל כזית והכותי מומצין עליו

Still stranger however is the prohibition against responding Amen. until the entire benediction of any kind of the S

is over. Cf. Mishna Berachoth VIII 9.

ענין אמר אחי ישאל המבדק ואין ענין אמר אחר כותי המבדק עד שישמע
כל הברכה

Note:-

In this connection speaking of prayers, it may be well to note the fact that an Israelite was not allowed to make his havdola on a light (i.e. candle etc.) borrowed or bought from a S. Cf. ibid.

אין מברכין על פתך ולא על הבשמים של כותים

To light one's own candle with a light of a S.

however was not forbidden Cf. Berachoth 53 a.

כותי שמדליק עישואל וישאל במדליק מכותי מברכין עליו

Another important consideration is the amount of confidence placed by the Jews in the S. as witnesses. In Mishna Gittin I 4, a document of divorce or of manumission, one of the two witnesses of which was a S. is declared valid. In fact R. Gamliel went even further, and accepted a document of divorce if both witnesses were S. (This view R. Elazar upholds Cf. Gittin 10 b.)

כל גט שיש עליו עד כותי פסול חוץ מביטוי נשים ושחרורי עבדים לעשה
שהביאו לפניו לכתוב עותקאי גט אשה והיו עדין עדי כותים והכשיר

Note:-

Such a recognition of S. honesty in this connection is peculiar, coming as it does on top of the fact, that the S. are accused of knowing nothing concerning the laws of either marriage or divorce. Cf. Kidd 73 B
אין בקיאין בתורה קידושין וגירושין
Still Kirch (Mass. Cu. Ch. I.) from general tendencies, comes to the conclusion that the Talmud otherwise recognizes the fact, that the S. does give a letter of divorce to his wife and sees to it that

82.
the law of chalitza is observed. חולץ ליבמתו ונתן קם לאשתו

In matters concerning incest, as in matters of life and death, S. testimony was accepted, S. witnesses not being suspected. Cf. ibid זא נחמדו על מעבדות ועדין נפשות כערי עדות

We have already made mention of the fact that no confidence was to be placed in the word of a S. regarding the עמיסה and that he had either to kill the animal which was to be sold to the Jews, while an Israelite was present, or in the presence of an Israelite, partake of some of the meat of the animal. Nor was S. testimony in monetary matters accepted Cf. Gemara to Jer. Gittin I 4. על הממון נחשדון ועל הממון נפסלו

Furthermore S. witnesses were believed in testifying as to whether an animal was a first born or not, likewise as to whether there was a grave in a certain field. They were not however believed when testifying regarding spreading trees, stones projecting from a wall, or a field in which a sepulcher had been ploughed up, since in these cases the S. testimony is open to suspicion. The general rule was therefore made that in all matters in which their testimony was open to suspicion, the S. were not to be believed. Cf. Nidda 56 b

Note:-

זה כלל דבר שחשודים בו אין נאמנין עליו

Kirch (Mass. Cu. Ch. I) claims the S. were also believed in testifying as to whether a tree was four years old or not. נאמן הכותי על שטע רבועי ועל העולה

Notice that in Jer. Demai Ch. 18 the Gentiles are not believed regarding this. One more point deserves notice in this connection, and that is, that the S. are

23

not to be trusted in testifying concerning the land
of non-Jews. (Cf. Demai (Jer) Ch. 18,) Such land
being most likely considered *אסא* by Jews and *אסא* by S.

לא נאמן על הארץ העמים

In the Talmud it is generally conceded, that the S. pay
tithes. So, for example, we read in Mishna Terumoth III 9,
that the tithe of the S. is regarded in the same light as
any other tithes.

הנכרי וכוונתו תרומתן תרומה ומעשרותן מעשר

(This is further substantiated in Berachoth 47 b)

וקנה כותאי עשורי מעשרי

The same view is mentioned (in
Mishna Demai IV-3) concerning the S. The *נכרי* there how-
ever is regarded as not paying tithe. As a consequence ,
wheat etc. may be brought to the former to be ground, on
the supposition that he pays his tithes. To the latter how-
ever this is not allowed.

המוליך חטים לטוחן כותי או לטוחן עם תאכץ בחזקתן למעשרות ולשבועית

לטוחן נכרי דמאי המפקיד פירותיו אצל הכותי או אצל עם הארץ בחזקתן

למעשרות ולשבועית אצל הנכרי כפירותיו לשומר דמאי

(Notice that the S. are here presumed to observe the She-

bath yr.) Interesting from its relation to these views

thus mentioned, comes that given us in Mishna Demai V 9.

Here the corn etc. ^{of the S.} is regarded as untithed. If an Israelite

buy such corn he must pay tithe thereon. An Israelite is

allowed to buy from another Israelite corn with which to

pay this tithe due on the corn bought from the S. He is

also permitted to buy from a S. corn with which to pay tithe

on corn which he previously bought from a S. This latter

privilege however R. Eliezer refuses to grant.

84

מעשין מעל ישנאל על של כותים מעל כותים על של כותים לא אומר
מעל כותים על של כותים

Note:-

Notice that whereas in the preceding quotations, the

S. were considered as tithing their fruits and grain,

Here the opposite view is held.

Furthermore, the S. are ^{believed} again, to observe the law concern-
ing the tithe for the poor, and speaking of the poor,
also the laws of the gleanings and the forgotten portions,
as well as the corners of the field. Cf. Massecheth Cuth.

Ch. I. ויש להם שנתה ופאה והם נאמנין על חלקם ועל השכמה ועל הפאה
בשנתן ועל מעשר עני בשנתו

Note:-

The S. poor were treated by the Jews exactly as were

the Jewish poor. Cf. Tosephta Pea Ch. III עני כותים כעני ישראל

It has always been a recognized fact that the S. never
observed the laws of Tephilin, though in Ex. XIII 9, they
read תפילין instead of תפלות Due to this non observance on the
part of the S. the Rabbis forbade the Jews using such Teph-
ilin as were made by S. Likewise were Mezuzoth made by
them forbidden to be used by an Israelite. Cf. Menachoth
42 b.

הפילין ומזוזות ענתבן עדוקי כותי נכרי עבד אשה וקטן מומר כסולין
שנאמר וקשיתם וכתבתם כל עישון בקשירה ישנו בכתובה כל שאינו
בקשירה אינו בכתובה

In this respect the Sadducees agree with the Rabbis Cf.

Horayoth 4 a.

Such prohibitions against using things made by S. were
of course prompted by a fear lest by permitting their use.

Israelites might defile the purity of their faith or become unclean. The S. However from the earliest centuries, strictly observed the laws of cleanness. (even as they do today. Cf. further the S. Customs.) To such an extent was this recognized, that the Rabbis declared not only the baths, the homes, and roads of the S. to be clean (טהור) but likewise their land. Cf. Aboda Sara V 44 d. (Krot. Ed.)

אנץ כותים טהור ומוקדויותיה ושג' ליה טהורין

Though however recognizing that the S. land was clean, the Rabbis would not permit the S. to acquire land in the territory of the Israelites, due possibly to the fact that the S. might sell it to heathen and thus defile it. So Kirch (Mass. Cuth. p 31 notes 3 & 4) urges that the expression

Aboda Sara 14 b. 19b. אין מוכרין להם במחובכ לקרקע

and 20 a. refers to the S. To substantiate their view there, the Rabbis changed Dt. VII 2 ("Thou shalt show no mercy on them") to ("Thou shalt not settle them.") In accordance with the same principle, even

priests of Israel were allowed to share with S. priests in possessing land of the S. IN Israel's land however, such privilege was not granted since these S. priests would then be acquiring Israel's land, and might later lay a claim to the priesthood. Cf. Kethuboth 25 and Kidd

69 b. Cf. Kirch (M.C. Ch. II and

p. 35 notes 3 & 4)

חלקים כהני ישאל עם כהני כותים במקומם שהם כמצילים מידם אבל לא

במקום ישאל שלא יחזיקו בכהונה

Very strange however is the view that the graves of the S. do not render unclean him who passes over them, figuratively thereby, making a tent there. Cf. Jebamoth 6I a.

קברי כותים אין מטמאין באהל

The most peculiar part of this view is the reason assigned for it. In Numb. XIX 14 it reads, אדם כי ימות באהל

Throughout the chapter 07X is always spoken of. In Ezech. XXXIV 3I, Israel is called אדם (איתן צאני צאן מעייתי אדם אתם)

The conclusion is therefore, that Numb XIX, since it legislates for אדם Israel, refers not to the S. Therefore the Jews are not made unclean by death or grave of a S.

אתם קבויין אדם ואין הכותים קבויין אדם

There is thus no liberality of sentiment expressed in the the Talmudic view above quoted, and furthermore, the fact that the S. were in reality in most cases considered as unclean, and things made by them thus becoming unclean, (in a religious sense) is emphasized by the prohibition against receiving from the Cuthim offerings (of doves or pigeons Lev. XV 14.29,) sin offerings and guilt offerings. To be sure this prohibition is directed against such S. as have had an issue. Likewise against S. women, after child birth. Cf. Mishna Shekalim I 4. Vows and free will offerings however are accepted from them.

הנכרי והכותי שעקלו אין מקבלין מהן ואין מקבלין מידם קיצי זבין וקיצי זבות וקיצי יולדות וחטאות ואשמות זה הכלל כל ענין דבר ונידב מקבלין מידן כל שאין נידב ונידב אין מקבלין מידן

From the attitude of the Jews toward the S. as thus far

presented, we should imagine that the Jews would have no compunctions about placing the S. in the same category as the סוֹכָס as far as their buying things from Israelites was concerned, and so when in Mishna Aboda Sara I 6 and Gemara ibid I 6 a. Rabbi Jehuda permits fatally wounded animals to be sold to כְּסוֹס, כִּי יְהוּדָה מְמַר בְּעִבְרָתָא אֶל יְהוּדָה מְמַר מִכְנִי, כְּסוֹס it is not so improbable that he should have considered the S. as contained in the class כְּסוֹס. The Gemara (ibid I 5 b.) at least urges that the idolators and S. are considered as one, אֶחָד כְּסוֹס Cf. also Kirch. Mass. Cuth. Ch. 2) Rabbi Jehuda we know in most cases to have been opposed to any liberality of view toward the S.

Though R. Jehuda allowed fatally wounded animals to be sold to idolators, the Rabbis however in general forbade it. They furthermore prohibited the Jews from selling to the S. any גְּבִילָה or מִיֶּסֶף, הַיֵּסֶד, הַשֶּׁקֶץ, הַשִּׁיפָה, the abortion of an animal, oil into which a mouse had fallen, or a foetus. Cf. Mass. Cuth. Ch. I

אֵין מִכְּבִּין לָהֶם לֹא גְבִילוֹת וְלֹא שְׂרִיפּוֹת וְלֹא שְׂקָצִים וְלֹא רִמְשִׁים וְלֹא סִנְדֵּל עַל בְּהֵמָה וְלֹא עֵמֶן שֶׁנֶּעְפָּל וְעֶנְפֹּל לְתוֹכָן עֲבָרָה לֹא כּוֹסְכִים וְלֹא שְׁלִיל אֶף עַל פִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲכֻלִּין כּוֹסְכִים וְשְׁלִיל
Since the Jews themselves were not forbidden to eat mortally - ill animals, or the foetus, I can see no reason why the prohibition thus stated should have made. A modern Rabbi suggested that the reason for the prohibition was, lest the S. might, upon getting the things here mentioned

(all with the exception of כוסות & כלים being forbidden the Jews) might sell them to the Israelites. This view is false however, as can be seen from the fact that the Rabbis laid as much emphasis upon the prohibition against buying these things from the S. as against selling them. The reason here assigned was that since in Dt. XIV 21, after the laws against גזל etc. it reads כִּי עַם קָדוֹשׁ אַתָּה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ " thou art a people holy to thy God ". The Jews were thus forbidden to make any other people holier than themselves. Therefore they dared not buy from S. such things as they themselves (the Jews) refused to sell them.

וכשם שאין מוכרין להם כך אין לוקחין מהם שנאמר כי עם קדוש אתה ליהוה אלהיך
 כשאתה קדוש לא תעשה עם אחר קדוש לעצמך מזה
 Cf. Mass. Cuth. Ch. I

Note:-

An explanation for the Jewish prohibition against selling the above mentioned things to the S. may be found in the remark of R. Chisda. (Pesachim 50 b. and 51 a.) He says the statement there made that "such things as Jews regard permissible of use, but which others forbid to be used, shall not be used by the Jews in the presence of the latter " refers to the S. Since therefore the S. from their strict observation of ^{the} laws of cleanness would have forbidden the use of such things, the Jews might thus have been forbidden to sell such to them.

דברים המותרים ואחרים שהגויבין איסור אי אתה כשאי להתירן כי חסדך
 אחר גבולתאי עסקיך

The fact however that the Jews themselves were

prohibited from eating all except 010010 & 411W shows
that even this explanation is not sufficient.

Another principle underlay the prohibition against selling to the Cuthim sheep for shearing, or crops to cut, since in that case the S. might sell it to other peoples, and the first fruit thereof would not be given to the priest. Cf. Kirch (Mass. Cuth. Ch. I.)

Note:-

The discussion on these points occurs in Aboda Sara 20b. There R. Jehuda represents the more liberal side. R. Meir however is his opponent, and limits every liberal proposition there given expression to. The entire discussion is however concerning the Acum. Kirch however p. 31, n. 5 quotes the Tosephta to this passage (which reads אָדָר פִּנְסֵי וְאָדָר פִּנְסֵי)

As for selling meats to the S. In Aboda Sara 20b (if in accordance with the above, we class the S. with the ד'ב'), Animals for purposes of slaughter and use for food, are allowed to be sold to the S. As we have seen, the Rabbis forbade wounded cattle (though R. Jehuda permitted it) to be sold them. Likewise were foals and calves forbidden to be sold them (Cf. Mishna Aboda Sara 1, 6, and Gemara 14 b. 15 a. and b.)

