

The Bibliotheca Sacra: Volume 65 – 1908 Page 694-710 Article VI

(p. 694) **CIRCUMCISION AMONG THE SAMARITANS.**

**BY JACOB, SON OF AARON,
HIGH PRIEST OF THE SAMARITANS AT SHECHEM.¹**

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

THE treatise which follows is the fourth chapter in a work on the Samaritan religion by Jacob, the present high priest. According to his account, it was written several years ago for an English scholar, who died before the book was completed.

The three previous chapters have been published, from time to time, in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA*, and the remainder of the work is undergoing translation at the hands of Professor Ben Kori.

The present chapter treats of the interesting and delicate subject of "Circumcision," and is in the nature, first, of an exposition of the Samaritan practice, and, secondly, of a polemic against the Jew. In this chapter, more than in either of those previously presented, the Samaritans appear as sticklers for the very letter of the Law. No Pharisee could possibly contend more earnestly for every jot and tittle than do these Samaritan priests. When the priest assures us that a child not circumcised the eighth day ought to be killed, we are hardly to assume that this theory is carried into actual practice; yet such a statement carries with it his profound conviction that it were far better that such a man should never have been born. No exigency, whatever, justifies the neglect of this rite, or its postponement by even a day.

The origin of circumcision is a matter of dispute. Several ancient nations are known to have practised it. The conjecture that it was once a mark of servitude finds some support in the High Priest's treatise, where he says, "He becomes a slave to this high God (may he be praised), owned by him whose mark is that of the master's slave, forever indelible."

The proof of the slaughter of an enemy described in 1 Samuel xviii. 25-27, and 2 Samuel iii. 14, appears not to have been uncommon in (p.695) old-time warfare; and it is conjectured that mutilation was not always confined to the dead, and that the excision which at the outset insured complete eunuchry was modified in the case of slaves as time went on.

¹ Translated from the Arabic by Professor Abdullah Ben Kori, Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oregon; Edited by William E. Barton, D.D., Oak Park, Illinois.

In Egypt, and other countries of the Old World, rites similar to those of the Jews were practised by way of initiation into the congregation. It is well known that the practice finds increasing favor among medical men of the present day.

The High Priest's curious little polemic has, therefore, a certain interest and value.

The High Priest has his own answer to the suggestion that Moses himself was negligent concerning the practice of this ordinance in his own household. He contends that here, as in other places, the Jewish scriptures have been falsified. His curious argument speaks for itself, and is given here for whatever it may be judged to be worth. It is safe to affirm that these chapters give a more intimate view of the Samaritan religion than anything hitherto published in the English language, and they have their value, at least as studies in ethnology and comparative religion.

The translator and the editor join in the hope that the publication of these first-hand studies may contribute to a better understanding of this small and fast disappearing sect.—WILLIAM E. BARTON.

A TREATISE ON CIRCUMCISION.

THIS treatise is concerning circumcision, its conditions and the regulations among the Samaritan people, with a mention of the difference existing between them and the Jewish people in regard to this ordinance, according as it is current among them in these days and as handed down from ancient times.

CIRCUMCISION ON THE EIGHTH DAY.

If the boy is born after the total submersion of the disk of the sun, seven days must pass; and on the eighth he is circumcised. It is likewise done if he is born at night or on the following day. Should he be born before the submersion of the disk of the sun, even' half an hour earlier, that day must be counted as one, and the boy is circumcised on the eighth. The Samaritans believe that on the eighth day the babe must be circumcised under all circumstances, and the rite may be (p. 696) performed during any of its hours. It is better, however, that the same should take place just at sunrise, or shortly thereafter, that honor may be rendered to the ordinance.

AN UNCIRCUMCISED CHILD TO BE SLAIN.

The Samaritans believe that if the entire eighth day should pass without circumcision, the killing of the babe would become obligatory. The uncircumcised child shall not be called a Hebrew; and purification shall never be lawful unto him. Therefore nothing hinders the Samaritans from circumcising the male child; no excuse is valid on that day, whether it be sickness or accident, or the absence of his father; nor must the rite be postponed even should the day fall on the Sabbath or a festival day. None of these is to be taken into account.

DIFFERENCES IN THE HABITS OF THE JEWS.

