

Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch

With a Brief Memoir

Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1874

(page 404-439)

Chapter XVI.

On the Samaritan Pentateuch.¹

The Samaritan Pentateuch, a Recension of the commonly received Hebrew Text of the Mosaic Law, in use with the Samaritans, was written in the ancient Hebrew (*Ibrī*), or so-called Samaritan characters.² This recension is found vaguely quoted by some of the early Fathers of the Church, under the name of “Ἰλαλιόταον Ἑβραϊκόν τό παρά Σαμαρειταίς,” in contradistinction to the “Ἑβραϊκόν τό παρά Ἰουδαίοις;” further, as “Samaritanorum Volumina,” &c. Thus Origen on Num. xiii. 1,.... “ἀ καί αὐτά ἐκ τοῦτων Σαμαρειτῶν Ἑβραϊκοῦ μετεβάλομεν;” and on Num. xxi. 13, ... “ἃ ἐν μόνοις τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν,” &c. Jerome, Prol. To Kings: “Samaritani etiam Pentateuchum Moysis *totidem*” (? 22, like the “Hebrews, Syrians and Chaldaeans”) “litteris habent, figures tantum et apicibus discrepantes.” Also on Gal. iii. 19, “quam ob causam” – (viz. ‘Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὅς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν π ἄ σ ι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις, being quoted there from Deut. xxvii. 26, where the Masoretic text has only - “cursed be he that confirmeth not³ the words of this Law to do them:” while the LXX. Reads πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ... πᾶσι τοῖς λόγοις)- “quam ob causam Samaritanorum Hebraea volumina relegens inveni κλ scriptum esse;” and he forthwith charges the Jews with having deliberately taken out the κλ, because they did not (page 405) wish to be bound *individually* to *all* the ordinances: forgetting at the same time that this same κλ occurs in the very next chapter of the Masoretic text (Deut. xxviii. 15):- “All his commandments and his statutes.” Eusebius of Caesarea observes that the LXX. And the Sam. Pent. Agree against the Received Text in the number of years from the Deluge to Abraham. Cyril of Alexandria speaks of certain words (Gen. iv. 8), wanting in the Hebrew, but found in the Samaritan. The same remark is made by Procopius of Gaza with respect to Deut. i.6: Num. x. 8, &c. Other passages are noticed by Diodorus, the Greek Scholiast, &c. The Talmud, on the other hand, mentions the Sam. Pen. Distinctly and contemptuously as a clumsily forged record: “*You have falsified⁴ your Pentateuch,*” said R. Eliezer b. Shimon to the Samaritan scribes, with reference to a passage in Deut. xi. 30, where the well-understood word Shechem was gratuitously inserted after “the plains of Moreh,”- “and you have not profited aught by it” (comp. *Jer. Sotah 21 b*, cf. 17; *Bibli 33 b*). On another occasion they are ridiculed on account of their ignorance of one of the simplest rules of Hebrew grammar, displayed in their Pentateuch; viz. the use of the ה locale (unknown, however, according to *Jer. Meg. 6,2*, also to the people of Jerusalem). “*Who has caused you to blunder?*” said R. Shimon b. Eliezer to them; referring to their abolition of the Mosaic ordinance of marrying the deceased brother’s wife (Deut. xxv. 5ff.), - through a misinterpretation of the passage in question, which enjoins that the wife of the dead man shall not be “without” to a stranger, but that the brother should marry her: they, however, taking התוצה (לתוצ) to be an epithet of אשת, “wife,” translated “*the other wife,*” i.e. the *betrothed* only (*Jer. Jebam. 3, 2, Ber. R.*, &c.).

Down to within the last two hundred and fifty years, however, no copy of this divergent Code of Laws had reached Europe, and it began to be pronounced a fiction, and the plain words of the Church-fathers- the better known autho-(page 406)rities- who quoted it, were subjected to subtle interpretations. Suddenly, in 1616, Pietro della Valle, one of the first discoverers also of the Cuneiform inscriptions, acquired a complete Codex from the Samaritans in Damascus. In 1623 it was presented by Achille Harley de Sancy to the Library of the Oratory in Paris, and in 1628 there appeared a brief description of it by J. Morinus in his preface to the Roman text of the LXX. Three years later, shortly before it was published in

¹ From Dr. Wm. Smith’s ‘Dictionary of the Bible,’ Vol. II.

² ליבנאה, רעצ, עבריה, רעצ, כהב עבריה, עזרא, בתב אשזרית, עזרא, Comp. Synh. 21 b, Jer. Meg. 5,2; Tosefta Synh. 4; Synhedr. 22 a, Meg. Jer. 1,9, Sota Jer. 7,2, sq.

³ The A. V., following the LXX., and perhaps Luther, has inserted the word *all*.

⁴ זייפתמ.

the Paris Ploygott, -whence it was copied, with few emendations from other codices, by Walton- Morinus, the first Editor, wrote his *Exercitationes Ecclesiasticae in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum*, in which he pronounced the newly found Codex, with all its innumerable Varients from the Masortic text, to be infinitely superior to the latter: in fact, the unconditional and speedy emendation of the Received Text thereby was urged most authoritatively. And now the impulse was given to one of the fiercest and most barren literary and theological controversies: of which more anon. Between 1620 and 1630 six additional copies partly complete, partly incomplete, were acquired by Ussher: five of which he deposited in English libraries, while one was sent to De Dieu, and has disappeared mysteriously. Another Codex, now in the Ambrosioian Library at Milan, was brought to Italy in 1621. Peiresc procured two more, one of which was placed in the Royal Library of Paris, and one in the Barberini at Rome. Thus the number of MSS. in Europe gradually grew to sixteen. During the present century another, but very fragmentary copy, was acquired by the Gotha Library. A copy of the entire (?) Pentateuch, with Targum (?Sam. Version), in parallel columns 4to, on parchment, was brought from *Nablus* by Mr. Grove in 1861, for the Count of Paris, in whose library it is. Single portions of the Sam. Pent., in a more or less defective state, are now of no rare occurrence in Europe.