Nor were weapons nor instruments which might be used for purposes of injury, permitted to be sold the S. Cf. Aboda Sara 15 b.

אין מכיין להם לא תיין ולא כלי תיין ואין משחין להן את התיין ואין מוכיין להם לא סדן ולא קניין ולא כבליס ולא שלשאות על דבר אחר ועל"ס אחר כותבי

In decided contrast to the unfavorable legislation concerning the S. comes the view which places the S. on an equal footing with an Israelite as far as exile and stripes as punishment, were concerned. Cf. Maccoth 8 b.

עבד וכותי גולה ולקח על ידי ישכאל וישראל גולה ולקח על ידי כותי ועבד

Such consideration is not however shown the S. in cases of damage done by oxen. If the ox of an Israelite gore the ox of a S. the owner of the former pays no damage. When the reverse however occurs, if it be the first offense, the S. pays one half of the value of the damage done. If he has been warned concerning this, when such an event again occurs he must pay the full value of the damage done. R. Meir again goes to extremes by urging that the S. must pay the full value of the damage done, whether he had been warned or not. Cf. Baba Kama 38 b.

שוכ של ישכאל שנגח שוכ של כותי פסור ושוכ של כותי שנגח שוכ של ישכאל אם תס הוא משלם חצי נזק ואם מועד הוא משלם נזק שלם כ' מאיר אומר שוכ של כותי שנגח שוכ של ישכאל בין תס בין מועד משלם נזק שלם

Such unreasoned intolerance is observable in much of the Talmudic legislation against the S. Even though Jews were forbidden to practice usury, we find they have no hesitancy in lending at interest to the Cuthim (at least to those in Caesarea.) Cf. Aboda Sara V 44 d. (Krot Edi)

כ' יעקב זכ אהא ו' חנינא כותאי דקיסרין מותר לתלוותן בריבית

Note:-

The reason that Caesarea seems to have been chosen as a place where such could be done, seems to have been that the S. of that city were considered by the

Israelites as having degenerated, become corrupt.
Kirch. (Mass. Cuth. Ch. I) claims that borrowing on interest from S. was also allowed by the Jews.

Still there exist numerous laws concerning the S. which are of a rather favorable nature. The Jews had no scruples about allowing their animals to be placed in S. stables, nor feared they to trust a S. to tend their cattle for them. Cf. Aboda Sara 15 b.

מעמידן בהמה בפירות של עכו"ם ומסכין בהמתן לכעס שלכן אחד עכו"ם ואחד כותי

Furthermore, of a still more favorable nature was the privilege granted S. women of delivering and suckling the child of an Israelite woman. (so long as this was done in the house of an Israelite) The reverse however was not allowed.

Note:-

The Mishna in Aboda Sara II i, speaks of עכו"ם Kirch. however (p.32 note 4.) offers arguments to prove that this refers to the S. also. In reality the Tosephta to Aboda Sara 23 b. (passage above quoted) reads ^{בת ישראל} ^{ישאל} מילדת ומניקה בן של כותית וכותית מילדת ומניקה בן של ^{ישאל} ^{ישאל} thus going beyond the Mishna in liberality of view (Cf. Kirch ibid.)

Closely connected with the above, is the privilege granted to the S. by R. Meir to circum^cise Jewish children. He says that in a city where there lived no Jewish doctor, but where were both a S. and an idolatrous physician, the S. was to be allowed to

circumcise a Jewish child, the last name d not so how-
 ever, R. Jehuda takes the opposite view on the ground that
 the S. Circumcise in honor of Gerizim. Cf. Aboda Sara 28 b.

and 27 a. עיר שאין לו כופא ישראל ויש לו כופא כותי וכו' מאיר

אמר ימול כותי ולא עכו"ם כ' יהודה אומר עכו"ם ולא כותי

and further on in the Gemara ישנא ל מל את הכותי וכותי לא ימול

ישנא ל מפני שמל לשם הכ כר' י' יקודה

Note:-

In reality, the opinions of R. Jehuda & R. Meir are first presented in the Gemara in the reverse order from that presented above. Jehuda grants and Meir refuses the privilege to the S. One of the Rabbis however, remarks there, that this is incorrect, and changes the views to the form presented above. It is difficult to say exactly which view is correct, since Meir & Jehuda has we have seen, ^{now} favor, now oppose the Cuthim. Since we have however more views from R. Meir than from Jehuda favorable to the S. and since in fact those examples in which Jehuda seems favorable to the S. are examples, concerning idolators, from which an inference to the S. is made, we have adopted the form which is presented in the above paragraph. We have already made mention of the debates between Jews and S. about the Gerizim worship. It is interesting in this connection to notice, that the opposition on the part of the Jews toward Gerizim went so far that in Jer. Sota VII 3, R. Eliezer

during a discussion concerning Ebal and Gerizim, affirmed that the Ebal and Gerizim mentioned in Dt. are not those, the one of which the S. regard as Sanctified. לאליעזר אמר אין זה הרי גריזים והרי עיבל של כותים

Jerome in his De Locis Hebraicis thought likewise Cf. Stanley (Sinai and Palest 234 n.I.)

Of a decidedly liberal nature is the permission given to entrust Jewish children to the care of S. to be taught especially a trade. Cf. Aboda Sara 15 b. מוסרין להם תינוק ללמדו ספר ולערו אומנות

This again refers to עכו"ס but is immediately followed by אמר עכו"ס אחר כותי

The height of condescension on the part of the Jews toward the S. is however reached, when the former agree to associate with the latter. Cf. Aboda Sara 15b. אייחדין עמהם followed by אמר עכו"ס אחר כותי (this refers to the latter גריזים

Note:-

It must not for a moment be imagined that this and the above mentioned liberal sentiments are expressive of a general Jewish feeling. On the contrary the Beraitha (Aboda Sara 15 b.) and Mishna (ibid II I) distinctly prohibit all that has above been allowed.

Thus far with the exception of a word about the S. belief in Gerizim we have said nothing of the beliefs of the S. Some mention thereof is made in the Talmud. In Sanhedrin (Mishna XI I) we read that he who claims that the dogma of resurrection is not to be found in the Torah, shall have no portion in the future world. In the Gemara

(90 b.) R. Elazar b. Jose therefore endeavours to show that this dogma is taught in the Torah and refers to תכרת Numb. XV 31. saying that תכרת refers to this world. תכרת to the future world.

א"ל אלעזר ברבי יוסי בדבר זה זייבתי טפסי צדוקים שהיו אמרין אין תחיית המתים מן התורה אמרתי להן זייבתם תורתכם ולא העלייתם בידכם כלום שאתם אומרין אין תחיית המתים מן התורה הרי הוא אומר תכרת תכרת

Note:--

In Sifre to Numb. XV 31, this same view is attributed to Simon b. Elazar. Note that the reference is to the Sadducees. It is evident however that the S. are meant. They are often confused with the Sudducees.

ס being often written for Cuthim. (Frankel Einfl. 244) Moreover whether Elazar b. Jose or Simon b. Elazar be the author of the quotation, it seems evident that the S. are meant. For both of these teachers often argued concerning the S. Pent. and in almost the identical words opening the quotation above made. (Cf. Sota VII 3, 33 b. & Jebamoth I 6) Cf also further * The S. Pent.^{Kirch.} * Massecheth Cuthim Ch. II claims that one of the necessary requirements for admission on the part of a S. to the Jewish fold, is the confession of a belief in resurrection, thus allowing us to infer that very early the S. did not believe in this dogma. Frankel however (Einfl. p.244) claims that the accusation of the Talmud is a false one. In later times (especially in modern times) it is known that the belief was found

among the S. Geiger (Urschrift p 132 note.) argues that so long as this belief among the Jews was bound up with the hope of a national restoration, the S. refused to accept it. As soon however^{at} a divorce of the two ideas occurred, the S. did accept it. Dositheus in the formation of the S. sect to which he gave his name (Cf. Jost Gesch d. Jud. U. S. Sekt. I 62-3 also Hamburger Talmud Art. Die S.) accepted this belief. His entire purpose was to do away with the differences between Jews & S.

In Sanhed. Mishna XI 1, we are also told that "he who pronounces the tetragramaton shall have no portion in the future world." Now it is a known fact that far back in the past centuries, the S. did not pronounce the tetragramaton. One of the laws emphasized by Dositheus. (Jost I 63) was that Q'לה be used instead of יהוה. Geiger very pertinently it seems to me (Urshrift 261-265) suggests that the S. adopted this and many other beliefs and customs from the Sadducees. The Pharisees also never used the tetragramaton in early times. But opposing the Sadducees as they did (likewise the S.) the Sadducees went to the extreme of allowing the name יהוה to be used and pronounced

Cf. also
Maccoth 23b
and. Jehuda
b. Yoson. ibid.
-147a

Cf. Mishna Joma IV 2, VI 2 and Gemara 39 b. Also Berachoth IX 1. Such is Geiger's view. It must be said however that in these references the priests alone are given the privilege of using the tetragramaton, while otherwise ^{יהוה}

96
is spoken of. When the Talmud speaks of Hashem however, it seems possible that the tetragram^maton is meant. It may further be said that in Kidd 71 a. we are told that the Rabbis used to teach on the tetragram^maton once and sometimes^{twice} every week.

Despite the fact that many views were expressed by Jewish teachers, against the S. from a purely prejudiced standpoint, we have seen that many of the Rabbis gave definite, clearcut reasons for their opinions. The natural conclusion to be inferred from all the unfavorable legislation against the S. was that the Cuthim should be kept distinctly separate from the Jews, as had been the case for centuries previous. But the question was but natural "why had the S. and Jews been thus^{separated and why must such a relation be} maintained?" The Rabbis of the Talmud by reviewing the past history of their people, were not slow in producing reasons why the S. should be discriminated against. Some as we have seen urged that the S. were but lion-proselytes, and hence not deserving of admission into the congregation of Israel. Others as Abahu Ami, and Assi justified the Jewish attitude toward the Cuthim on the ground that they were the same as heathen. (Aboda Sara V 44 d. Krot. Edi.) Others again justified it on the ground that the S. were mixed up with the priests of the high places. Cf. End of Mass. Cuth. מן שותפי העבודה מן הכהנים. R. Ishmael though at first considering them as genuine

gation of Israel, because of the illegitimate children they had begotten, and because they did not observe the law of Jibum. Cf. ibid. לישמעאל אומר כיני צדק בין מתחילתן מפני מה הם

אסורים מפני הממזכות ושאינו מייבמין את הנשואה
Cf. further the same accusation Kidd 75 b. (אסורים) מפני שהיו

Other Rabbis were opposed to allowing the S. to join the Israelites because they (S) were unacquainted with the minutiae of the laws of marriage and divorce. (Cf. Kidd. 76 a. (לפי שאין בקי' אין בתורה קדושין וליכושין) while still others found justification for their attitude, in the fact that the S. were not well versed in details of the law. (Cf. Kidd. 76 a. שאין בקי' אין בדקדוקי מצות Cf. also Chulin 4 a. Gittin 10 a.)

It is but natural however that most of the Rabbis should find cause for their opposition to the S. in the oft repeated accusations against the latter, of laxity in religious matters or of idolatrous inclinations. Some mention of this we have already made. It is a point upon which the Talmudic and later teachers in Israel laid continual stress. We have noted that the S. were accused by the Jews of offering heathen libations during reign of Diocletian. (Aboda Sara V 44 d.) In the same place we are told that when R. Ishmael visited Neapolis (Schechem) he accused the S. of worshiping the images buried on Gerizim by Jacob. לישמעאל ב' רבי יוסי אצל להדא נכבוליה אמתן כות"א לגביה אמר לון אנא מחמי לכוון דלית אמתן סגדין לאהין סורא אלא לצלמיה דתחומי דכתיב ויטמן אותם יעקב תחת האלה אשר ישבע

Note:-

98

The same story with additions is told us in Midrash Bereshith Rabba 81, 3. There Ishmael is met by a S. who asks him whether it were not better for him (Ish.) to worship at Gerizim than at Jerusalem. Whereupon Ishmael accuses the S. of venerating not Gerizim, but the images hidden there. Their worship of these images he compares to the eagerness with which a dog goes after a carcass. The S. enraged, related this to his friends, whereupon they sought to kill Ishmael. He however escaped.

-6

Such journeys to Neapolis, by Jews were few and far between. In Midrash Dt. Rabba 3, 8, we are told of a visit thither made by R. Jonathan. A S. whom he met, immediately begins to dilate on the sanctity of Gerizim, claiming that it was the only Mt. which the flood had not covered. The S. not being satisfied with the objection of Jonathan, that Noah should then have ascended Gerizim, instead of building an ark, is finally silenced by the mule driver of Jonathan. The latter upon receiving from the S. the admission that Gerizim was beneath the heavens quotes Gn. VII 19 "and the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth and all the high hills beneath the heavens were covered", whereupon Jonathan, pleased beyond measure with the dialectic skill of his servant, descends from his ass and allows the mule driver to ride four miles. The same

story substantially is repeated in Bereshith Rabbah 32, 16. That the accusations against the S. were not however limited to early times, is seen from the fact that Abn Ezra in the introduction to his commentary on Esther claims that the S. instead of reading

זרע שית זרע אשמיא read זרע שית זרע אלהים

(quoted from Kirch I 7.) Ashima = idol of the people of Chamath Cf. II Kgs. XVII 30. The accusation is however groundless, since the S. Pent. has no such reading.