In this matter there is a wide difference between the Samaritans and the Jews. The latter make it lawful unto them, because of well-known reasons, to postpone circumcision for a period of thirty days. Our Torah, however, in regard to the command of this ordinance, given to our lord Abraham (upon whom be peace), reads as follows: "And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin on the eighth day, that soul shall be cut off from his people.-' Thus it is believed by the Samaritans that if circumcision is postponed later than the eighth day, the boy is not to be looked upon as an Israelite in this world, nor shall he be gathered with the people of God in the day of judgment. He is neither pure nor can he ever be subject to purity. The command which is found in the Jewish Torah differs from that in ours; it reads as follows: " But the male who is uncircumcised in the foreskin of his flesh, that soul shall be cut off from his people" (Gen. xvii. 14). They have omitted from this verse (p. 697) *biom hosheminy*, that is "on the eighth day "; and this accounts for the license they have taken for postponing circumcision. They, however, are at variance with the command of God (may he be exalted) in several respects, which will be shown later in this chapter.

HOW THE ACT IS PERFORMED.

On the seventh day of the birth of the babe, he is washed and cleansed, and on the eighth day his father or guardian invites the priest and his family, his friends and the tribe living in his town, and also some man who is expert in the art of circumcision. It is preferable that the latter be one of his own people, if there is such a one. He may be chosen from another people in case no Samaritan is expert in the performance of the rite, so that less injury may be done to the babe and serious harm may be avoided. This function must be taught to a Samaritan by the learned men of the people. But circumcision with us means only the cutting off of the foreskin. The Jews make an addition to what God has commanded; for their *hacham*, "doctors," make necessary the removal of a larger portion of the skin than the prepuce, sometimes denuding the phallus, which they call *perih*, which does not correspond with the circumcision known in the Hebrew language as *nemilek*. We do not practise this as the Jews do, for we think theirs is an addition to the divine command, and has not been revealed as such.

The high priest and the circumciser, and all those who have been invited to be present, after they have been gathered together, stand up; and the priest begins the prayer designed for such a ceremony and known as "the prayer of circumcision." It is opened in the name of the high God (may he be exalted) and with the mention of his oneness and the confession of his (p. 698) Godship. Then the Surahs of Creation are read, in which is mentioned the creation of the world from the beginning until the creation of our father Adam! (upon whom be peace). The reading is done in Hebrew, the ancient language which the Samaritans still preserve. The guests also read some verses of the histories of our holy forefathers, also the command that was delivered to our forefather Abraham, the friend of God (may he be exalted), in regard to the ordinance of circumcision, and his fulfilment of this ordinance and his obedience to its directions.

They read also the command as given for the second time to our lord Moses (upon whom be peace) in regard to this ceremony, together with verses containing a mention of the covenants and blessings of God (may he be exalted), as revealed in the Torah. Then

the cutting off of the foreskin takes place while a hymn is read, containing useful ideas and written in the best Hebrew style. It is of ancient date, being the composition of the High Priest Merkah. This high priest and most learned writer lived fully two hundred years before Christ.

THE HYMN OF CIRCUMCISION.

The hymn opens with the glorification of the great Creator (may he be exalted), who made the image of man perfect and gave him directions for his life. It contains thanksgiving to God (may he be exalted), who has helped his people to keep this ordinance until the present age and throughout the generations of Israel. It contains also congratulations to the father upon the circumcision of his son, and the assurance of obtaining reward for the fulfilment of this ordinance; also a prayer to God (may he be praised) for the safe keeping and blessing of the boy. A mention is also made of our lord Abraham (upon whom be peace) in whose days this permanent statute was established. (p. 699)

It explains the fact that he who is circumcised on the eighth day is marked with the covenant of his Master; he becomes a slave to this high God (may he be praised), owned by him whose mark is, like that of the master's slave, forever indelible.

THE MENTION OF GERMON.