Respecting the external condition of these MSS., it may be observed that their sizes from the 12mo to folio, and that no scroll, such as the Jews and the Samaritans use in their synagogues, is to be found among them. The letters, (page 407) which are of a size corresponding to that of the book, exhibit none of those varieties of shape so frequent in the Masor. Text; such as majuscules, minuscules, suspended, inverted letters, &c. Their material is vellum or cotton-paper; the ink used is black in all cases save the scroll used by the Samaritans at *Nablus*, the letters of which are in gold. There are neither vowels, accents, nor diacritical points. The individual words are separated from each other by a dot. Greater or smaller divisions of the text are marked by two dots placed one above the other, and by an asterisk. A small line above a consonant indicates a peculiar meaning of the word, an unusual form, a passive, and the like: it is, in fact, a contrivance to bespeak attention.⁵ The whole Pentateuch is divided into nine hundred and sixty-four paragraphs, or *Kazzin*, the termination of which is indicated by these figures, = (three dots to below one on top centered) or <. At the end of each book the number of its divisions is stated thus:-

(250)	קצין מאתימ זנ	הזה מפר הראשון :	[Masoret. Cod., 12 Sidras (Parahioth), 50 Chapters]
(200)	מאתימ	“ השני	“ [“ 11 “ 40 “]
(130)	מאה זשלזשים	“ השלישי	“ [“ 10 “ 27 “]
(218)	ר. זיה	“ הרביעי	“ [“ 10 “ 36 “]
(166)	ק. זזם	“ התמישי	“ [“ 11 “ 34 “]

The Sam. Pentateuch is halved in Lev. vii. 15 (viii. 8, in Hebrew Text), where the words “Middle of the Torah”⁶ are found. At the end of each MS. the year of the coping, the name of the scribe, and also that of the proprietor, are usually stated. Yet their dates are not always trustworthy when given, and very difficult to be conjectured when entirely omitted, since the Samaritan letters afford no internal evidence of the period in which they were written. To none of the MSS., however, which have as yet reached Europe, can be assigned a higher date than the 10th Christian century. The scroll used in *Nablus* bears- so the Samaritans pretend- the following inscription:- “I, Abisha, son of Phinehas, son of Eleazer, son of Aaron the Priest, - upon them be the (page 408) Grace of Jehovah! To His honour have I written this Holy Law at the entrance of the Tabernacle of Testimony on the Mount Gerizim, Beth El, in the thirteenth year of the taking possession of the Land of Canaan, and all its boundaries around it, by the Children of Israel. I praise Jehovah.” (Letter of Meshalmab b. Ab Sechuah, Cod. 19,791, Add. MSS. Brit. Mus. Comp. *Epist. Sam. Sichemitarum ad Jobum Ludolphum*, Cizae, 1688; *Antiq. Eccl. Orient.* p. 123; Huntington *Epist.* Pp. 49, 56; Eichhorn’s *Repertorium f. bibl. Und morg. Lit.*, tom. Ix., &c.) But no European⁷ has ever

⁵ **and הנה and הנה, עד and עד, דבר and דבר, אל and אל, יאכל and יאכל, יקרא and יקרא, ש and ש, the suffixes at the end of a word, the ה without a dagesh, &c. are thus pointed out to the reader.**

⁶ פלגא דארהזחא

⁷ It would appear, however (see Archdeacon Tattom’s notice in the *Parthenon*, No. 4, May 24, 1862) that Mr. Levysohn, a person lately attached to the Russian staff in Jerusalem, has found the inscription in question “going through the middle of the body of the Text of the Decalogue, and extending through three columns.” Considering that the Samaritans themselves told Huntington, “that this inscription had been in their scroll once, but must have been erased by some wicked

succeeded in finding it in this scroll, however great the pains bestowed upon the search (comp. Eichhorn, *Einleit.* li. 132); and even if it had been found, it would not have deserved the slightest credence.