Still further specific charges of idolatrous worship were made against the S. Such is the accusation that they worshiped the image of a dove on Gerizim. Of this we have already made some mention in our history of the S. IN Jer Aboda Sara V 44 d. the S. are accused of offering libations to the image of a dove. ואית דבעי מימר כמין יון אית להון ולעס כין לית Furthermore in Chulin 6 a. R. Nachman b. Yitschok attributes the decrees made against the S. by the Jews. to the fact that they (the S.) worship the image of a dove.

אמר לנחמן בר יצחק דמות יונה מצאולתן ברעאש הך גרזנים שבו עובדין אותה

Note:--

According to Meor Enayim S. adopted the worship of a dove from the Assyrians. So thinks Nutt (Sketch of S. Hist. etc. p. 44. n. 5.) According to the S. Ek. Josh. (Chs. 48 - 50) Cf. Hamburger) Hadrian forbade the S. worshiping as formerly at Gerizim, and forced them to worship a dove . That this dove idea

is not foreign even to the Jews proper, is seen from the fact that they themselves represented the spirit of God. as a dove. Cf. Bera choth 3 a. שמעתי בת קול
Cf. also for this same view Matthew III 16 " And to the heavens were opened unto him and he saw the spirit of God descending as a dove " Jost Gesch. d. Isr. Volk. II 196 quotes a modern traveler who claims to have seen on the interior of the case in which the S. enclosed their sacred scroll, the picture of a dove and a lion. To be sure this might symbolize the Millenial picture of harmony. But with Jost. I should rather imagine the traveler mistaken.

A natural question now confronts us. If the relations between Jews and S. of Talmudic times, were such as we have thus pictured, under what if any circumstances, and upon what conditions would the Jews permit the S. to convert to Judaism? What belief; would they have to give up and what dogmas accept? In the words of Mass. Cuth. (End) " we shall accept them into the Jewish fold when they cease believing in Gerizim, acknowledge the legitimacy of Jerusalem as the holy place, chosen by God, and confess belief in resurrection. Thenceforth he who robs a S. will be considered as one who robs an Israelite." מאימתי מקבלין אותם
משכבם במלכותם ומהודו בירושלים ובתמיית העתים מכאן ואילך הוזהר
את מכותי כקול את ישראל

In this somewhat confused arrangement of Talmudic views concerning the S. we have had one method in mind, and that

101

was to arrange these views, according to their subject-matter. At the same time having previously advanced the statement that in Talmudic discussions on the Cuthim, would be found the liberal and conservative characteristics marking other debates between the Rabbis, we have in most cases pointed out these contrasting opinions. We have endeavoured to show how the S. as a people were regarded by Jewish teachers. We have seen that though the majority of the Rabbis were entirely opposed to having any close relations with them, others again were not so prejudiced against them, and herein at least we notice an advance in liberal sentiment on the preceding centuries. It would be highly interesting and instructive, and would greatly simplify matters, could we do divide these Rabbinical views on the S.^{so} as to show exactly what was the prevailing, the general Jewish attitude toward the Cuthim. This Hamburger (Real Ency. Art. Die S.) at least attempts to do . . . , and so assures us that during the first and second centuries, the Jews were pleased with the manner in which the S. adopted their customs, and so looked favorably upon them; that during the third century this friendly attitude gave way to one of hostility, owing to the fact that the S. adoption of Jewish customs ceased, and that this hostility continued during the fourth and fifth centuries. In part, but in very small part this division will hold. When we remember however that during the first and second centuries when Hamburger asserts harmonious relations existed between the S. & Jews.

R. Elizier, Elazar, Simon b. Jochai, Nehmiah, Elazar b. Jose, Jehuda, Hanassi, Ishmael, Chiya, Bar Kappara, and others uttered denunciations against the S. and opposed any leniency toward them: when we note that during the third and fourth centuries when hostility is said to have marked the attitude of Jews toward the S. there flourished R. Chizkiyo, Rovo, Zeira, Jochanan, who were continually favorable to the S. when further we see that such Rabbis as Meir, Jehuda, Elazar, Assi, are not always consistent in their views, now opposing, now favoring the S. we can see that Hamburger's divisions are of not much worth. Nor do the generality of views justify any such divisions, As we have endeavoured to show, there is no generality of view favorable or unfavorable. Almost every lenient tendency meets its rigorous opposition. Almost every orthodox, conservative, opinion is attacked by the more liberal opponents. The Talmudic views on the S. will simply not allow of classification in any other manner than by subject matter.

CHAPTER (IV)

The Samaritan Pentateuch.

I The Time of its Reception by the Samritans.

We now come to a most important study concerning the S. a study of their Pentateuch. The interest manifested in this particular direction, and the investigations carried on with the desire thoroughly to understand the importance of the recension of the Pent. as possessed by the S. is characteristic of but late centuries. Up to the seventeenth century, not only was the character of this recension a mystery, but its very existence remained for a long time doubtful. And even after it had been seen by travelers, the character of its text and its worth still remained unknown, from the jealous care taken by the S. to prevent it from being seen by strangers. In 1616 however, Pietro della Valle succeeded in procuring at Damascus, a copy of the scroll possessed by the S. and soon was enabled to disclose its heretofore hidden secrets, and to determine its value, textually considered, as compared with the Massoretic text.

Note:-

The S. Pent is divided into chapters called Kazzin, After each book, is given the number of chapters it contained viz. First has 250, Second 200, Third 130, Fourth 218 & Fifth 166. These chapters are divided

into verse s. These verses being further subdivided, as likewise these subdivisions, Lev. VII 15 is given as the middle of the Pent.

Before entering into any discussion as to the text and value of this S. recension, a most important matter must first be disposed of. We must endeavour to discover if possible, when the S. received their Pentateuch. That this is of primary importance, can be seen from the fact that some authorities have inferred the great antiquity of the Pentateuch, from the early date at which the S. are said to have had a copy thereof. It is evident at first glance therefore, that the date of the canonization of the Pent. should play a decidedly interesting part in the determination of the time when the S. succeeded in getting possession of their copy of the Five Books of Moses. The fact however that the question of the time of canonization of the Pent. is still far from answered, prevents us from inferring anything therefrom. All that we can at first glance postulate, is that they received it sometime after 722 B. C. Furthermore, no one doubts that they had their copy of the Pent. around 300 B. C. The question which therefore demands our attention and consideration is "When between 722 and 300 B. C. is it most likely that the S. received the Pent? " We say most likely, from the fact that we realize that certainty in this direction is beyond question, for the present at least. In the consideration of

the question here presented, therefore, it is our purpose to point out and emphasize such an event in the history of the S. (occurring between 722 & 300 B. C.) as will enable us to assign with great probability, a definite date to the reception of the Pent. by the S. Let us first however consider briefly the early references which we have concerning the S. Pent. and the many views or theories suggested to account for its early presence among the S.

We have already in our treatment of the History of the S. and The S. of the Talmud, referred to some of the Talmudic views on the worth of the S. Pent. It will be well to repeat them here, as they are of importance. In Sota VII (29 b.) Elazar b. Simon addresses a S. with the words " You have falsified your law, and have done yourselves no good thereby. " (referring to the insertion of ל in Dt. XI 30) In Sota 33 b. the same view is attributed to Elazar b. Jose. In Jer. Jebamoth Ch. I (Krot. Ed. 3 a.) The S. ignorance, (Shown by their making ל in Dt. XXV 5. an adjective) is ridiculed by Simon b. Elazar Furthermore in Nidda Ch. V. the S. are accused of interpreting the Torah literally. A further very important reference is found in Sanhedrin 29 b. Here we are told either by Mar. Zutra or Ukba that at first the Torah was given to the Jews in Hebrew Script. (כתב עברי) and the holy language (לשון הקודש) Later in Ezra's time, it was transcribed (and translated) in to the Assyrian script, (כתב אשורי)

2 -

106

and the Aramaic language (ארמאית), Later again the Jews
chose for themselves the Assyrian Script, and the Hebrew
language, and left the תנ"ך the Hebrew Script, and
Aramaic language " To the question " who are the תנ"ך?
R. Chisda answers " The Cuthim." Such are the Talmudic
references to the S. Pent. The last quoted in fact makes
no mention of the S. recension of the Pent. but to the S.
Targum, An Aramaic translation of the Pent. which the S.
had very early, (at least as early as Onkelos. Cf. Nutt p.
108 and Carme Shomron pp 48-54 for description thereof.)
As it is acknowledged on all hands that the S. Targum is of
a date much later than the time of the S. acceptance of the
copy of the Pentateuchal Hebrew text, this last quotation
implies the existence of the S. Pent, though it does not
express such implication.

Note:-

Due to the fact that they, from this very passage and
from other sources and times, are acknowledged to
possess the original Hebrew Characters, in contradic-
tion to the Jews, the S. found in this fact one
argument for their claim of being true Jews, ...
better Jews in reality than the Israelites themselves.
The older Script however continued to be used by the
learned class of Jews down to the 4th Cent. A.D.

(Cf. Zunz Gottes d. Vortage 8.)

From the above Talmudic quotations, what may we infer
concerning the time when the S. received their Pent?

107

Absolutely nothing further than that such reception must have occurred earlier than the second century C. E. (Elazar b. Jose, Simon b. Elazar, and Elazar b. Simon), Since the Rabbis of that time were acquainted with the fact that in the S. Pent. were to be found variants from the Massoretic text. Finding no answer to our previously formulated question in Jewish sources, let us see what the S. have to say on this point. Their position can easily be imagined, and we will not be surprised at the peculiarly orthodox tenor of their remarks on this, to them all important question. From none of the writers of the S. can be gathered ought different from the claim of the community now at Nablus. They point to their scroll of the law, on which they say is written " I Abisha son of Phinehas, son of Elazar, son of Aaron, the priest, upon them be the grace of Jehovah, in his honor have I written this holy law at the entrance of the Tabernacle of the testimony on Mt. Gerizim, even Bethel, in the 13th year of the taking possession of the land of Canaan and all its boundaries around it, by the children of Israel. I praise Jehovah " To be sure, nothing is to be learned from such a statement, and forced to the conclusion that we can get no definite answer to our question from either Jewish or S. sources of early years, we direct our attention for a while to the answers or theories suggested by Moderns.

Note:-

The scroll which the S. possess is about 500 years

old, though the S. claim it to be about 3460 years old. (Cf. Frankl. Nach. Jerus. 417 f.) Some travelers claim that the inscription is not on the scroll. If it were, it could not thus be over 500 years old. Another Copy which the S. have, is dated 655 A. D. A third copy which they possess they claim to be the one used in a debate between Zerubabel and Sanballat, before the King of Babylon. (Nutt. 105-6 and N.I.) Brigham (Art. The S. in Unit. Rev. IV 141-159) thinks the oldest scroll of the S. is in reality from a few centuries B. C.

The earliest date assigned by moderns for the S. reception of the Pent. is the latter part of the 8th century B.C. Those who assign this date claim the S. received the Pent. from the remnants of the ten tribes remaining in Samaria, and the adjacent territory. They produce as arguments for their claim, the fact that the S. desired to aid in the rebuilding of the temple in the time of Ezra. This it is said could not have been the case, had not the S. become previously acquainted with the Pent. its laws etc. as they would not under other circumstances, have dared to make such a request. Furthermore, the advocates of this view claim that the S. could never have accepted the Pentateuch from the Jews after the exile, as the enmity between the two peoples was too great at that time. The S. must therefore have received it at a time much earlier than the

exile. A further reason urged, is, that if the S. received the Pent. later than the time of Zerubabel, there is no reason why they should not have taken other than the Five Books of Moses. Why should they have limited their choice?

Article in Princeton Review "The S. Ancient and Modern" April.

(For this view Cf. 1868. Michaelis " Einleitung p 315.

Other exponents of this view are Eichhorn, and Morinus.

Cf. also for presentation of this view De Wette Einleit.

transl. by. Theod. Parker pp 323-330)

Bearing in mind the fact that, owing to the lack of definiteness on the question of the date of the Canonization of the Pent., we are to infer from such a date as seldom as possible, and only when absolutely necessary, let us see what arguments can be brought against the view above presented, arguments which will show the weak foundation on which the above suggested theory rests. In the first place it is peculiar that the S. should have been so idolatrous (as they are pictured in II Kgs. XVII) at the time of the arrival of the Assyrian priest , among them, if they had received the Pent. previously. Furthermore their requesting to aid in erecting the temple, is sufficiently accounted for by their close relations with the remnant of the Ten Tribes left behind, from which they certainly learned much. The presence of the Assyrian priest among them (which fact the above mentioned defenders of the view now being refuted, do not refuse to accept as historical) would further account for the Jewish tinge of S. life during the second half of the sixth century B. C. Furthermore the very fact

110

of the S. desiring to aid in rebuilding the temple, may lend another argument to the claim, that they had not the Pent. at an earlier date. For if they had, during the two centuries that intervened between their transportation to Samaria and the time of Cyrus, they would have established their religious rites and worship, and observances in accordance with the Pent. with such strictness, and have made themselves so independent, as to render the fact of their request of Zerubabel, and their willingness to adopt Jewish customs, and ideas, well-nigh utterly impossible. A people with a fixed form of rites is not so ready to adopt another form. (Cf. De Wette Beiträge I 234) Again, despite the fact that the S. were indignant at the treatment accorded them, by Zerubabel, the animosity between them, and the Jews was not yet sufficiently intense to cause them to refuse to accept the Book, which they, now that they had become the enemies and rivals of the Jews at Jerusalem, absolutely needed, to legitimize their claims of Jewish descent. The Jews rejected the S. offer of aid, because of their fear lest these " lion Proselytes " would contaminate and weaken Judaism internally. It were but natural then, that the S. should endeavour to possess themselves of the Book from which they could learn the how and when of conforming themselves the more to the true Jewish religion, and life, in order to give the lie to the Jewish view of their (the S.) religious faith and observances.