At the end of this hymn, a mention is made of a Roman chief by the name Germon. The mention of this man reads as follows: "Let Germon the Roman chief be mentioned for good." The reason is that in those days when the Romans were conquerors, there was a king by the name Tehos. He oppressed the Samaritans and set over them prefects who would forbid them to pray and read the Torah and to perform their ordinances such as circumcision, and the other acts of their faith. In those days there lived a high priest by the name Akbon. And the prefect that the Roman king had set over him was the aforesaid Germon. The latter watched closely, day and night, the door of the house of the High Priest, never departing from his place and possessing much prudence and courage, so that the High Priest Akbon and his family were exceedingly afraid of him. It happened that in those days, God (may he be praised) blessed the High Priest Akbon with a son, and the parent had much anxiety and concern wondering how and what he should do in order to circumcise the boy according to the requirements of the ordinance in all its regulations and directions. He gathered his family and the chiefs of his people, and took the advice as to the best way and means whereby the circumcision of the babe and the fulfilments of the ordinance might take place, and it was agreed that the High Priest should take the boy to the wilderness, on the eighth day, and there secretly circumcise him. On the eighth day the High Priest took a large straw-(p. 700) basket, wrapped the babe with wool, and put him within the basket and covered him also with some wool, and said to one of the women of the house, a maid servant: "Take this basket and go out with it to a place near by the town called Ras Alain [a place called by the same name unto this day], and I will meet you there." As she was going out with the basket Germon saw her, but did not speak ill to her, although he knew well that the boy was within the basket, but said to her: "Go thy way and do thy work in joy." Not meeting with resistance, she proceeded to the High

Priest and informed him of what the guard had told her. The High Priest was therefore terrified and said unto the woman: "Let him do what it pleases him, but my trust is in God alone; may his will be done." Then he went into a cave that was thereabouts and circumcised the boy himself and put him again into the same basket, covering him with wool, and handed him to the woman, after having pacified him of the pain of circumcision.

She returned with him home, and after a while the High Priest Akbon went his way home, but the guard stood up and met him and kissed his hand and said in the Hebrew language, "Rabbi, Rabbi, Allyz!" which means: "My lord, My lord, with joy." For Germon was an intelligent man and knew the Hebrew language because of his familiarity with this people of Israel, who spoke only Hebrew in those days.

When the High Priest heard these words from the guard, with much fear he went into his place, filled his hand with gold coins, and returned to Germon, saying, "Accept this little from me, for the much I would like, if I were able, to offer to you." Germon answered and said, "God forbid that I should sell my good deeds for worldly gain!" The fear of the High Priest increased greatly, because Germon refused to accept the gold. The latter, however, told him, "Quiet yourself (p. 701) and fear not, for what I have done is for God (may he be exalted); but to please you I will take only three coins, as if I had taken them all. Rejoice, therefore, in your son, and may the Lord preserve him for you. I only wish that you institute a memorial among your people for reminding them of what I have done, that it may be kept among them to the end of time; therefore promise me that it shall be done."

The High Priest replied to him in accordance with his demands, and made a covenant with him. That very hour the fear of the Lord (who is exalted) became great in the heart of the High Priest, and he praised and glorified God (may he be praised) with exceeding gratitude for his abounding favors. He rejoiced immensely in his son, and in company with the Samaritans of that place, he uttered praises and thanks and said to those present: "Let us institute a perpetual memorial of what has taken place; and let us mention fitly this good man whenever there is a circumcision of a boy."

The words of the prayer are as follows: "How but with praise should be remembered Germon, the Roman chief?"

This is how we remember with thanks this Roman guard, a memorial which is kept unto our own day.

NAMING THE BOY.

By the time this hymn has ended, the circumcision is at an end also. Then the High Priest goes to the father of the boy and inquires, *Mah Shnwh?* meaning, "What is his name?" and the name which the father gives and has been decided upon, shall be the name of the boy and can never be changed. The answer of the High Priest is, "Blessed be the name "; he blesses also those present and delivers an address to that end, and all is

done in the ancient Hebrew Samaritan language. AND TO GOD BELONGS THE BEST KNOWLEDGE. (P. 702)

THE ARGUMENT AGAINST THE JEWS.