We have briefly stated above that the *Exercitationes* of Morinus, which placed the Samaritan Pentateuch far above the Received Text in point of genuineness, - partly on account of its agreeing in many places with the Septuagint, and partly on account of its superior "lucidity and harmony," - excited and kept up for nearly two hundred years one of the most extraordinary controversies on record. Characteristically enough, however, this was set at rest once for all by the first systematic investigation of the point at issue. It would now appear as if the unquestioning rapture with which every new literary discovery was formerly hailed, the innate animosity against the Masoretic (Jewish) Text, the general preference for the LXX., the defective state of Semitic studies, - as if, we say, all these put together were not sufficient to account for the phenomenon that men of any critical acumen could for one moment not only place the (page 409) Sam. Pent. on a par with the Masoretic Text, but even raise it, unconditionally, far above it. There was indeed another cause at work, especially in the first period of the dispute: it was a controversial spirit which prompted Morinus and his followers, Cappellus and others, to prove to the Reformers what kind of value was to be attached to *their* authority: the received form of the Bible, upon which and which alone they professed to take their stand; - it was now evident that nothing short of the Divine Spirit, under the influence and inspiration of which the Scriptures were interpreted and expounded by the Roman Church, could be relied upon. On the other hand, most of the "*Antimorinians*" - De Muys, Hottinger, St. Morinus, Buxtorf, Fuller, Leusden, Pfeiffer, &c. - instead of patiently and critically examining the subject and refuting their adversaries by arguments which were within their reach, as they are within ours, directed their attacks against the persons of the Morinians, and thus their misguided zeal left the question of the superiority of the New Document over the Old where they found it. Of higher value were, it is true, the labours of Simon, Le Clerc, Walton, &c., at a later period, who proceeded eclectically, rejecting many readings, and adopting others which seemed preferable to those of the Old Text. Houbigant, however, with unexampled ignorance and obstinacy, returned to Morinus's first notion - already generally abandoned - of the unquestionable and thorough superiority. He, again, was followed more or less closely by Kennicott, Al. a St. Aquilino, Lobstein, Geddes, and others. The discussion was taken up once more on the other side, chiefly by Ravius, who succeeded in finally disposing of this point of the superiority (*Exercitt. Phil. In Houbig. Prol. Lugd. Bat. 1755*). It was from his day forward allowed, almost on all hands, that the Masoretic Text was the genuine one, but that in doubtful cases, when the Samaritan had an "unquestionable clearer" reading, this was to be adopted, since a certain amount of value, however limited, did attach to it. Michaelis, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Jahn, and the majority of modern critics, adhered to this opinion. Here the matter rested until 1815, when Gesenius (page 410) (*De Pent. Sam. Origine, Indole et Auctoritate*) abolished the remnant of the authority of the Sam. Pent. So masterly, lucid, and clear are his arguments and his proofs, that there has been and will be no further question as to the absence of all value in this Recension, and in its pretended emendations. In fact, a glance at the systematic arrangement of the variants, of which he first of all bethought himself, is quite sufficient to convince the reader at once that they are for the most part mere blunders, arising from an imperfect knowledge of the first elements of grammar and exegesis; and that others owe their existence to a studied design of conforming certain passages to the Samaritan mode of thought, speech, and faith - more especially to show that the Mount Gerizim, upon which their temple stood, was *the* spot chosen and indicated by God to Moses as the one upon which He desired to be worshipped⁸. Finally, that others are due to a tendency towards removing, as well as linguistic shortcomings would allow, all that seemed obscure or in any way doubtful, and towards filling up all apparent imperfections: - either by repetitions or by means of newly-invented and badly-fitting words and phrases. It must, however, be premised that except two alterations (Ex. xiii. 7, where the Sam. Reads "Six days shalt thou eat unleavened bread," instead of the received "Seven days," and the change of the word תהיה, "There shall not be," into תחיה, "live," Deut. xxiii. 18), the Mosaic laws and ordinances themselves are nowhere tampered with.

We will now proceed to lay specimens of these once so highly prized variants before the reader, in order that he may judge for himself. We shall follow in this the commonly received arrangement of

hand," this startling piece of information must be received with extreme caution:- no less so than the other more or less vague statements with respect to the labours and pretended discoveries of Mr. Levysohn. See note, p.426.

⁸ For יבחר, "He will elect" (the spot), The Sam. Always puts בוחר, "He has elected" (viz. Gerizim). See below.

Gesenius, who divided all these readings into eight classes; to which, as we shall afterwards show, Frankel has suggested the addition of two or three others, while Kircheim (in his Hebrew work שמררך כרמי) enumerates thirteen,⁹ which we will name hereafter. (page 411)

1. The *first* class, then, consists of readings by which emendations of a grammatical nature have been attempted.

(a.) The quiescent letters, or so-called *matres lectionis*, are supplied.

(b.) The more poetical forms of the pronouns, probably less known to the Sam., are altered into the more common ones.

(c.) The same propensity for completing apparently incomplete forms is noticeable in the flexion of the verbs. The apocopated or short future is altered into the regular future.

(d.) On the other hand the paragogical letters and at the end on nouns, are almost universally struck out by the Sam. Corrector; and, in the ignorance of the existence of nouns of a common gender, he has given them genders according to his fancy.

(e.) The infin. Absol. Is, in the quaintest manner possible, reduced to the form of the finite verb.

For obsolete or rare forms, the modern and more common ones have been substituted in a great number of places. (page 412)

2. The *second* class of variants consists of glosses and interpretations received into the text: glosses, moreover, in which the Sam. Not unfrequently coincides with the LXX., and which are in many cases evidently derived by both from some ancient Targum.