///

The claim that had the S. received their Pent. after the exile, there is no reason why they should not have taken some of the other books of the Bible, is one that is most generally advanced, and most easily answered. In the firstplace, with the exception of Joshua, Judges and Job, the other books of the Bible extol Jerusalem. The S. venerating Gerizim, would certainly not desire to receive books in which a city rival to their own was thus praised. Even though they have a Bk. Joshua, it bears but a faint resemblance to the Biblical book of the same name. Furthermore, the S. cared nothing for the Prophets. To them Moses was their all in all. Joshua they accepted as a hero, simply from his relation to Moses. (Cf. Kirch p. 19) Keil. Introd. II 344 says the S. took only the Pent. because they thought it the summary of divine revelation, just as Philo thought Moses the only teacher of mysteries, the rest of the writers of the Bible having only a general inspiration. Hengstenberg (Cf. Keil. ibid. n. I.) is of the opinion that the S. thus restricted themselves, because in the other books, there was too much of a nature hostile to Israel. The S. desiring to be the successors of Israel, would certainly therefore refuse to accept such books. That the S. actually did think but little of these books, and of their heroes, can be seen from the manner in which they speak of Samuel, of Solomon, of the Prophets in general, and of Ezra (Cf. Gesenius De. Pent. Samar. 4 n. 9.) All this but leads us to conclude that the claim that the S. received

112

the Pent. in pre-Exilian times will not hold. As a consequence, the claim that the priest sent by the Assyrian King (2 Kgs. XVII 27-28) brought the Pent. to the S. is open to almost the same objections as was the first presented view. (Cf. for this view Jahn. B. A. and Robinson B. R. III 116) and rests on a basis not even as substantial as that of the first theory. Neither of these views has presented a single fact which would have necessitated the presence of the Pent. Among the S. before the exile. Neither has presented any fact which would militate against the claim that the S received the Five Books of Moses after the exile. The influence of the Israelite priest, and of the remnant of Israel in the northern country, may have been felt to a considerable degree. No historic fact however, and no condition of the S. from a religious or any other standpoint, would lead us even to suspect the presence of the Pent. among them before the exile.

The view as above presented having thus ^{been} shown to have no weight, we must look to some historic occasion after the exile, as marking the time of the transfer of a copy of the Pent. from Jerusalem to the S. We say a historic occasion, and emphasize the statement, from the fact that the reception of the Pent. revolutionized the life of the S. and the occasion therefore must have been a most important one. Now when in later years we meet the S. we find them limiting their observances to such as are mentioned in the Torah (according to their own interpretation). We find

113

them in possession of a religious worship exactly in accord with the dictates of the Pent. The time of their entrance upon a life of such strict religiosity, and of such strict obedience to Pentateuchal commands, must have been synchronous with their reception of the Pentateuch. The question then is "When did the S. enter upon such a career as enabled them for centuries to pursue an existence, characterized by a religion and a form of worship, almost exactly parallel to that of the Jews in Jerusalem? We answer, at the time of the erection of the temple of Gerizim in 432 B. C. and we answer further, that then it was, that the S. first received their Pent. To indicate the better, our reasons for such conclusions, we shall have to refer again to the expulsion of Manasseh from Jerusalem 432 B. C.

Reformers never succeed in gaining over an entire people to their views. The harsher and more rigorous the reform, the greater the opposition met with. Now the fact that Manasseh of the priestly family married outside the pale of Israel, is indicative of the fact that both priests and people must have considered such actions allowable, or any rate maintained a passive attitude toward such infringement of the law. We have already stated that it seems very probable, that Manasseh was not alone in his action, but that great numbers must have acted as did he, and must have sided with him in suffering the consequences. Accordingly when Nehemiah

begins his wholesale reforms, he meets with strenuous opposition. When further he demands that those who had taken strange wives should separate themselves from them, the opposition met with increases. When therefore Manasseh is

Cu

114

driven from Jerusalem for refusing to obey the order, he leaves the city in all likelihood not alone, but accompanied by the majority of those against whom Nehemiah's reforms had been aimed. Whither are these exiles to go? Nothing is more natural than that they, indignant at the treatment accorded them by their own brethren, should join the ranks of those who, though resembling in belief and claim the inhabitants of Jerusalem, should yet be considered their worst enemies.

Now the priestly law based on the practice of the priests at Jerusalem was most likely reduced to form after the rebuilding of the temple and first published by Ezra as the law of the rebuilt temple. (Cf. Art The S. by W. R. Smith in Brittanica. Also Kuenen Relig. of Isr. II 245-249) Now this Levitical Law (completing as it did the matter of the Pent.) having been thus definitely formulated and emphasized, lends great weight to the claim that the canonization of the Pent. occurred some time soon after 458 B. C. Most authorities thus agree that it occurred between 458-444 B. C. (Cf. De Wette Einleit. 22. Kuenen II 233. Bleek Einleit 555. Jost Gesch u. Sekten I 30. W. R. Smith O. T. in J. C. 56 & 158) Accordingly we may with great probability accept the conclusion, that the Pent. as Pent. existed by 444 B. C.

Now the expulsion of Manasseh we have already mentioned, took place about 432 B. C. Belonging to the priestly family, he was therefore without doubt acquainted with this

115
matter of the Pent. When furthermore we remember that the great reason for the building of the Temple on Gerizim, (aside from the desire on Sanballat's part to place his son-in-law in a position similar to the one of which he had been deprived, a position consonant with the high family connection of Manasseh), When I say we remember that the great and ultimate cause for the erection of the Gerizim temple, was the desire, burning within the hearts of Sanballat and Manasseh, of erecting a structure, within which a service should be conducted exactly similar to the temple service at Jerusalem, we can readily understand that the Pent. with which Manasseh and many others must have been acquainted, became the basis of such a service. Furthermore, such a service would be made parallel to that at Jerusalem, and the Samaritan's manners patterned exactly after Jewish customs, in order to make the S. typical Jews. Otherwise the entire plan of the building of the temple would have failed, since the intention was, by converting the S. into true Jews, and making their service similar to that at Jerusalem, to attack the claim of the Jerusalemites, that the S. were non-Jews, and that they alone were of true Jewish blood. In such a way the S. hoped that the time was not far distant, when they could show the inferiority of the so called Jews at Jerusalem (from their point of view) and prove their own claim to being the true descendants of the ten tribes. Now without the Pent. as a basis for their priestly practice, their religious worship and their daily

life, the entire movement becomes ridiculous, without heart 116
and soul, in fact cannot be understood. Since furthermore
the Pent. seems to have been canonized before the building
of the Temple on Gerizim, nothing militates against the
view that the exile of Manasseh was synchronous with the
reception of the Pent. by the S. (about 432 B. C.)

Note:-

A similar view (without argument or reasons where-
fore) is accepted by Keil (Introduc. II 302, 303.)
De Wette (Einleit, 203) Gesenius (De. Pent. S. 9)
Kautsch (in Herzog Art. Die S.) W. R. Smith (in Brit-
tanica Art. The S.) (O. T. in J. C. 73, 398) Kirch.
(Carme Shomron 31) Wellhausen (Hist. of Jud. & Isr.
136) Prolegomena (Transla. by Black.) 498) Graetz
(Gesch II part 2 173) Cornill (Introd. 298.) Bleek
(Einleit. 555) says the S. received the Pent. about
400 B. C. Jost (Gesch d. Isr. Volkes I 451) Also
(Gesch u. Sekten I 51) Kirch (Carme. Shomron 30) says
the S. received the Pent. not earlier than ^{the} time of
Ezra. Naturally, those who, though conceding that the
expulsion of Manasseh and the transfer of a copy of
the Pent. from Jerusalem to Gerizim were immediately
successive events, claim that Manasseh's forced exile
occured during the time of Alexander, place the S.
reception of the Pent. about a century later than
do we. (Cf. Geiger Einleit. Die S. Pent. IV 53.)
We have already stated why we think Joseph confused

117
in his accounts, and why it seems to us that the Manasseh event occurred during Nehemiah's time. All arguments ^{to the contrary notwithstanding (such arguments)} being few in number, and worthless as far as even probability is concerned) it seems decidedly likely that the interpretation of the events as above presented is correct. It has been said in opposition to this theory of Manasseh bringing the Pent. to the S. that he would not bring them a Book in which his marriage with a foreign woman was condemned (Ex. XXXIV 16 Dt. VII 3) The fact that Nicaso, the wife of Manasseh was a S. shows how weak the argument is. Be it understood that our conclusion in no way does away with the probability of the S. having been acquainted with much now contained in the Pent. ^{long} before , at any rate before, the expulsion of Manasseh. No historic fact would lend color to the claim that they were not so acquainted. The contrary seems certain. The coming of the Israelite priest, the S. offer of aid, in Zerubabel's time, the presence of many S. in Jerusalem(Tobiah, Sanballat, Nicaso etc.) and the fact that the S. received the exiled Jews with open arms, all seem to testify to the fact that the S. had learned much of what is now Pentateuchal, before they received it as canonized.

II The Text of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Accepting as probably conclusive, the assertion that the S. received their Pent. from the Jews at the time of the expulsion of Manasseh by Nehemia about 432 B. C., our next inquiry is as to the character of this recension as possessed by the S. its variations from the Massoretic text, and its worth. We shall first present a number of examples in which the S. Pent. and the Mass. Text vary. We shall thus be the better able to understand the character of the text with which we are now concerned, and shall have the more reason for conclusions drawn.

To those who have made a thorough study of the S. Pent. it seems to have been a matter of some difficulty to arrange in a systematic way, the variants from our text, which this recension presents. Michaelis (Orient. u. Exeg. Bibl. IV Bk. XVII 50; V Bk. XXI 177 f. and Bk. XXII 185-203) gives a long list of such variants, with critical comments thereon, but presents them in no systematically arranged order, except in Bk. XXI where, three classes of changes are mentioned viz. 1) Those resulting from confusion of ν, ρ, σ, χ changes of λ and γ 2) critical conjectures and explanations. Keil. (Introd. 305) mentions the following divisions of variants 1) Grammatical conjectures 2) Glosses and additions from parallel passages. 3) Conjectures of a grammatical and historical kind, to remove

difficulties or offer explanations 4). Samaritanisms 5)
 Changes in accordance with the dogmas and ordinances of the
 S. (Cf. for these classes of variants De Wette Einleit
 207.) Geiger throughout the Urschrift, presents these
 variants, but owing to the nature of his work, in no orderly
 arrangement. In his " Die S. Pent. (Nachlassene Schrif-
 ten IV 54-67.) he presents seven classes of changes, but
 confesses himself unable to arrange in a systematic manner,
 those variants which do not enter these seven classes (67)
 His arrangement of the variants is as follows: 1) Changes
 made to show that Schechem and Gerizim, not Zion and Jer-
 usalem are the holy places chosen by God. 2) Introduction
 of Aramaic and later Hebrew forms 3) Changes made to
 overcome difficulties, inconsistencies etc, Such changes con-
 sisting at times of newly introduced words, at times, of
 phrases, and again even sentences. 4) Changes made to
 augment the glory of God 5) Changes to mollify harsh
 epithets applied to men of old, and harsh words spoken of
 them 6) Changes to spread a veil of propriety over re-
 ferences of a delicate nature 7) Halachic changes with
 reference to customs. Frankel (Einfluss 239 f.) notes three
 classes of changes 1) Use of imperative for the third
 person 2) Use of Galila¹en¹ Palestinian dialect forms 3)
 Aramaic forms, Kirchheim (Carme Shomron 30-48) presents
 the variants in thirteen classes as follows 1) Additions
 and changes to honor Gerizim 2.) Changes to complete an
 expression 3.) Changes for sake of explanation 4.)

4) Changes of verbs and conjugations, 5.) of nouns, 6.) of forms of verbs to bring them to a form similar to others in the sentence, 7.) Permutation of letters, 8.) Changes with regard to pronouns, 9.) Changes of Gender, 10) Added letters II) Change s in prepositions, conjugations and articles, 12) Junction and separation, 13) Chronological changes. Gesenius, whose almost every word in connection with the S. Pent. is accepted as authority, (he having been the first thoroughly to analyze the S. Pent. and thus having put an end to the seemingly interminable disputes waged by Capellus, Morinus, Hottinger, Walton, Richard Simon, Buxtorf, Houbigant, Ravius, Poncet, Michaelis, Tychsen, Hassencamp, Pfeiffer, Kennicott, Eich-horn and others) classifies the variants as follows (De Pent. §. 22-61) I) Grammatical Emendations a.) supplying quiescent letters, b.) Unusual forms of pronouns constantly changed to the more usual form, c.) Apocopated future always changed to longer form, d.) Omission of Paragogic 'and' and changes of gender, e.) Infinitive absolute used in various constructions is changed to finite verb, 2.) Interpretations and glosses received into the text, 3.) Conjectural Emendation of difficulties 4.) Corrections and insertions of words and phrases from parallel passages, 5.) Interpolations of entire passages from parallel historic references, 6.) Corrections of what seemed offensive or impossible of belief, 7.) Samaritanisms a.) Orthographic changes, b.) Changes in forms of pronouns, c. in verbs, d.)

121
d) in nouns and adjectives 8.) Changes to make the Pent.

conform to the doctrines and views of the S. a.) Concern-
ing unity of God. b.) dignity of God. c.) reverence for
the patriarchs, d.) dignity of the Law e.) Gerizim.