It is proper to add some remarks concerning the differences between us and the Jews. This ordinance is one of the greatest ordinances among this people. It must be fulfilled and the presence of those invited is necessary, wherever the place may be. Gladness and festivals are the order of the day. Fidelity to this covenant is of the most supreme importance, for should the Samaritans neglect, in the least, the fulfilment of this ordinance, the covenant of God (who is to be praised) would be broken with them. They believe that this ordinance is most exacting. No delay should be made beyond the eighth day, even if it should fall on the Sabbath or on a feast day. On such days the fulfilment of this ordinance and the circumcision of the boy are compulsory, although they themselves are of an exacting nature with definite regulations which, they believe, are transcended by those of circumcision. If a man be on a journey and his wife be with child, he must be ready in case of emergency to fulfil this ordinance. The Samaritans do not follow the practice of the Jews to postpone circumcision, and cite the command prepared by their priests who have garbled the word of God (may he be exalted) in regard to this matter, namely, " But the uncircumcised male whose foreskin is not cut on that day, that soul shall be cut off from his people." But of this command the Jews have omitted the words " on the eighth day." Therefore they take a great liberty in the fulfilment of circumcision, delaying its appointed time in most cases, in spite of the fact that the day has been often set definitely by the apostle of God, Moses (upon whom be peace). Leviticus xii., which begins with *Wayedabber IHWH*, etc., says in its third verse, "And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised." Again in Genesis xvii. 12, "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male (p. 703) throughout your generations." This command was given to our lord Abraham (upon whom be peace). Plain as this command may be, the Jewish people practise much license in its fulfilment. If on the eighth day the child may be sick, his circumcision is postponed to the following day; to the tenth and eleventh day. It is likewise done, if the father of the child happens to be absent; the circumcision is postponed until the return of the father, though it may extend for months. Verily this is the worst apostasy!

THE CIRCUMCISION OF THE SON OF MOSES.

The Jews interpret falsely the words of God (may he be exalted), and they place Moses (upon whom be peace) on the wrong side in reference to circumcision, claiming that he himself postponed the circumcision of his son² Eliezer (upon whom be peace), and that it was the mother of the boy that performed it. This they make up out of what is said about our lady Zipporah, the wife of our lord Moses (upon whom be peace), namely, *Watikroth eth garlat benmah*, which means, according to us, "To cut off the uncleanness of her upbuilding," or rather to cut her off from having children. But the Jews read it as " She

² Gershom. See Ex. ii. 22.

cut the foreskin of her son." Now all the difference proceeds from the reading of the Hebrew word, which is composed of the three letters b-n-h. We read it by doubling the letter " n," while the Jews do not. And as this question is of great interest, being as it is the source of difference between us and the Jews, in matter of interpretation and pronunciation, it is fit that its discussion be appended to this chapter.

We believe that the interpretation adopted by the Jews and which is strictly believed by them of Exodus iv. 24, discredits the mission of the apostle Moses (upon whom be peace). (p. 704)

HOW THE JEWS DISHONOR MOSES.

They say that while Moses was on the way by the stopping-place, God sent his angel to slay him, because the circumcision of his newly born son Eliezer was not performed in time, but delayed, and therefore God (may he be exalted) was angry and intended to destroy him. When the angel found him and was about to slay him, Zipporah, his wife, knowing the reason, which was the postponement of the circumcision of his son, immediately took a sharp flint and cut off the foreskin of her son, and as the apostle was about to approach her, she took hold of his legs and said to him interrogatively, "Wilt thou be my bridegroom while I am in the birthblood?" The angel seeing what she had done was pleased with her, and refrained from slaying the apostle, when she said, "A bridegroom of blood art thou," and because she performed the ordinance of circumcision. Behold how daring are the Jews in their insults and in their interpretations, which bring dishonor on the apostle! Verily, they are beside themselves!

ANOTHER JEWISH INSULT TO MOSES.

Some of them have a different interpretation. They say that the words " So he let him alone " refer to the boy Eliezer. The angel was swallowing him up because his circumcision was delayed. The process of swallowing began with the head, and when it reached the secrets of the boy, his mother took hold of him by the legs and the angel let him alone.

THE SAMARITAN INTERPRETATION.

The Samaritan people, on the other hand, interpret the passage in this manner: It happened that while on the way by the stopping-place, the angel of the Lord met him and sought (p. 705) to incite him,³ and Zipporah took distress and cut off the uncleanness of her being built up by him,⁴ and she approached his feet and said, "Thou art a bridegroom of blood to me," and he let her alone.⁵ Then she said, "Thou art a spouse of blood to me " until he ceased off. They comment on this passage as follows: When the apostle Moses sought to retire in that stopping-place, God sent his angel to incite and encourage him.

³ Apparently this reading is due to the fact that the Samaritans derive the form *hemito*, "his slaying," from the root *hamah*, which means "to incite, excite, and make a turmoil," and not from *moot*.—TB.

⁴ The Samaritans derive the word *bnh* from *banah*, which means "to build up, to have children."—TB.