3. The *third* class exhibits conjectural emendations – sometimes far from happy – of real or imaginary difficulties in the Masoretic text. (page 413)

4. The *fourth* class exhibits readings in which apparent deficiencies have been corrected or supplied from parallel passages in the common text. Gen. xviii. 29, 30, for “I shall not do it,” “I shall not destroy” is substituted from Gen. xviii. 28, 31, 32. Gen. xxxvii. 4, אחיז, “his brethren,” is replaced by בניז, “his sons,” from the former verse. One of the most curious specimens of the endeavours of the Samaritan Codex to render the readings as smooth and consistent as possible, is its uniform spelling of proper nouns like יתיר, Jethro, occasionally spelt יתר in the Hebrew text, Moses’ father-in-law – a man who according to the Midrash (*Sifri*), had no less than *seven* names; יהושע (Jehoshua), into which form it corrects the shorter הזשע (Hoshea) when it occurs in the Masoretic Codex. More frequent still are the additions of single words and short phrases inserted from parallel passages, where the Hebrew text appears too concise: - unnecessary, often excessively absurd interpolations. (page 414)

5. The *fifth* class is an extension of the one immediately preceding, and comprises larger phrases, additions, and repetitions from parallel passages. Whenever anything is mentioned as having been done or said previously by Moses, or where a command of God is related as being executed, the whole speech bearing upon it is repeated again at full length. These tedious and always superfluous repetitions are most frequent in Exodus, both in the record of the plagues and in the many interpolations from Deuteronomy.

6. To the *sixth* class belong those “emendations” of passages and words of the Hebrew text which contain something objectionable in the eyes of the Samaritans, on account either of historical improbability or apparent want of dignity in the terms applied to the Creator. Thus in the Sam. Pent. no one, in the antediluvian times, begets his first son after he has lived 150 years: but one hundred years are, where necessary, subtracted before, and added after the birth of the first son. Thus Jared, according to the Hebrew Text, begot at 162 years, lived afterwards 800 years, and “all his years were 962 years;” according to the Sam. he begot when he was 62 years old, lived afterwards 785 years, “and all his years were 847.” After the Delude the opposite method is followed. A hundred or fifty years are added before and subtracted after the begetting: *E.g.* Arphaxad, who in the Common Text is 35 years old when he begets Shelah, and lived afterwards 403 years: in all 438- is by the Sam. made 135 years old when he begets Shelah, and lives only 303 years afterwards = 438. (The LXX. Has, accordingly important and often discussed emendation of this class is the passage in Ex. xii. 40, which in our text reads, “Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years.” The Samaritan (supported by LXX. Cod. Al.) has “The sojourning of the children of Israel, [and their fathers who dwelt in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt- ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐν γῆ Καναάν] was four hundred and thirty years.” an (page 415) interpolation of very late date indeed. Again, in Gen. ii. 2, “And God [? Has] finished (זיכל ? pluperf.) on the seventh day,” השביעי is altered into הששי, “the *sixth*,” lest God’s rest on the

⁹ שערם יב” must be a misprint.

Sabbath-day might seem incomplete (LXX.). In Gen. xxix. 3, 8, “We cannot, until all the flocks be gathered together, and till they roll the stone from the mouth of the well,” עדרים, “flocks,” is replaced by רועים, “shepherds,” since the flocks *could* not roll the stone from the well: the corrector no being apparently aware that in common parlance in Hebrew, as in other languages, “they” occasionally refer to certain not particularly specified persons. Well may Gesenius ask what this corrector would have made of Is. xxxvii. [not xxxvi.] 36: “And when *they* arose in the morning, behold *they* were all dead corpse.” The surpassing reverence of the Samaritan is shown in passages like Ex. xxiv. 10, “and they beheld God,” – a reading certainly less in harmony with the following – “and they ate and drank.”

7. The *seventh* class comprises what we might briefly call Samaritanism, *i.e.*, certain Hebrew forms, translated into the idiomatic Samaritan; and here the Sam. Codices vary considerably among themselves, - as far as the very imperfect collation of them has hitherto shown – some having retained the Hebrew in many places where the others have adopted the new equivalents.(page 416)

8. The *eight* and last class contains alterations made in favour or on behalf of Samaritan theology, hermeneutics, and domestic worship. Thus the word *Elohim*, four times construed with the plural verb in the Hebrew Pentateuch, is in the Samaritan Pent. joined to the singular verb (Gen, xx. 13, xxi, 53, xxxv. 7; Ex. xxii. 9); and further, both anthropomorphisms as well as anthropopathisms are carefully expunged-a practice very common in later times. The last and perhaps most momentous of all intentional alterations is the constant change of all the יבחר, “God will choose a spot,” into בחר, “he has chosen,” viz. Gerizim, and well-known substitution of Gerizim for Ebal in Deut. xxvii. 4 (A.V. 5):- “It shall be when ye be gone over Jordan, that ye shall set up these stones which I command you this day on Mount Ebal (Sam. *Gerizim*), and there shalt thou build an altar unto the Lord thy God,” &c. This passage gains a certain interest from Whiston and Kennicott having charged the *Jews* with corrupting it from Gerizim into Ebal. This supposition, however, was met by Rutherford, Parry, Tychsen, Lobstein, Verschuir, and others, and (page 417) we need only add that it is completely given up by modern Biblical scholars, although it cannot be denied that there is some *prima facie* ground for a doubt upon the subject. To this class also belong more especially interpolations of really existing passages, dragged out of their context for a special purpose. In Exodus as well as in Deuteronomy, the following insertions after the Ten Commandments, the following insertions from Deut. xxvii. 2-7 and xi. 30: “And it shall be on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan . . . ye shall set up these stones . . . on Mount *Gerizim* . . . and there shalt thou build an altar . . . ‘*That mountain*’ on the other side Jordan by the way where the sun goeth down . . . in the champaign over against Gilgal, beside the plains of Moreh, ‘*over against Shechem*:”- this last superfluous addition, which is also found in Deut. xi. 30 of the Sam. Pent., being ridiculed in the Talmud, as we have seen above.