Such are the chief classifications of the Pentateuchel
variants which we have met in our study. It is evident
at first glance that the classifications do not entirely
differ^{one} from the other. The shorter classifications will be
found in toto in the divisions of Kircheim and Gesenius.
The examples given by these two authorities do not always
agree. Furthermore, the principle of division is so entirely
different that a comparison between the two were a diffi-
cult matter. It is my intention here to give a number of
examples of variants falling under^{each} and every one of the
divisions presented by both Kircheim and Gesenius. The
method of division will then be clearly seen, the character
of the variants will be easily observed, and we shall be
able to generalize with a great deal of probability. The
fact that so large a number of variants is here presented
(though but a few to illustrate each kind) finds justi-
fication in the fact that it is imperative ly necessary
to see and study every class of change s in the S. Pent.
and in the further fact, that these changes are not so well
known, as to render this presentation useless. Such a pre-
sentation furthermore, shows better the nature of the S.
Pent. than could an entire volume devoted to the character-
ization of the said recension. The examples are selected
from the large number given by Kircheim and Gesenius.

Variants as arranged by Gesenius.

1). Grammatical Emendations

a). Supplying quiescent letters

Gen. I 14-16 S. has מארות for מארת
Gen. XLIII 4. XXV 24. XXVI 1. XXVIII 19. for כאשון כאשון
Lev. XVI 12 חפניו for חופניו
2. At III 4 גיעורי " גיעורי
" XXVIII 68 אניות " אניות

b). Unusual forms of pronouns constantly changed to the more usual form.

Gen. XII 11, XVI 7-8, Num. XXII 32 for אנחנו
Gen. IX 21, XII 8, III 3. אכלו
Often כס " כסה
" כאל " כאלה
" כיוא " כיא

c). Lengthening of apocopated future.

Gen. XXV 18 וימות for ימות
" XLIII 7 ויגיד " ויגיד
" XL 33 יראה " יראה and Gen. XXI 10 ואכאפ for ואכאפ
" XXI 35 ותהינה " ותהינה

d). Omission of paragogic and and Changes of gender.

Gen. I 24 חית for חית
Gen. XXIII 16 שכן " שכן
Gen. XXIV 16, XXIV 3 for וענה וענה
Gen. XL 20 שמע for שמע
" XXII 9 אחת " אחד

e). Infinitive absolute used in various constructions is changed to finite verb.

Gen. VII 3 וישבו הלוך ושוב for וישבו הלוך ושוב
" " 7. וישא יצא ושוב " וישא יצא ושוב
" " 5. פיו הלוך וחזור " פיו הלוך וחזור

7). Samaritanisms a). Orthographic Changes.

En VIII 4 אררט פון כררט
 " IX 9 " פארט " גיט
 " XXIII 18 באי " בעי
 " XXVII 19 שבי " שבע
 St XXXII 21. הבליהם " אבליהם

b). Changes in forms of pronouns.

En. XII 13, XIV 47. את פון אתי
 " XXI 6, אתנה " אתין
 " XXII 2, 12, 16. Suffix פון אך
 " III 16, XII 12, XVI 6, 9, 10, 11, XXI 18, XXIV 14, 43, 60. XXV 14, 15 פון יך
 St XXXII 3 ון פון יך

c). Changes in verbs.

En XVII 16, ערקת פון ערקתי
 Ex XXXI 5 ידעת " ידעתין
 En VI 7, שחת פון השחית (also En VI 17, IX 25, XXI 29)
 " IX 16 לזכר " לאזכרה
 Ex XX 24, הזכרתי " אזכרתי

d). 1). Nouns of form קטל changed to form קטיל

En XXXVII 35, אביל פון אביל
 " XL 7, מלאות " מליאות
 " XLIII " שקדים " עקידים
 Ex XXVIII 4, אבנט " אבניט
 " XIV 7, שלישים " שלישים

2). Adjectives of form קטול changed to form קטיל

Lev. XI 44, XXI 2, XX 7, 26, XXI 6, XXIV 9. קדשים פון קדישים
 En XLV 10 קיב פון קיב
 St XI 4, בכור פון בכיר

Other changes in noun forms.

Ex. XXII 37, Numb XXI 20, כבלי פון כבלאי
 En XXVIII 16, אנשים פון אנשים

8). Changes to make the Pent. Conform to the doctrines

a.) Unity of God.

Ex. XXII 3, XXXI 53, XXXV 7, Ex. XXXII 8, plural verb with אלהים is changed to sing

b.) Dignity of God.

Ex. XXV 3, אש מחמה for גבוה מחמה
 Dt. XXXII 19, " יחזק " יחזק
 Dt. XXXII 18, מלך for מלך
 Ex. XXI 12, האשים for המלכים
 " XXVIII 16, מלך (God) for מלך

c.) Reverence for the patriarchs.

Ex. XXI 7, ארוך אפס (Levi and Simeon).

d.) Dignity of the Law. (i.e. Changes made to raise dignity of the law).

Ex. XXXII 30, לבל תשליכון for תשליכון
 Dt. XXI 12, במעון for במעון
 Dt. XXXVIII 30, ישכב עמה for ישכב עמה

e.) Changes to magnify Gerizim.

Dt. XXXVII + is placed after Ex. XXI 17 and Dt. I 21.

" XXXVII 5, עיבל for גיזים
 " XXXVII 7, הכהן הכהן is added here.
 " XXI 30, מול עכס " " "

" XII 5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26 XIV 23, 24, XV 20, XVI 2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, XVII 8, XVIII 6, XXXVI 2, XXXI 11, יבחר for יבחר (to show that Gerizim has already been chosen as the sacred place). These references to magnify Gerizim are taken from Kirchheim. Erenius simply refers to the fact that changes to magnify Gerizim are made, and undoubtedly has these in mind.

We can by this time gain some idea of the character of the variants as presented to us in the S. Pent. We can see even in the brief treatment thus made, that all of the minor classifications of Geiger, Miachalis and Frankel have been dealt with. It is not my intention here (this statement has already been emphasized) to give a detailed account of all the examples found in the writings of those who have made a thorough study of the subject. A single glance at the vast list as presented by these authorities will immediately impress one with the impracticability of such a performance. To the interested investigator the sources are at hand. My effort here is but a characterization. I shall therefore refrain from quoting further examples of variants from other than Kirchheim. It may be well however to note the fact that Frankel (Einfluss 238) correctly criticises Gesenius for not accounting in his classification, for such additions found in the S. Pent as are not taken from parallel passages as

- Gen. XXIII 2. בקיית מארגע אל עמק
- " XXVII 27. כריח השדה עלא
- " XLIII 48 ברוך האיש שהוא לאלים
- Ex V 13. כאשר בבוית המבן נתן לסם
- " XXXII 32 אם תשא חטאתם עא
- Lev. VIII 31. בעקום הקדוש

The nature of Kirchheim's classification however is so vitally different in many points from that of Gesenius, that I find it necessary to present an account of his examples of variants, if my desire of characterizing fully the nature

of the S. Pent. is to be satisfied. Kircheim quotes the entire variant without giving us the reference to the Pent. Gesenius often errs on the opposite side in referring to places where a variant occurs, without giving the variant proper. Examples of class I of Kircheim we have already given under 8 e. of Gesenius. We will therefore begin with

Class 2. Changes to Complete an Expression.

In Σ 19 after הכניני S. adds עד נמי הגדול נהר פ"ה (cf. Σ 18)
" Σ 20 " וישלחו " " ולס עשו (cf. Σ 17)
" Σ 14 " אבימלך " " אלק כסף (cf. Σ 16)
 Σ 20 " אהרן " ומה ואת מרים אחותם (cf. Σ 18)
Lev. Σ 21 Sonite לחקריב and adds, וטן הקדשים יאכל, מקדש הקדשים

3). Changes for Sake of Explanation.

In I 4 After הפעמים S. adds להאיר על תאריך
 Σ 7 " זישהתו " " למשה
Lev. Σ 25 " בגדין " " וכתב בערו במים
Numb Σ 4 " משה " " אמר וימנה את האנשים הנמצאים לבעל פועל וישבו
(cf. Σ 5) חרון אף ח' וישכאל
St Σ 28. After ושערת S. adds. ועשית

4). Changes of Verbs and Conjugations.

In Σ 19 ולבן מלך לבנו את צאנו
Lev. Σ 11 " לא יצק עליה שמן " ויצק עליה שמן
Numb Σ 4 ויקרא אליהם " וימצא מלאך אליהם
 Σ 18 וכל העם באים את הקולות " וכל העם שמע את הקולות
St Σ 5 לעוס את שמו שם " לשכן את שמו שם

5). Changes of Nouns.

In Σ 24, כימים for האמים
 Σ 10 הילך " הנעב
Numb Σ 11 כבלים " פעמים
St Σ 8 טפרת " חג
St Σ 27 לשמה " לעם

6). Changes of forms of verbs to bring them to a form similar to others in the sentence.

Ex. $\overline{XXV} 26$ ויקרא for ויקרא (cf v 25)
Numb. $\overline{XIX} 17$ ונתן " ונתן
Numb. $\overline{XIII} 3$ ויב " ויב
Ex. $\overline{XV} 10$ שער " שער
Numb. $\overline{XIII} 24$ קרא " קרא

7). Permutation of Letters.

Ex. $\overline{XXII} 13$. אחד for אחד
Ex. $\overline{VI} 1$. אתה " אתה
Ex. $\overline{XXVIII} 49$. ידא " ידא
" $\overline{XXII} 18$. מללך " מללך
" $\overline{XXIII} 25$. דבך " דבך

8). Changes Regarding Pronouns

Noun for pronoun. Ex. $\overline{XXXVII} 36$ את יוסף
Lengthening of pronoun. Numb. $\overline{XI} 5$. אתה " אתה
Added pronoun. Ex. $\overline{XXXIII} 20$ וישעיהו ויסמא
Omission of pronoun. Ex. $\overline{VI} 11$, $\overline{XI} 19$. 22 בית " 22 בית
Change of pronoun Ex. $\overline{XXXIII} 5$. מי " מי

9). Changes of gender.

Ex. $\overline{XIX} 23$. ישא for ישא (making שמע fem.).
Ex. $\overline{XVI} 2$. וחס " וחס (" " ")
Ex. $\overline{XXII} 6$. ומשא " ומשא (" מע masc.)
Numb. $\overline{XXVII} 11$. אתה " אתה (" נחל masc.)
Ex. $\overline{XXXVII} 32$. היא " הוא (" כותב fem.) and making the pronoun distinct.

10). Added Letters are dropped. Sometimes letters are added.

Numb. $\overline{XXII} 11$. שמע for שמע
" $\overline{XVII} 17$. שמע " שמע
Ex. $\overline{XXVIII} 28$. שמע " שמע
" $\overline{XX} 20$. ואתפלל " ואתפלל
" $\overline{XVII} 17$. שמע " שמע

Such omission of letters is also characteristic of the Massoretic text. Cf. Geijers 129
 Mschrift 233. Jer. Meg. I 9. Jebamoth I 6.

11). Changes respecting prepositions, Conjunctions, and Articles.

In \overline{XIV} 4. ושלש for ובעלש

\overline{XV} 18. לעולם " עולם

Numb \overline{XXVII} 14. כאשר " אשר

" \overline{XXI} 9. כאיש " איש

\overline{XXII} 20. את בני " בני

12). Junction And Separation

In \overline{XXXII} 31 פניאל for פני אל

\overline{XXII} לא כן " לכן

\overline{XXII} 2. וזמרת " וזמרתיה (The original was זמרתיה)

mighty song. (Cf. Art. Origin of form ירה by Jacobson in Stud. Zeitochrift 96)

St \overline{XXXII} 33 אכזר for אך זר (In \overline{XXI} 7)

" \overline{IV} 32. קן היה " קנהיה

13). Chronological Changes.

In \overline{V} 18. for ויהי יכד שתיים וששים שנה וילד חנוך

שנים וששים ומאת שנה

" \overline{V} 25. ויחי מתושלח שבע וששים שנה וילד את למך

שבע ושנים ומאת שנה

" \overline{V} 28. ויחי למך על שבע וששים שנה וילד בן

שנים ושנים ומאת שנה

" \overline{V} 3. שלשים ומאת שנה ויחי אדם מאתיים ועלשים שנה וילד

שלשים ומאת שנה

" \overline{XI} 12. ויחי ארבע מאות חמש וששים שנה ומאת שנה וילד בן

חמש וששים שנה

But how
 this statement
 hold good with
 Adam?

These Changes it can be seen are in accordance with the view above ex-
 pressed, that in Ante-Deluvian times no one begets a child, after 150 yrs.
 of age. In Post-Deluvian times " " " " " before 50 "

of age. (Cf. Genesis 5 a). For such Changes Cf. the Criticism of
 In \overline{V} 4 \overline{XI} in Geijers Zeitschrift I, 98-121. 174-185. The LXX likewise
 makes Chronological Changes in these Chapters, though different from
 both Mass. and S. texts. (Cf. Frankel Einfluss 70-72).