⁵ "The Samaritan reading differs in this instance and in the others from the Hebrew reading. The third pers. pron. suffix is *ah*, "her," and not *o*, " him," as the Hebrew reads. —TB.

Zipporah, seeing the light of the angel and that of her husband, was much terrified and afflicted, both on account of the majestic presence of the angel and the conviction that her husband had been raised to a high sphere of spirituality. She was struck with a great fear, and for the reasons mentioned before she lost all hope in being "upbuilt" any longer by him, as if she swore off and cut away the uncleanness of cohabitation with him, for the word *garlah*, "foreskin," means, also, "uncleanliness" or "unholiness," as an example can be produced in the Torah bearing us in this interpretation. Therefore she begged her leave of him and approached his feet and kissed them and said to him, "Thou art a blood spouse unto me"; and thereupon the apostle Moses (upon him be peace) let her alone, and granted her what she desired, and dismissed her to her father, together with her children, at that very time. What proves our contention, namely, that Moses did really dismiss her here and give her a divorce, is Exodus xviii. 2, where we find the words *ahar shellooheyhab*, that is, "after he (p. 706) had dismissed her." We need not assert again that we have proofs of a large number consisting of similar passages in the Torah in favor of this interpretation. Behold, therefore, intelligent readers! how degrading is the interpretation the Jews adopted to the noble station of our lord Moses ben Amran (upon whom be peace)! To plan death and deal destruction are the greatest punishment which could be devised. They indicate the horrible crime of the doer, which is impossible in the dignity of the apostle. Such an attempt on the part of God (may he be praised) reflects with fallacy and vain purposes to his divine omniscience. Did He not speak to him face to face? Did He not make him acquainted with all the miracles and perform them through him? Did He not thereby teach mankind obedience to Him and watchfulness in their duties towards Him and the purpose which they neglected and for which they were created, to do righteousness and acts of piety, to worship Him and know Him, who is highly exalted? He made it well known to us from his predilection to Moses, that he (Moses) was the first and best fitted for obeying him, the man of the most steadfast will and resolution to stand to and abide by all his laws, thereby attaining a degree of perfection which no other creature had ever reached. The informing answers and questions the apostle asked from God (may he be exalted) did in no wise add knowledge to God's: otherwise, how could God (who is to be praised) trust him with his mission, knowing him to be faithless? Would not this supposition reflect upon God?

THE JEWS LIBEL ZIPPORAH.

The Jews claim that Zipporah was in childbirth, or about to deliver a child at that time. But to approach or touch a woman in such a state was polluting and prohibited among the people of Jacob. Compare Genesis xxxi. 35, "*Ky lo ookal lakoom* (p. 707) *meppaneyka ky derck nashm ly*," which means that she could not approach him to do her duty towards him as she had her flux. If the Jews declare that *circumcision* in time is more binding, and obliges one to suffer the company of his wife in such a state, we answer, Herewith you contradict yourselves, as you occasionally believe that Moses (upon whom be peace) thought of the necessity of circumcising his son, and therefore suffered to accompany his wife, who was about to give birth to a child, and at other times you declare that he decided to postpone the circumcision of his son, in order that he might not be delayed in his journey or his mission, and that therefore it became the duty of his wife to perform it. You also say that he did not rely on his wife in performing the same: therefore it became his duty to do it himself which, according to you, he did not: and thus you contradict

yourselves in two ways. You attribute to the apostle fallacy in belief, in decision and in deed, but he (may the peace of God be on him!) is far too noble to be touched by what you say and attribute of neglect and transgression, thereby deserving such a punishment for such a great crime.

A SUMMARY OF THE ERRORS OF THE JEWS.

The Jews are mistaken in assigning to Moses (upon whom be peace) the predilection of fulfilling one ordinance to the detriment of another, and asserting that the wife of Moses (upon whom be peace) was wiser than he, and more resolute than he was, and that she performed the circumcision herself. With such a belief it results that Moses (upon whom be peace) committed several errors. Among these was that of having accompanied his wife while she was in the blood of childbirth, which is the first error. The second is that of having purposely postponed the circumcision of his son, for, as they pretend, he was departing with that intention. The third is that (p. 708) of allowing the date of circumcision to pass by and his wife to perform the ordinance while he decided to neglect. They say also that the apostle feared lest in circumcising his son, there might result a delay to his mission, and therefore he did not do it. Truly they err, and charge the apostle with ignorance for having a predilection in fulfilling one command while neglecting another. They attribute to him the sin of not having remedied his wrong, but allege that it was his wife who became aware of the duty, and performed the deed of which he was worthier and to which he had a greater right.