From the immense number of these worse than worthless variants Gesenius has singled out four, which he thinks preferable on the whole to those of the Masoretic Text. We will confine ourselves to mentioning them, and refer the reader to the recent commentaries upon them: he will find that they too have since been, all but unanimously rejected. (1.) After the words, “And Cain spoke (זיאמר) to his brother Abel” (Gen. iv. 8), the Sam. adds, “let us go into the field,” in ignorance of the absol. Use of אמר, “to say, speak” (comp. Ex. xix. 25; 2 Chr. li. 10, xxxii. 34), and the absol. זיגד (Gen. ix. 21). (2.) For אחר (Gen. xxii. 13) the Sam. reads אחד *i.e.* instead of “behind him a ram,” *one* ram.” (3.) For ארם (Gen. xlix. 14), “an ass of bone” *i.e.* a strong ass, the Sam. has חמור גרים (Targ. גרם, Syr. *%&^). And (4) for זירק (Gen. xiv. 14), “he led forth his trained servants,” the Sam. reads זידק, “he numbered.”

We must briefly state, in concluding this portion of the (page 418) subject, that we did not choose this classification of Gesenius because it appeared to us to be either systematic (Gesenius says himself: “ceterum facile perspicitur complures in his esse lectiones quarum singulas alius ad aliud genus referre forsitan malit . . . in una vel altera lectione ad aliam classem referenda haud difficiles erimus . . .”) or exhaustive, or even because the illustrations themselves are unassailable in point of the reason he assigns for them; but because deficient as it is, it has at once and for ever silenced the utterly unfounded though time-hallowed claims of the Samaritan Pentateuch. It was only necessary, as we said before, to collect a great number of variations (or to take them from Walton), to compare them with the old text and with each other, to place them in their own tale. That this was not done during the two hundred years of the contest by a single one of the combatants is certainly rather strange:- albeit not the only instance of the kind.

Important additions to this list have, as we hinted before, been made by Frankel, such as the Samaritans’ preference of the imperat. For the 3rd pers.; ignorance of the use of the abl.; Galileanisms,- to which also belongs the permutation of the letters *Ahevi* (comp. *Erub.* 53, אמר, חמר, עמר), in the Samaritan Cod.; *i.e.* the occasional softening down of the פ into ב, of כ into ג, צ into ר, &c., and chiefly the presence of

words and phrases in the Sam. which are *not* interpolated from parallel passages, but are entirely wanting in our text. Frankel derives from these passages chiefly the conclusion that the Sam. Pent. was, partly at least, (page 419) emended from the LXX., Onkelos, and other very late sources. (see below.)

We now subjoin, for the sake of completeness, the before-mentioned thirteen classes of Kirchheim, in the original, to which we have added the translations:-

1. זרנזיים למעלת הר גריזים. [Additions and alterations in the Samaritan Pentateuch in favour of Mount Gerizim.]
2. תזמפזת למלאזת. [Additions for the purpose of completion.]
3. באזד. [Commentary, glosses.]
4. חלזף הפעלים זזהבניים. [Change of verbs.]
5. חלזף השמזת. [Change of nouns.]
6. השזאה. [Emendation of seeming irregularities by assimilating forms, &c.]
7. תמזרת האזתיזת. [Permutation of letters.]
8. כנזיים. [Pronouns.]
9. מין. [Gender.]
10. אזתיזת הנזמפזת. [Letters added.]
11. אזתיזת היחם. [Addition of prepositions, conjunctions, articles, &c.]
12. קבזץ זפרד. [Junction of separated, and separation of joined words.]
13. ימזת עזלם. [Chronological alterations.]

It may, perhaps, not be quite superfluous to observe, before we proceed any further, that, since up to this moment no critical edition of the Sam. Pent., or even an examination of the Codices since Kennicott – who can only be said to have whole subject remains a most precarious task, and beset with unexampled difficulties at every step; and also that, under these circumstances, a more or less scientific arrangement of isolated or common Samaritan mistakes and falsifications appears to us to be a subject of very small consequence indeed.

It is, however, this same rudimentary state of investigation – after two centuries and a half of fierce discussion – (page 420) which has left the other and much more important question of the *Age and Origin* of the Sam. Pent. As unsettled to-day as it was when it first came under the notice of European scholars. For our own part we cannot but think that as long as – (1) the history of the Samaritans remains involved in the obscurities of which a former article will have given an account; (2) we are restricted to a small number of comparatively recent Codices; (3) neither these codices themselves have, as has just been observed, been thoroughly collated and recollated, nor (4) more than a feeble beginning has been made with anything like a collation between the various readings of the Sam. Pent. and the LXX. (Walton omitted the greatest number, “cum nullum sensus varietatem constituent”); - so long must we have a variety of the most divergent opinions, all based on “probabilities,” which are designated on the other side as “false reasonings” and “individual crotchets,” and which, moreover, not unfrequently start from flagrantly false premises.