Such a presentation of variants as this just given, will it seems to me, but emphasize any opinion as to the value of the S. Pent. which may have been formed by a glance at the variants given by Gesenius. And yet it does not seem to me that full justice has been done. Arranging the variants under the various heads as above, gives no true idea of the absurd lengths to which the application of certain general rules as laid down by the S. was carried. In the examples above given I have been entirely impartial. A single glance at a long list of ridiculous changes of variants which remove all sense from the passages corrected, instead of clarifying that which is obscure, will give a good idea of what the S. Must have considered to be pure Hebrew, and will show us the grammatical knowledge of S.

grammarians. Cf. for example the following:

Gn. III 2 נחש פה כחש Gn. XXX 40 אל פה איל אל
 " XIX 32 " חב'ן " XXII 10 אל ובהוללת ישמעאל
 " XXIV 8 " אחקד " " 24 " מדי פה מדי
 " XXX 34 " לז " 30. " ולא " לו
 " XXVII 19 עבד " שבה " " " " יצורס " כי צורס
 " XXV 27 " עקב " " XXXIII 3 " א " אף
 " XXXV 18 XLIX 27 ב' ימין פה ב' ימין " II 12 " יד יד " יד
 to make it mean 'son of day' i.e. of yesterday
 age. Gn. XXXIII 8 " ישות פה " אפי' הם
 Gn. XLIV 10 " פה נקראים " XXIV 17 " חכבאף " חכבאף
 " XLIX 5 " כח חסס " XXIV 17 " חכבאף " חכבאף
 Ex. XVII 16 " פה כח " XXIV 17 " חכבאף " חכבאף
 " IV 25 " משה " XXIV 17 " חכבאף " חכבאף
 Gn. XXIV 62. " מוא פה מדבב " XXIV 17 " חכבאף " חכבאף
 Lev. VI 12. " בק פה בק " XXIV 17 " חכבאף " חכבאף
 Num. XXIV 17. " קדק " קדק " XXIV 17 " חכבאף " חכבאף

Some conclusion. as to the value of this S. text, compared with the Massortie text, may now in a general way be noted. The examples which we have given altogether are fair types of the entire list of divergencies in the S. Pent. None of a character distinctively different from those here presented, are to be found in our authorities. In the first place let it be noticed, that with the exception of Ex. III 16 where S. has ~~new form~~ and Dt. XXIII 18 לא תחיה for לא תחיה and the changes made to advance the claims of Gerizim, no distinct laws are modified, reversed, or even tampered with. As soon as we assign reasons for a change, as soon as we see definite laws or rules guiding the variants of the S. Pent. we infer its having been copied from the Mass. text, and intentionally changed. Hence when Gesenius, Kirchem Michaelis, and Geiger, classify the variants as made under the guidance of a definite idea, be it for explanations sake, or for harmonies sake, the character of the S. Pent. as a representative of the original text is impeached, and rightly so. Furthermore, variants due to carelessness or to ignorance, are not to be compared with the passages of the Mass. text. We do not for a moment intend to argue that our present Mass. text is at all a perfect representative of the original text. The corruptions of ages are visible throughout it, and in a manner similar to that mentioned above, such corruptions are often of a nature calculated to obscure instead of clarifying.

Note:-

132

It is interesting to notice here as characteristic of the criticism of these Mass. text corruptions, the view of Bishop Colenso (Pent. & Ek. of Josh. II 151) that the Jews falsified their own text by changing מוריה of Gn. XXII 2. to גריזים to draw attention away from Gerizim and to Moriah, just as they likewise changed Gerizim in Dt. XXVII 4 and Josh VIII 30, to Ebal. This latter they did, to make it appear that Ebal and not Gerizim was the Mt. where Joshua was to build the altar. We might almost imagine Bishop Colenso a s. in his claims (for it is exactly this that the S. urge) Cf. for the same view Kennicott (Cf. Gesenius 23) Stanley Sinai & Palest. 234.

Aware of the fact, ^{then} that the Mass. text is not the original text, the question here to be considered briefly is, how many if any of the S. Pent. variants, are to be preferred to the Mass. text I. e. how many such variants seem to represent the more truly the original text? The fact that Origen, Eusebius, Jerome and later Houbigant, Poncet, Kennicott, Geddes and Bertholdt considered the S. Pent. far superior to the Mass. text, argues nothing, when we remember that a thorough examination of the S. Pent. was unknown until the time of Gesenius, in the early part of this century. Nor does the fact that De Muis, Hottinger, Ravius, Tychsen, Fuller and Pfeiffer took the opposite stand, influence the question today. If we are to look for

authorities, let us glance for a moment at the opinions of those whom we have already recognized as of weight in this matter. Geiger, though admitting that the S. text represents an old recension and that its change of לך for את in Gn.

22. XXIII 17, XXIV 23, תקדשתי ונקדשתי. הארץ היא in Ex. XXIX 42, אתה וזרעך for אתה וזרעך in Gn. XXVII 12, and אמר for אמר in Ex. XXXIV 19 make better sense that the Massoretic text, never dreams of assigning to the S text a high value. He, on the contrary shows how poor a text it is. (Cf. Zeitschrift I 107 & 8 III, II3. Also I23-5 in his review of Popper's work) Michaelis, after a critical examination of all of the variants presented in his Bibliothek ' concludes that, though some make good sense, the Mass. text is by far the better (Cf. V Bk. XXII 203) Kuenen (Relig. of Isr. III 8) claims that the S. altered their text to bring it into harmony with their peculiar position, and to clear away real or imaginary difficulties. No thought of its being superior to the Mass. text. Keil (Introd. 305) puts it concisely when he says " Scarcely one genuine critical various reading can be found in it " (i.e. the S. Pent.) De Wette (Einleit 205-6) thoroughly agrees with the view of Ewald (Hist. IV 243) that the character of the S. text is entirely uncritical. Frankel (Einfluss 238) characterizes the variants as " barbarous forms, mistakes for which we would not forgive even a beginner " Further (240) " what confusion ! " Note now the views of Gesenius.

" The S. text was changed and interpolated by half-taught

scribes " (De Pent S. I4) Note also p.24. The variants Gesenius usually characterizes by such words as inapte inflicter, insensum. Of all the variants he accepts four as better than the Mass. text viz. Gn. IV 8 Sadsd לכה חסד after י'OX, Gn. XXII 13-14 for י'OX, Gn. XLIX 14, O' for O' for XIV 14 י' for י' (Frankel Einfl. 242 and Keil 305 reject even these) The closing sentence of : Gesenius' long examination of S. variants, expresses well the true state of affairs. " In many places where the Jewish text is manifestly in error, our S. codex is so far from exhibiting the ancient and genuine reading, unless it can be reached by conjecture, that it rather presents that faulty reading expressed after the manner of later Jews."

As far therefore as authorities are concerned, we can see that most all are agreed, that though our present Mass. text contains many corruptions and glosses, it yet represents more nearly the original text, by all means, than does the S. text; that the S. upon receiving their copy of the Pent. Made changes therein, first naturally with reference to Gerizim. Later, changes for the sake of explanation and interpretation, interpolations and grammatical changes, were made. Incidentally to be sure, mistakes of all kinds crept in, mistakes due to similarity of many of the letters of the old Hebrew script, to ignorance, and to carelessness. As a recension, a text, to which recourse may be had when Mass. passages are in obscurity, the S. Pent. utterly fails. Its worth is far below par, as a basis to the

135
S. for their service, worship and customs, it served its
purpose. As a text from which to construct the original
however, it is of not much use.

III The Relation between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint.

It will now be interesting to pay a little attention to the important fact of the resemblance between the S. Pent. and the LXX. In those passages in which, agreeing with each other, they differ from the Mass. text. Hassencamp claims that there are 1900 such resemblances. Gesenius assures us that there are more than 1000. The character of these similarities may be seen from the following few examples, gathered from the large number presented in Geiger's Ura-chrift, especially 436 f. and excursus II 451-480 Also Zeitschrift I 98-121, 174-185. Likewise Frankel's Einfluss.

Ex. XXIII 2 S. + LXX have בקרית המדבר אל עמק
 " XXIV 62 " " " " סוואחם בעבור
 " XXVI 18 " " " " בימי " עבדי
 " XXIX 40 " " " " ויהן כפי סמך איל עקוד
 " XXXIX 12, 13, 15, 18 " " " " ויהן כפי סמך איל עקוד
 " XXIX 16 both add לא before יעקב
 " XLIII 27 " " " " ברוך מאיש כהן לא להם
 " XLVI 13 " have יוב for ישוב
 " XLVII 21 " " " " בעניי לערים " העביר לעבדים
 " XLIX 22 " " " " בני צעירי עלי שור

Ex. XII 40 " add וצוחם after ישרא
 " I 22 " " " לעבדים
 " XVII 16 " have כסיה for יסיה
 " XXV 31 " " " " ותעית " תעשה
 " XXXII 32 " add ש after מסאחם

Lev. XV 13 " " " " מסאחם after כל ימי
 " XI 9-10 " have במים for בימים
 " " " " המבחים " המבחים

Numb. XIII 19 " " " " ויבא " ויבא
 " " 22 " " " " קרא " קרא
 " " 24 " " " " קרא " קרא

Deut. XXVII 26 " add כל before דברי
 " " " " + 2 times and omit it about 10 times

Various theories have been offered to explain the strong resemblance existing between the S. Pent. and the LXX. I) It has been suggested that the LXX was translated from the S. Pent. Some go so far as to claim that a S. translated the LXX. The fact alone that S. changes in Dt. XXVII 4. are not found in the LXX would disprove this, since these changes refer to the basic doctrines of the S.

2) It has furthermore been claimed that the S. had a Greek translation of their Pent. called to το ζαμαρετικον and that this was used as a basis for the LXX (Cf. Kohn De. Pent. Sam. 36. (Nutt 97), Frankel (Einfluss III) speaks of this work as actually having existed. Nothing however is known of this work before the 4th C.B.C. and it is difficult to conceive how the Jews could have accepted the LXX, had a S. version or translation been the basis of it.

3) Others hold that the S. Pent. was corrected from the LXX (Frankel Einfluss 238.) He also asserts that the S. Pent. shows that Onkelos in its present form was used by the transcriber thereof. Mishnic mannerisms in the S. Pent. Frankel likewise points out (Ibid. 239) If this be so, why should the S. Pent. resemble our Mass. text in many places in which it differs from the LXX, and why should the LXX resemble the Mass. text in numerous passages in which it differs from the S. Pent? For example.

Lev. VII 34, S and Mass. have עלתיהם	LXX has שלחיהם
" VIII 14 " " " " " " "	" " " " " " " "
Numb. IV 41 " " " " " " " "	" adds משה
" XX 14 " " " " " " " "	" " " before כה

Gn xxxiii 18 Mass. and LXX have עַל = עַל S. makes it an adjective.
 " lv 19 " " " " צִוִּית " has צִוִּיתִי
 " " 22 " " " " חַלִּיבוֹת (plur.) " " חַלִּיבָה (sing).
 Ex. xxxvi 6 " " " " וַיִּכְרֹם " " וַיִּכְרֹם
 Lev. II 2. " " " " מִקְטִירוֹ " " מִקְטִירוֹ

- 4) It has been further held that if the variants now in the S. Pent. were present in the MSS from which it was copied, and not originated by the S. proper, then the LXX used this same MSS as a basis for its translation. How shall we then account for the differences existing between the S. Pent. and the LXX?
- 5) The view of Gesenius (De Pent. Sam. I4) has been most generally accepted. He holds that both S. Pent. and the LXX were derived from MSS, Greatly resembling each other, but containing already many corrupted passages. The differences between the S. Pent. and LXX are due to later mistakes and intentional changes. This view is sufficiently comprehensive to account in a satisfactory manner for the likenesses between the two texts and at the sametime, offers a reason for the differences existing between the two. As far however as respects a working theory, it seems to me that both texts may be based on the same MSS, not as above. (4) containing the present variants of these two texts, but a close copy of the original. This will explain the similarities between the two. The differences arose later owing to mistakes, purposed corruptions etc. Many such changes are from a later time. If not, it were strange that more of the S. variants from the Mass. text are not

137

mentioned in the Talmud. Owing to the fact that Simon b.
so few of such variants. Frankel (Einfluss 1497) thinks
Elazar who criticises the S. text mentions that many of
the now existing S. variants were not introduced until
after the time of said Elazar.

Note:-

For a discussion of these views Cf. Gesenius (De
Pent. S. 11-15) Pick (Mc Cl. & Str.) Art. The S. Pent.
Also Nutt 91-100. A certain Isaas Voss suggests that the Mass.
text is a translation from the LXX.

Doctrines of the Samaritans.

It was Mason (Womans Share in Primitive Culture) who said " The life of a race or epoch is mirrored in its creeds and cults, and the creeds or cults of a race or people is best understood, by studying the daily life of that people. " It has been in this way, that the creed of the S. has in the main become known to us. The sources for this, are all late, being hymns, prayers, theological treatises etc. written mostly between the 11th and 14th centuries. From these we gain a considerable, yet in its totality, a fragmentary knowledge of S. customs and beliefs. We must rely for more accurate and complete details upon the reports given us by trust worthy travelers, who have visited the S. and observed the routine of their daily life. It is therefore from the every-day life of the S. from their doings, their services, their religious rites, that their beliefs and customs may be best learned and the S. themselves best understood. To be sure, in the course of centuries, new beliefs and customs were adopted by the S. and a presentation of their religious ideas and daily doings of today, may give us but a slight knowledge, possibly no idea of the S. life of a thousand years ago. Owing to the fact however that the S. are so strictly conservative, much that is of early origin, is retained and

141

and adhered to with a persistence as astonishing as it is interesting; and so R. Simon B. Gamliels' view^{the} such commands as the S. do obey, they obey with a greater strictness than do the Jews " is further emphasized (Cf. Kidd. 76 a. Chulin 4 a. Gittin 10 a. Berachoth 47 b. Pesachim 3 a.) Many of the beliefs and customs of the S. were adopted from the Sadducees. Much later was it that Pharisean views exerted any influence on the S. From the Karaites, also this people took much, while neither Kabbalistic nor Mohammedan influence is unnoticeable in their life of today.

Note:-

It is very likely that at the time of the rise of the Sadducees and their adoption of certain views, the relations between the S. and Jews were not of the usual hostile nature. Hence Sadduceean ideas could be transferred to the S. There is no necessity of tracing (as does Cowley "Remarks on S. Lit. & Relig. Jew Quart. Rev. July ' 96) the Sadduceean coloring of S. life to those Jews, (as Cowley claims of a conservative tendency) who came to the S. before the time of the Sadducees. The S. adopted their Sadduceean characteristics from the Sadducees. The S. were often extremely Anti-Pharisaic in their views and even went to the extreme of altering their Pent. to show their attitude. (Cf. Geiger Nachgel. Schr. IV. S. Pent. 66) Cf. Cowley (Above ment. Art.)