Their statements contradict the passage they have in their book of Joshua, that the people of Israel, in spite of the presence of Moses (upon whom be peace), had not been circumcised during the forty years they spent in the wilderness, as is declared in Deuteronomy: "These forty years the Lord has been with thee, and thou hast missed nothing," but as to the apostle, God (may he be exalted) would slay him because he postponed the circumcision of his son! It is evident that their scriptures and belief are false and contradictory, to which no sane-minded person can give long assent. To claim, as they do, that the children of Israel neglected the ordinance of circumcision for a period of forty years, during which all their sons were left uncircumcised, is a bold error. It is self-contradictory, and can easily be made void from many points of view, and through many testimonies and passages from the Law, the simple mentioning of which would be too lengthy for this abridged book. It is enough to have proved that their interpretation of Exodus iv. 24-26 is false, and that the lawlessness with which they charge the apostle is untrue, for the reading of the passage is liable to different pronunciations, and its meaning is thereby wholly changed. Thus different interpretations may be attached to it, and the best and nearest to rea- (p. 709) son is the one adopted by the Samaritan people, according as they have received their traditions, both in point of correct reading and interpreting the same. For one can easily see that such are nobler and not liable to those charges to which we have already called the attention of the reader. The Samaritans have in the books of their learned teachers a strong commentary and clear explanation which favor their claim, but which are of a linguistic nature, and we have refrained from recording them down, as this is not the purpose of this book.

THE REASON FOR MOSES' DIVORCE FROM HIS WIFE.

Their interpretation of the passing affirms and verifies the true mission of the apostle and suggests to us his willingness, yea, his firm resolution, to fulfil it. When the righteous God (whose name is exalted) appeared to him in the stopping place, and he was convinced that his mission is an arduous duty, requiring courage and resolution and freedom from other absorbing relations, he consented to let his wife and children alone solely in order that thus he might attend to his missionary duties. But his desire was not enough: he had no reason to violate the rights of the wife, if she were unwilling to consent, and all depended on her as it was necessary. Naturally he did not make an overture to her, as it was below his sense of duty, but she made one and asked her dismissal. Thus we read that when she acquainted him with her state, disclosing the impossibility of her stay with him, as it might have proved dangerous to her, the Apostle of God (who is exalted) understood her purpose and realized the necessity of granting her a divorce in accordance with her pleasure. So thus it is written, *Wayiref mimmenah*, that is, "He separated from her," according to the demand which she made at first with the words *Ky khetan dameem attah ly lammoolot*, which mean "Thou art a (p. 710) spouse of blood to me for 'thy consent.' " ⁶He therefore separated from her, and sent her back to her father, just at that time. If it were not for this passage, we would neither have known the date of her return to her father, nor the reasons for her dismissal. In fact it would not have been lawful unto the Apostle to have abandoned her and divorced her. Again, the word *watikroth*, that is "And she cut," is never used, in any of its forms, for the purpose of circumcision; on the contrary, all the commands and verbs used and applied to this ceremony are one of the forms of *hmool*. For God mentioned the ordinance of circumcision in eighteen passages, and all the words used with reference to its performance are derived from the infinitive *mool*, and there is nowhere the word *kritah*, nor *kartoo*, in all passages containing God's commands with reference to this ceremony. The truth is therefore very apparent to the careful observer of God's words used in this regard. Let then all prejudice and self-gratification be put aside, for the words of God are not self-contradictory: BLESSED BE HIS NAME FOREVER ! AND EXALTED LET HIM BE ETERNALLY! AMEN.

Note from this Editor of the SamaritanUpdate.com

This book is referenced # 2403 in *A Bibliography of the Samaritans, Third Edition, Revised, Expanded, and Annotated*, by **Alan David Crown** and **Reinhard Pummer**, ATLA Bibliography, No. 51, **The Scarecrow Press, Inc.** Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford. 2005

⁶ The High Priest derives the Infinitive *moolot* from a lost root, meaning to "consent," "to incline," which is found in another Semitic tongue with the same meanings. Compare the Hebrew *mool*, in the construction *el mool*, "towards," which, of course, is liable to other derivations.—TB.