We shall, under these circumstances, confine ourselves to a simple enumeration of the leading opinions, and the chief reasons and arguments alleged for and against them:-

- (1.) The Samaritan Pentateuch came into the hands of the Samaritans as an inheritance from the ten tribes whom they succeeded- so the popular notion runs. Of this opinion are J. Morinus, Walton, Cappellus, Kennicott, Michaelis, Eichorn, Bauer, Jahn, Bertholdt, Steudel, Mazade, Staurt, Davidson, and others. Their reasons for it may be thus briefly summed up:-
 - (a.) It seems improbable that the Samaritans should have accepted their code at the hands of the Jews after the Exile, as supposed by some critics, since there existed an intense hatred between the two nations.
 - (b.) The Samaritan Canon has only the Pentateuch in common with the Hebrew Canon: had that book been received at the period when the Hagiographa and the Prophets were in the Jews' hands, it would be surprising if they had not also received those.
 - (c.) The Sam. Letters, avowedly the more ancient, are (page 421) found in the Sam. Cod.: therefore it was written before the alteration of the character into the square Hebrew- which dates from the end of the Exile- took place.

[We cannot omit briefly to draw attention here to a most keen-eyed suggestion of S.D. Luzzatto, contained in a letter to R. Kirchheim (*Carme Shomron*, p. 106, &c.), by the adoption of which many readings in the Heb. Codex, now almost unintelligible, appear perfectly clear. He assumes that the copyist who at some time or other after Ezra transcribed the Bible into the modern square Hebrew characters,

from the ancient copies written in so-called Samaritan, occasionally mistook Samaritan letters of similar form. And since our Sam. Pent. has those difficult readings in common with the Mas. Text, that other moot point, whether it was copied from a Hebrew or Samaritan Codex, would thus appear to be solved. Its constant changes of ך and ך, ם and ן, ן and ן- letters which are similar in Hebrew, but *not* in Samaritan- have been long used as a powerful argument for the Samaritans having received the Pent. at a very late period indeed.]

Since the above opinion- that the Pent. came into the hands of the Samaritans from the ten Tribes- is the most popular one, we will now adduce some of the chief reasons brought against it, and the reader will see by the somewhat feeble nature of the arguments on either side, that the last word has not yet been spoken in the matter.

- (a.) There existed no *religious* animosity whatsoever between Judah and Israel when they separated. The ten tribes could not therefore have bequeathed such an animosity (page 422) to those who succeeded them, and who, we may add, probably cared as little originally for the disputes between Judah and Israel, as colonists from far-off countries, belonging to utterly different races, are likely to care for the country. On the contrary, the contest between the slowly judaized Samaritans and the Jews, only dates from the moment when the latter refused to recognize the claims of the former, as belonging to the people of God, and rejected their aid in building the temple: why then, it is said, should they not first have received the one book which would bring them into still closer conformity with the returned exiles, at their hands? That the Jews should yet have refused to receive them as equals is no more surprising than that the Samaritans from that time forward took their stand upon this very Law- altered according to their circumstances; and proved from it that they and they alone were the Jews κατ' ἐξοχήν.
 - (b.) Their not possessing any other book of the Hebrew Canon is not to be accounted for by the circumstance that there was no other book in existence at the time of the schism, because many psalms of David, writings of Solomon, &c., must have been circulating among the people. But the jealousy which the Samaritans regarded Jerusalem, and the intense hatred which they naturally conceived against the post-Mosaic writers of national Jewish history, would sufficiently account for their rejecting the other books, in all of which, save Joshua, Judges, and Job, either Jerusalem, as the center of worship, or David and his House, are extolled. If, however, Loewe has really found with them, as he reports in the *Allgem. Zeitung d. Judenth.* April 18th, 1839, our Book of Kings and Solomon's Song of songs, - which they certainly would not have received subsequently, - all these arguments are perfectly gratuitous.
 - (c.) The present Hebrew character was *not* introduced by Ezra after the return from the Exile, but came into use at a much later period. The Samaritans might therefore have received the Pentateuch at the hands of the returned exiles, (page 423) who, according to the Talmud, *afterwards* changed their writing, and in the Pentateuch only, so as to distinguish it from the Samaritan. "Originally," says Mar Sutra (*Sanhedr. Xxi. B*), "the Pentateuch was given to Israel in *Ibri* writing and the Holy (Hebrew) language: it was again given to them in the days of Ezra in the *Ashurith* writing and *Aramaic* language. Israel then selected the *Ashurith* writing and the Holy language, and left to the Hediotes (Ἰδιώται) the *Ibri* writing and the *Aramaic* language. Who are the Hediotes? The Cuthim (Samaritans). What is *Ibri* writing? The Libonaah (Samaritans). It is well known also that the Maccabean coins bear Samaritan inscriptions: so that "Hediotes" would point to the common use of the Samaritan character for ordinary purposes, down to a very late period.
- (2.) The second leading opinion on the age of the Sam. pent. is that it was introduced by Manasseh (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 8, § 2, 4) at the time of the foundation of the Samaritan Sanctuary on Mount Gerizim (*Ant.* van Dale, R. Simon, Prideaux, Fuld, Hasse, De Wette, Gesenius, Hupfeld, Hengstengerg, Keil, &c.). In support of this opinion are alleged, the idolatry of the Samaritans before they received a Jewish priest through Esarhaddon 2K. xvii. 24-33), and the immense number of readings common to the LXX. and this Code, against the Masoretic Text.
 - (3.) Other, but very isolated notions, are those of Morin, Le Clerc, Poncet, &c., that the Israelitish priest sent by the king of Assyria to instruct the new inhabitants in the religion of the country brought the Pentateuch with him. Further, that the Samaritan Pentateuch was the production of an impostor, Dositheus (דוסית in Talmud), who lived during the time of the Apostles, and who falsified the sacred records in order to prove that he was the Messiah (Ussher). Against which there is only this to be observed, that there is not the slightest alteration of such a nature to be found. Finally, that it is a very late and faulty recension, with additions and corruptions of the Masoretic Text (6th century after

Christ), into which glosses from the LXX. had been (page 424) received (Frankel). Many other suggestions have been made, but we cannot here dwell upon them: suffice it to have mentioned those to which a certain popularity and authority attaches.