It is our intention here simply to point out the most important doctrinal beliefs of the S. They have five special articles of faith viz: I) God is one, without associate, incorporeal, without passions, the cause of all things, filling all things, omniscient, speaking without mouth, interrogating without sound.

Note:-

Jost (and others) draw attention to the strong resemblance between this view of God, and the view held by Mohammedans, and suggests the possibility of a Mohammedan source there-for. The S. love of God is exhibited in every page of their Bk. Josh. (Cf. Kirch C. S. I 7) We have also seen how, to emphasize the unity of God, they in their Pent. changed the plural verb with ~~quinto~~ to the singular. To raise the dignity of God, we have seen that they also changed anthropomorphistic, and all other expressions which seemed to place God on a level with man (Cf. The S. Pent. (2) Moses was the greatest prophet of God. Revelation was given through him. The fact that Joshua was the Servant of Moses, raises Joshua in the estimation of the S. (Cf. Kirch C. S. I 9).

(3) The Law is divine and perfect for all times, and is never to be changed (ibid).

Note:-

How the S. believed this, is evidenced from the changes they made in their pent. (4) Gerizim is the

143

holy Mt. chosen by God. and is His abode on earth.

Throughout our treatment of the S. as thus far made we have seen sufficient of the S. idea of Gerizim to render unnecessary any further comment here.

We will but add a few remarks to what we have already said. When the S. ascend and descend Gerizim, they remove their shoes, as they consider the ground holy. (Cf. Frankl. Nach. Jer. 424, Robinson E. R. III 100) Peterman says that shoes worn when S. are going to Gerizim are made of leather from animals killed by the S. themselves (Herzog R. E. III 383) To be sure the Pent. contains no direct reference to Jerusalem, as the holy place selected by God. still the hints to this idea are numerous, and strong.

Ewald (Hist. V) refutes the S. claim that the six tribes that stood on Gerizim were the nobler because of being stationed on said Mt. by showing that their superior nobility lay in their having been the first division. The first reference to any former sanctity of Gerizim, he claims is in Judges IX 7, Jotham's address to the Schechemites. That Gerizim and not Moriah was the place of Abraham's sacrifice, we have by Colenso, Stanley and others (Cf. The S. Pent.). Speaking of the sacrifice already seen is contended, of Isaac a S. said to Frankl. " It were wrong for me to disturb you in your belief, But here (i.e. on Gerizim) is where it occurred. (Nach. Jer. 425) Some even go so far as to doubt whether ירושלים in Gn. XXXIII 18 is original

and argue that it is most likely a later insertion made by the Jews. to do away with the idea that Schechem was the first resting place of Jacob.

5) There will be a day of retribution on which the righteous will rise, and be rewarded and the wicked be punished. (Kirch. 17)

Note In Dt. XXXII 5 the S. Pent. Changes יום נקם ויום נקם ל' יום נקם

Closely connected with the belief in retribution is the belief of the S. in resurrection. This again is a late belief. As we have already noticed, they are accused in the Talmud. (Sanhed XII) of not having such a belief. In Mass. Cuth. (End) likewise the confession of such a belief is made a necessary condition for their conversion to Judaism. Nutt (32n. 2) attributes the early disbelief of the S. in resurrection to the teachings of Sadok, and Boethus, who, being pupils of Antigonus of Socho, interpreted his saying " Serve God not for the sake of reward " to mean " No reward is to be expected from God ". This was followed by a disbelief in resurrection and future judgment, and the disbelief was then adopted by the S. from the Sadducees. Later however we find the doctrine of resurrection accepted by the S. and we are told that on that day the wicked even though they turn to God, will yet be burned with fire, but the true believers shall go to Eden. By Marqah the S. author 362 C. E. this belief is accepted as a firm doctrine (Cf. the above mentioned art. by Cowley

145
in Jew. Quart. Rev.) In later times the S. adopted all the views on resurrection which the philosophers presented.

(Cf. Kirch. C. S. 18)

A vast amount of discussion has been raised concerning the S. Messianic belief, some urging that it was adopted from Islam. (Jost. Sekten. 53) others claiming that it originated with the S. (Nutt. 40) In John (IV 25) The S. woman answers Jesus with the words " I know that Messiah cometh (which is called Christ) when he is come, he will declare unto us all things ". However, in all the statements of the S. concerning the Messianic belief, such confusion and uncertainty is exhibited that it is difficult to understand exactly what their views on this subject are. The messiah is called משיח or מלך who will bring all people under his command. He is spoken of (claim the S.) in Gn. XV7, XLIX 10, Numb. XXIV 17, Dt. XVIII 15, (Jahn B. A. claims that the S. based their hope for the coming of the Messiah on Gn. XII 13, XVIII 18, XXII 18, XXVI 4, XXVIII 14) He will influence all people to believe in the Law, and in Gerizim, and in the glory of the religion of Moses. The initial letter of the Messiah's name will be M. When he dies, he will be buried near Joseph the fruitful bough ' (Gn. XLIX 22) At other times the S. confess the idea of the Messiah to be a mysterious one to them. Yet they have prodigies, by which they will recognize him. To exalt Joseph at the expense of Judah, they claim that the Messiah will be a son of Joseph. (This is due to the

146

fact previously mentioned, that the S. claim descent from Joseph, Ephraim, Manasseh, They however acknowledge that the house of Aaron has long since died out (1631), and that the priest of today is only a Levite. (Cf. Nutt 75 n. 4 and Frankl. Nach Jerus. 417) As to when this Messiah will come, the S. themselves are in doubt. A certain Ab Zehuta 1589 (quoted by Pick. Mc Cl. & Str. Art' The Mod. S.) says " No one knows his coming, but Jehovah " while others asserted that he would come 6000 years after creation, would live 110 years, and be buried near Gerizim, the last judgment, day coming 7000 years, after creation. When Frankl. visited Nablus a S. said to him " On Gerizim El. Muhdy (Arabic for 1000) the leader, will appear and deliver us. from this slavery. The measure of the time of the world is about full, and our liberation is not far distant. " (Nach Jer. 425)

Note:-

The S. believe in Creatio Ex. nihilo (Hamburger)
The world they say is twofold in its nature, spiritual and Material. The spiritual part is the abode of the angels. Man was formed from the dust of Gerizim. (Kirch I 7 f. Peterman in Herzog XIII 373 f.) Now the S. calculate time from the Creation of the world. Hence to them this year (1897) is 6334. (Cf. Jost. Sekten I 52 n. 2.) Accordingly, since the Messiah was to appear in the year 6000, he must have been here already. The idea of the Messiah coming

6000 years after creation seems to have been borrowed
from the Talmud. Aboda Sara 9. a.

עשרת אלפים שנה הו' עולם שני אלפים תורה שני אלפים ימות המשיח

When the S. belief in angels arose, is not known. Early S. are said to have denied belief in personal angels at least. That the S. of today do have an angelology, is known. They however limit themselves to the Pent. for their description of ^{the} being and functions of the angels. In this they are opposed to the Pharisees and Chasidim (Cf. Hamburger) These angels the S. say are powers of God. Peterman (in Herzog Art. The S.) was given the names of four such powers viz. Fanuel (Gn XXXII 31) Anusa (Ex. XIV 25) Cabala (Numb. IV 20) and Nisi (Ex. XVII 15) He claims also to have been told that Aazazel (Lev. XVI) Belial (Dt. XV 9.) and Jasara (Ex. XXIII 28) were devils, while the Nephilin (Gn. VI 4) were evil angels, who had been trust out of heaven. Kirch (C. S. I 7 n. 2) mentions the references in the Bk. Josh. to angels of punishment and of aid. As we have already noticed, the S. often place ^{לפני} before, to do away with anthropomorphisms. Marqah (Above ment.) accepts the belief in angels as an article of faith. Reland's assertion that the S. did not accept the belief in angels has been disproved (Cf. Cowley's Art. Above ment. also Winer B. R. W. B. Art the S.) Pick. (Art. S. Mc Cl. & Strong Enc.) says that the S. seem to have had the doctrine of original sin, because

148

in one of their prayers, they say " For the sake of Adam and because of the end of all flesh, forgive and pardon the whole congregation. " The passage by no means proves the inference. The doctrine is never mentioned among the writings of the S. nor do any of the travelers who have visited Nablus and have been present during the services of the S. and have conversed and corresponded with them, make any mention thereof. That the Samaritans however had some sort of a philosophic system, seems evident from the teachings of Simon Magus, and his School, (Menander, Clodius) of which a good characterization is given in Nutt. 55-64. In it however the influence of Greek Mythology is conspicuous. The S. had no completely developed philosophic system. Their doctrinal beliefs are often confused and inexact.

The S. believe that seven covenants were made with God whereby their creed was recognized viz: Gn. IX IO covenant with Noah: XVII 4. covenant with Abraham; Ex. XXXI 16 covenant of the Sabbath; XXXIV 27-28 Covenant of revelation or giving of the Law: Numb. XVIII 19, Salt covenant: XXV 13 priestly covenant: and Dt. XXIX I Covenant with Moses. (Cf. Jost. Sekten I 59-60 N. 1.)

The Customs of the Samaritans.

It is our intention here, not to give a detailed description of S. daily life, but rather briefly^{to} direct attention to the chief S. Customs which bear a strong resemblance to Jewish customs, either of today or of earlier years. We have already noticed in the S. Pent. some of the changes made to make the Pent. conform to S. customs. Let us now notice the S. food laws. Here the influence of the Sadducees becomes immediately evident, as likewise the resemblance to the Karaites. The fruit of the tree in the fourth year belongs to the priest. (Likewise think Sadducees and Karaites) (Cf. Geiger. Urschr. 181-2.) The S. as also Sadducees and Karaites, conclude from Lev. III 9. that the animal belongs to the priest alone. (Cf. Geiger Nachg. Schr. S. Pent. 66-7. and Geiger Urschr. 467.) No dying animal may be killed and eaten, while the unborn young found in a slain animal, having an existence of its own, must have its proper share. In this the Karaites agree with the S. (Nutt. 39) Meat or food bought from Jews or others may not be eaten. (Cf. Jost Gesch d. Isr. Volk, II 195.) Swine, beasts that do not chew the cud or divide the hoof, unclean poultry, all are forbidden to be eaten. Flesh and milk are not eaten at same time. (To Ex. XXIII 19 S. Pent. adds כִּי עֵשָׂה זֶמֶת כִּזְבִּים עֹכֵל וְעִרְבָה הוּא לֹאֵלֶּה יֵעָרֵב

(Likewise the LXX) Cf. Geiger Nachg. Schr. IV 66) The skin 150
of an unclean animal, or of an animal not killed in ac-
cordance with the rules of Shechita, may not be used (
(Nutt 39.) This agrees with the statement made by Peter-
man. (Herzog R. E. III 383) that the S. when they go to
Gerizim, wear shoes, leather made from the skins of animals
which they themselves have slaughtered. Corn for Mazzoth
is bought while in the ear, and prepared by women. It is
not threshed by oxen. The lambs for Pesach must have been
born in the preceding Tishri, and must be free from blemish.
On Erev. Pesach, the lamb is killed and (after the en-
trails, forelegs, bones and fragments have been burned)
eaten. Mazzoth, bitter herbs, rice, fish and eggs form the
chief food of the S. on Pesach (We shall have more to
say of Pesach further on.) Cf. Art. Modern S. by Pick.
In Mc Cl. & Str. Also Jost Gesch d. Isr. Vol. II 194-7)
Also Nutt 72-77)

The Sabbath is strictly observed by the S. the day be-
ginning²⁵ among the Jews. at sunset on the preceding day.
With the exception of going to services, no one leaves the
house, in strict compliance with Ex. XVI 29 (Nutt 39)
Every form of labor is forbidden and praying alone is con-
tinued throughout the day. (Robinson B. R. III 106)
Even conjugal acts are forbidden on Sabbath (In this they
agree with the Karaites (Kirch C. S. 27.) Likewise are
circumcision, fighting against an enemy (though the Jewish
Rabbis permitted this) and slaying the Passover lamb, (if

Pesach fell on Sabbath) forbidden on this day. (Hamburger) 151
Jost (Gesch d. Isr. Vol. II 196) quotes a traveler who says
that the lamb is slaughtered on Sabbath. From the strict
manner in which the S. observe this day, this does not
seem very likely. The altar on which the sacrifices were
offered was made of whole stones, on which no iron instru-
ment was used. (Frankl Nach. Jer. 425.) Ex. XXXV 3 is
interpreted by the S. " ye shall neither make nor let burn
a fire " Hence they read אור לא ידליק As a consequence the S.
allow no light in their homes throughout Friday night or
Saturday. (Kirch C. S. 27) Three services are held on
the Sabbath. One on the eve preceding, one in the morning,
and one in the afternoon just before sunset (Hamburger)
In the morning the priest reads the Pent. portion through-
out without interruption, then carries the scroll among the
congregants, that they may all kiss it. (Jost Gesch d. Isr
Vol. II 196) On the two Sabbaths preceding Pesach, special
prayers are used. (Pick. Mc Cl. & Str. Art. The Mod. S.)

On the first of every month special services are held,
when special prayers are used. Numb. X 10 and XXVIII 11-14
are read (Cf. Pick's Art. above ment.)

The S. observe seven festivals. The first is Pesach,
Now called Karaban Aphsah, 15th of Nissan. The lamb and
unleavened bread are eaten on the preceding evening. As
long as the S. were allowed to go to their holy Mt. this
was done on Gerizim. During the early part of this century
this was however forbidden them. (Jost. Gesch D. Isr. Vol.