Another question has been raised :- have all the variants which we find in our copies been introduced at once, or are they the work in our copies been introduced at once, or are they the work of many generations? From the number of vague opinions on that point, we have only room here to adduce that of Azariah de Rossi, who traces many of the glosses (Class 20 both in the Sam. and in the LXX. to an ancient Targum in the hands of the people at the time of Ezra, and refers to the Talmudical passages of *Nedar.* 37: "And he read in the Book of the Law of God- this is *Mikra*, the Pentateuch; פְּתַרְתָּן explanatory, this is *Targum*." Considering that no Masorah fixed the letters and signs of the Samar. Codex, and that, as we have noticed, the principal object was to make it read as smoothly as possible, it is not easily seen why each succeeding century should not have added its own emendations. But, here too, investigation still wanders about in the mazes of speculation.

The chief opinions with respect to the agreement of the numerous and as yet uninvestigated- even uncounted- readings of the LXX. (of which likewise no critical edition exists as yet), and the Sam. Pent. are:-

1. That the LXX. have translated from the Sam. (De Dieu, Selden, Hottinger, Hassencamp, Eichorn, &c.).
2. That mutual interpolations have taken place (Grotius, Ussher, Ravius, &c.).
3. That both Versions were formed from Hebrew Codices, which differed among themselves as well as from the one which afterwards obtained public authority in Palestine; that however very many willful corruptions and interpolations have crept in in later times (Gesenius).
4. That the Samar. Has, in the main, been altered from the LXX. (Frankel).

It must, on the other hand, be stated also, that the Sam. and LXX. quite as often disagree with each other, and follow each the Masor. Text. Also, that the quotations in the N.T. (page 425) from the LXX., where they coincide with the Sam. against the Hebr. Text, are so small in number and of so unimportant a nature that they cannot be adduced as any argument whatsoever.

The following is a list of the MSS. of the Sam. Pent. now in European Libraries [Kennicott]:-

- No. 1. Oxford (Ussher) Bodl., fol., No. 3127. Perfect, except the 20 first and 9 last verses.,
- No. 2. Oxford (Ussher) Bodl., 4to., No. 3128, with an Arabic version in Sam. characters. Imperfect. Wanting the whole Leviticus and many portions of the other books.
- No. 3. Oxford (Ussher) Bodl., 4to., No. 3129, wanting many portions in each book.
- No. 4. Oxford (Ussher, Laud) Bodl., 4to., No. 624. defective in parts of Deut.
- No. 5. Oxford (Marsh) Bodl., 12mo., No. 15. Wanting some verses in the beginning; 21 chapters obliterated.
- No. 6. Oxford (Pocock) Bodl., 24mo., No. 5328. Parts of leaves lost; otherwise perfect.
- No. 7. London (Ussher) Br. Mus. Claud. B. 8. Vellum. Complete. 254 leaves.
- No. 8. Paris (Peiresc) Imp. Libr., Sam. No. 1. Recent MS. containing the Hebr. And Sam. Texts, with an Arab. Vers. In the Sam. character. Wanting the first 34 chapters, and very defective in many places.
- No. 9. Paris (Peiresc) Imp. Libr., Sam. No. 2. Ancient MS., wanting first 17 chapters of Gen.; and all Deut. from the 7th chapter. Houbigant, however, quotes from Gen. x. 11 of this Codex, a rather puzzling circumstance.
- No. 10. Paris (Harl. De Sancy) Oratory, No. 1. The famous MS. of P. della Valle.
- No. 11. Paris (Dom. Nolin) Oratory, No. 2. Made-up copy.
- No. 12. Paris (Libr. St. Genev.). Of little value.
- No. 13. Rome (Peir. and Barber.) Vatican, No. 106. Hebr. And Sam. texts, with Arab. Vers. In Sam. character. Very defective and recent. Dated the 7th century (?).
- No. 14. Rome (Card. Cobellutius), Vatican. Also supposed to be of the 17th century, but very doubtful. (page 426)
- No. 15. Milan (Ambrosian Libr.) Said to be very ancient; not collated.
- No. 16. Leyden (Goliush MS.), fol., No. 1. Said to be complete.
- No. 17. Gotha (Ducal Libr.). A fragment only.
- No. 18. London, Count of Paris' Library. With Version.

Printed editions are contained in the Paris and Walton Polyglots; and a separate reprint from the latter was made by Blayney, Oxford, 1790. A facsimile of the 20th chapter of Exodus, from one of the *Nablus*

MSS., has been edited, with portions of the corresponding Masoretic text, and a Russian Translation and Introduction, by Levysohn, Jerusalem 1860.¹⁰

II. VERSIONS.

1. *Samaritan*. – The origin, author, and age of the Samaritan Version of the Five Books of Moses, has hitherto- so Eichhorn quaintly observes- “always been a golden apple to the investigators, and will very probably remain so, until people leave off venturing decisive judgments upon historical subjects which no one has recorded in antiquity.” And, indeed, modern investigators, keen as they have been, have done little towards the elucidation of the subject. According to the Samaritans themselves (*De Sacy Mem.* 3; Paulus; Winer), their high-priest Nathaniel, who died about 20 B.C., is its author. Gensenius puts its date a few years after Christ. Juynboll thinks that it had long been in use in the second post-Christian century. Frankel places it in the post-Mohammedan time. Other investigators date it from the time of Esarhaddon’s priest (Schwarz), or either shortly before or after the foundation of the temple on Mount Gerizim. It seems certain, however, that it was composed (page 427) before the destruction of the second temple; and being intended, like the Targums, for the use of the people exclusively, it was written in the popular Samaritan idiom, a mixture of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac.