153
 II 196) Even during this century the S. were accustomed to sacrifice the $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\delta\pi\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma$ on the three festivals, and the $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\delta\pi\alpha\gamma$ Pesach (Kirch C. S. 19-20) one being offered for every few families. Now however the Pesach sacrifice alone is offered, one lamb sufficing as an offering for the entire community. (Jost Sekten I 582) Some however claim that six lambs were offered for the community (Cf. The S. Ancient and Modern, Princeton Rev. April 1866 195-221) The S. have no idea however of expiation or remission of sins by sacrifice. George Grove (Nabloos and the S.) in describing their services says " No one seemed to be touched or interested " In general, prayers have taken the place of the sacrifices. Stanley (Hist. of Jewish Church I 513 f) gives an account of the Passover celebration of the S. A second Pesach in Ijar is allowed those who have not celebrated in Nissan. The law of unleavened bread is strictly observed, though only for six days. As we have already pointed out the S. Pent. changes $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\delta\pi\alpha\gamma$ of Ex. XII 15, $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\delta\pi\alpha\gamma$ 6-7, XIII 15 to $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\delta\pi\alpha\gamma$ in accordance with Dt. XVI 8, (Cf. Frankel Einfluss 25 2) The seventh day is observed as a special feast, this forming their second festival. Pick (Mc Cl. & Str. Mod. S.) claims that the first six days are observed to commemorate the safety granted the Jews, when the plague of the death of the first born was brought upon the Egyptians, while the seventh day is observed as the regular Pesach, to commemorate the deliverance of Israel from Egypt.

The third festival of the S. is that of weeks (Shebuoth) ¹⁵³
now called by them Chamsin. This festival is also observed
as the anniversary of the giving of the Law on Sinai. The
forty nine days are counted from the Sunday in Passover
week. (So also the Karaites but not the Pharisees.)
Cf. Geiger Urschrift I37) In the temple Ex. XX is read,
while the occasion is enlivened by all sorts of songs and
festivities (Jost, Sekten 58) after which Gerizim and
the holy places are visited. The whole law read (Nutt.
74)

On the first of Tishri the ~~Yom Kippur~~ (Never called Rosh
Hashona though Pick says it is now called Arisheni) is
celebrated. Peculiar ,special prayers are used on this acca-
sion. No mention is made of a day of judgement. No work
is allowed to be done. Cooking is forbidden on all festi-
vals. (Nutt. 39) Cf. Jost Sekten I 58.) Nutt (74)
calls this the feast of Trumpets, while Hamburger also
asserts that the Shofar is used. Others deny this.

Very interesting is the S. method of observing Yom
Kipur now called Kibburim. These services are well des-
cribed by George Grove. (Nabboos & The S.) in vacation
Tourists I86I. Before the day enters, all must bathe in
running water. All must fast, even sucklings, from one
half hour before sun-set on the 9th, to a half hour after
sun-set on the 10th. Not even medicines may be taken.
Services are continued throughout the night and day, ex-
cept for a short time in the morning, when the tombs of the

134

prophets Joseph. Eliezer, Ithamar, Phineas, Joshua, Caleb, Eldad and Medad (the location of which the S. claim to know) are visited. Services are then continued. The congregation often takes part in the chanting of the services, the priest and what we would call chazan, alternating in the conducton there-of. The learned men are separated from the rest of the congregation. The services consist of reading the entire Pent. (during which the priest and his assistants wear the Talith.) such reading being interrupted now and then by prayers. No light is allowed, even within the house of prayer, even during the night, and the services are continued in utter darkness. After finishing the reading of the Pent. the Sacred Scroll is kissed by all, after which responsive reading is introduced.

On the 15th of Tishri occurs the feast of Succoth, now called Sekuth. Huts are built on the slopes of Gerizim. Journeys to the top of the Mt. are made daily. In these huts the S. live for seven days. Special prayers are used, (Cf. Jost. Sakten I 59, Nutt. 75.) Pick. (Mod. S. Mc Cl. & Str.) says that when the S. were forbidden to visit Gerizim, they built their booths in their courtyards. In their pilgrimages to the top of Gerizim, they carry what appears to be an ethrog (although this is doubtful) and a bundle of four different kinds of twigs. (Cf. Jost. Sakten I 59.) The 22nd of Tishri marks the feast of conclusion.

Besides having special prayers for each of these festivals, special prayers are likewise used on the first and last days of the year. All the prayers are in Hebrew, it being considered a sin to translate them. The S. now however speak Arabic which they call El. Ebry. The language of the Jews they call El. Kashury. (Robinson B. R. III 104) The years of Jubilee and Release are counted, as among the Jews, always beginning in the seventh month, though the observance thereof has long since ceased. (Jost. Sekten I 59 . and Kirch 20) A sort of Purim is held in Shebat to commemorate the mission of Moses, viz: to deliver the children of Israel from Egypt.

In addition to the festivals above mentioned, the S. have two other special days of assembly called Zumoth, which occur sixty days before the feast of Passover, and Tabernacles. These are not however considered as regular holidays. On these occasions the census of the congregation is taken. Every male above twenty years of age, giving unto the priest one-half shekel, (Ex. XXX 12-14) receives a calendar for the next six months. These calendars are prepared by the priests, from a copy which they claim to have been made originally by Adam and written down by Phinehas. (Cf. Nutt 75.) Also Pick. (Mc Cl. & Str.)

Like the Jews the S. have two New Years. For the ordinary calculation of the year, Nissan is the first month.

152

On the first day of this month, services ^aare held, morning and evening. Otherwise the day is not observed. For the Shmita and Jubilee years, Tishri is the first month. The noon of the 30th of every month is taken as the turning point thereof. If the conjunction of the planets occurred during the first six hours (before noon) the day is counted as the Rosh Chodesh of a new month, the preceding month having thus 29 days. If later, the day belongs to the passing month, which thus has 30 days, the Rosh Chodesh not coming till the following day. The S. likewise have leap years, their calendar being divided into regular years (שנה פשוטה) and leap years (שנה מעוברת) (Cf. Kirch C. S. 20)

Note:--

The S. it is known, often attempted to confuse the Jews by lighting beacon fires (fore-telling the time of the new moon) before it really appeared, on which account the Rabbis determined to send out couriers instead of lighting beacon lights. (Cf. Rosh Hashona Mishna II I and Gemara 22 b. also Rashi ibid.)

So much for the festivals of the S. A word now concerning their domestic life; and first their marriage customs. Girls marry as early as 10 - 12 years of age and boys 14-15. (Pick. Mc Cl. & Str. Art. Mod. S. explains the extreme youth at which marriage is allowed, by the desire on the part of the S. for progeny, owing to their small numbers) Two witness to the ceremony are necessary. The

... down to the father of the bride. In

the evening enjoyment is had in the form of singing and dancing by Mussulmen engaged for the occasion. Thursday is considered a propitious day for marriage. Intermarriage with Jews is strictly prohibited (Robinson B. R. III 107) Pick however says that marriage with Jew or Christian is allowed providing they become S. Marriage with the daughter of a brother or sister is prohibited (Kirch C. S. 28) Polygamy is never allowed, and bigamy only under extenuating circumstances, as when the first wife of a man is barren. (Nutt 77) Frankel Einfluss 252) According to R. Jehuda Hadassi (Kirch 20) the priests may not marry. The fact that there is special legislation concerning the consecration to the priesthood of the offspring of the priest, shows this to be false. (Nutt 75-6.) Hamburger is no doubt correct, in affirming that the priests may marry only within the priestly order. (R. E. Die S. Also Frankl. Einfluss 253) Though permitted in cases of fornication, divorces are otherwise uncommon. The law of Chalitza is also observed. (Cf. Mass. Cuth. Ch. I) Be it noted however that the S. (as do the Karaites) interpret נשואין in Dt. XXV 25 as an adjective modifying נשואין and say the law applies only to a betrothed wife i.e. one who has not yet entered the home of her husband. (Cf. Jebamoth I 6 where R. Simon b. Elazar Criticises this.)

Note:-

Cf. for Jewish views on marriage and divorce Mielziner " Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce " especially

156
pp. 28-31, 71, 30, 86, (120-1), 115-137 where interesting differences from and resemblances to S. customs will be found.

When a child is born, if it is a male, circumcision is performed on the eighth day. In Gn. XVII 13, the S. Pent. inserts ~~yywn~~ Opinions differ as to whether a delay may be had in case of necessity. Hamburger says yes, Jost. (Sekten I 59) no. Nutt 78 says no delay is allowed even if 8th day is Sabbath. The priest is the Moel. If he is not present, anyone competent to perform the operation, may take his place, and circumcise the child. If the child be female the naming is done on the third day, though the joy on such an occasion is not as great as in the preceding case. Formerly the child was redeemed. This is no longer done. Pick attributes this to the present extreme poverty of the S. In case the child born is a male, the mother is unclean 41 days, if female 80 days. As soon as the child is able to learn, the father teaches him the 613 commands. (The officiating minister of the congregation is in reality the teacher.) Rabbinical comments and explanations the S. refuse to accept, (though unconsciously they did receive much of such interpretations.) Jost Gesch d. Isr. V. II 194-7. ^{the rise of the} says that until Talmud, Rabbinical views were still accepted by the S. The high priest of the S. Salemeah Cahen (the same who corresponded with De Sacy) said to Frankl, " We don't read the Talmud because we don't believe in its contents. Had God desired to give us

159

more commands, he would not have left their interpretations to the Rabbis. " He likewise showed Frankl how the children could read and write Hebrew (though both were well nigh unintelligible) (Nach. Jer. 420.) Jost Sekten I 81,-2. quotes Dr. Barges who visited the S. in 1853, and heard them read Hebrew. He says that they have a different pronunciation from the Jews, the sounds not being properly differentiated. This is also said of the Galliles (Matthew XXVI 73. Erubin 53) That the Children are well brought up, lends itself to no doubt, if we take the statement of Robinson (B. R. III 98) as basis. He relates that when he wished to visit Gerizim a S. was to accompany him. At the last moment his mother forbade him to go. He quietly acquiesced to her will, lest as he said, he might disobey a command of the decalogue.

Note:--

Referring to the statement above made, that women are unclean for a length of time after a child birth, we may state here that there are six other things which the S. claim make one unclean. 1) The conjugal act 2.) Nocturnal pollution 3.) Touching a dead body. 4) Touching unclean birds and animals 5) a female from hemorrhage 6). Menstrual discharge of female in which case the uncleanness continues for seven days. (Pick) Speaking furthermore of Pick's explanation for the disappearance among the S. of the practice of redeeming the child, because of

160

poverty, it may not be out of place to remark that every traveler to Nablus speaks of the poverty of the S. In 1840 they had but one man in comfortable circumstances. (Robinson B. R. III 106.) In 1853 they wrote a letter to Queen Victoria, asking for aid. accompanying this letter by another to the English people. (Jost Sekten I 81)

Purification of women after child-birth, is practiced in exact accordance with Biblical commands (Lev. XII) and with but little difference from Rabbinical views ((Midda 33.) Cf. Jost Sekten I 59. Gesch II 196) They differ from the Jews in requiring but aspring bath for purification. nor do they demand exactly 40 Saah of water, as the minimum. (Aboda Sara 22. Hamburger) For purification purposes as we thus see, nothing but running water is used. Formerly in accordance with Numb. XIX 17-19, the ashes of a burnt heifer was also used.

When death threatens any member of the congregation, the rest begin (to begin) to read the Pent. and read to Numb. XXX I. even though the death occurs while they are reading. After death the funeral preparations, according to Pick and Nutt (77) are made by the relatives of the deceased according to Frankl. (Nach Jer. 428) by Mohammedans, engaged for the work. If possible, the burial takes place the same day before sunset. The coffin is of plain wood, the shroud of cotton. Meanwhile the rest of the Pent. is read by the rest of the congregation. Mourning is

/6/

discouraged as much as possible. There is no rending of clothes Lev. XXI 10 and no periodic mourning. After the body has been carried to the grave, the S. visit the grave and weep, visiting it again the next Sabbath. During the week the female relatives of the deceased watch the grave. The house in which the death occurred is declared unclean for seven days (Numb. XIX 14) Every S. is taught the expression " The Eternal is our God, the Eternal is one. " which he repeats as death approaches. (Frankl. 428 f. Nutt. 77, Pick.)

The S. women must let their hair grow and are not allowed to wear earrings, since of them the golden calf was made. The men may not cut their beards (Lev. XIX 27 XXI 5) Nutt. 73 also Pick.) The priest to be sure is likewise not allowed this. The priest has all the priestly functions of the Pent. which time and conditions allow. Sacrifices for example, as we have already mentioned, have been replaced by prayers, of which they have two or three each day. (Hamburger) Any of the priestly family above twenty-five yrs. of age, is qualified for the position of priest, provided his hair had never been cut. When reading the Pent. he as likewise his assistants wears a tallith. (Nutt 73) In addition to the priest, there is a chazan who is in reality the officiating minister of the congregation. To him is entrusted the education of the children, although the school seems to be rather a place for children to congregate than for education purposes. Schools or education

162
places for adults, the S. have not. (Jost. Gesch d. Isr. Vol. II 195.) The priest and chazan constitute the Beth Din of the community. To them are submitted all questions demanding an authoritative answer. The most important questions are sometimes submitted to the entire congregation (Pick.)

To the Levites $\frac{1}{10}$ of all tree and field fruits is given. Of this the Levites give $\frac{1}{10}$ to the high priest. Another $\frac{1}{10}$ of all fruits is given to both priests and Levites. With this and with donations, the priests and Levites manage to live. The Levites are divided into four classes or divisions. The scribes constitute one division, a second division is concerned with the protection of the house of worship, a third inspects the animals for sacrifice, a fourth (before prayers took the place of sacrifices) offered the customary sacrifices (Cf. Hamburger) The scribes are always busy making copies of the Pent. of which when Robinson visited them (1840-1850) they had about 100 copies (B. R. III 105)