In this version the original has been followed, with a very few exceptions, in a evidently being of minor consideration. As a very striking instance of this may be adduced the translation of Deut. iii. 9: “The Zidonians call Hermon שרין (Shirion), and the Amorites call it שניר (Shenir).” The translator deriving שרין from שר “prince, master,” renders it רבן “masters;” and finding the letters reversed in the appellation of the Amorites as שניר, reverses also the *sense* in his version, and translates it by “slaves” משעבדון! In other cases, where no Samaritan equivalent could be found for a Hebrew word, the translator, instead of paraphrasing it, simply transposes its letters, so as to make it *look* Samaritan. Occasionally he is misled by the orthography of the original: אם כן אפזא: “If so, where, . . . ?” he renders אפזא “If so, I shall be wrath:” mistaking אפזא for אפז from אף “anger.” On the whole it may be considered a very valuable aid towards the study of the Samar. Text, on account of its very close verbal adherence. A few cases, however, may be brought forward, where the Version has departed from the Text, either under the influence of popular religious notions, or for the sake of explanation. “We pray”- so they write to Scaliger- “every day in the morning and in the evening, as it is said, the one lamb shalt thou prepare in the morning and the second in the evening; we bow to the ground and worship God.” Accordingly, we find the translator rendering the passage, “and Isaac went to pray (למצלאה) in the field.” “And Abraham rose in the morning (בבזקר),” is rendered בצלי, “in the prayer,” &c. Anthtopomorphisms are avoided. “The image (תמונת) of God” is rendered נעימת, “the glory.” פי יהזה, “the mouth of Jehovah,” is transformed into מימר יהזה, “the word of Jehovah.” For אלהים, “God,” מלאכיה, “Angel” is frequently found, &c. A great difficulty is (page 428) offered by the proper names which this version often substitutes, they being, in many cases, less intelligible than the original ones.¹¹ The similarity it has with Onkelos occasionally amounts to complete identity, for instance-

¹⁰ The original intention of the Russian Government to publish the whole Codex in the same manner seems to have been given up for the present. We can only hope that, if the work is ever taken up again, it will fall into more competent hands. Mr. Levysohn’s Introduction, brief as it is, shows him to be utterly wanting both in scholarship and critical acumen, and to be, moreover, entirely unacquainted with the fact that his discoveries have been disposed of some hundred and fifty years since.

¹¹

Onkelos in *Polygott*. – Num. vi. 1, 2.
 ומלל יהוה עם מזשה למימר : מלל עם בני ישראל
 ותימר להון גבר אז אתתא ארי יפריש למדר נדר
 נזירא למזר קדם יהוה : מחמר חדת ועחיק יזר חי
 דחמר חדת וחל דחמר עחיק לא ישחי וכל מחרוח
 ענבין לא ישתי רטיבין ויבישין לא ייכול.

Sam. Vers. In *Barberini Triglott*. – Num. vi. 1, 2.
 ומלל יהוה עם מושה למימר : מלל עם בני ישראל
 ותימר להון גבר או אחא כד יפרש למדר נדר
 נזיר למתנזרה ליהוה : מן חמר ורחט יזיר חמי
 דחמר וחמי דרחט לא ישתא וכל מור שורת ענבין
 לא ישתה וענבין רטיבין ויבישין לא ייכול.

(page 429) But no safe conclusion as to the respective relation of the two versions can be drawn from this.

This Version has likewise, in passing through the hands of copyists and commentators, suffered many interpolations and corruptions. The first copy of it was brought to Europe by De la Valle, together with the Sam. Text, in 1616. Joh. Nedrinus first published it together with a faulty Latin translation in the Paris Polygott, whence it was, with a few emendations, reprinted in Walton, with some notes by Castellus. Single portions of it appeared in Halle, ed. by Cellarius, 1705, and by Uhlemann, Leipz, 1837. Compare Gesenius, *De Pent. Sam. Origine, &c.*, and Winer's monograph, *De Versionis Pent. Sam. Indole, &c.*, Leipzig, 1817.

2. To Σαμαρειτικον. The hatred between the Samaritans and the Jews is supposed to have caused the former to prepare a Greek translation of their Pent. in opposition to the LXX. of the Jews. In this way at least the existence of certain fragments of a Greek Version of the Sam. Pent., preserved in some MSS. of the LXX., together with portions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, &c., is accounted for. These fragments are supposed to be alluded to by the Greek fathers under the name Σαμαρειτικον. It is doubtful however whether it ever existed (as Gesenius, Winer, Juynboll, suppose) in the shape of a complete translation, or only designated (as Castellus, Voss, Herbst hold) a certain number of scholia translated from the Sam. Version. Other critics again (Havernick, Hengstenberg, &c.) see in it only a corrected edition of certain passages of the LXX.

A list of the more remarkable of these, in the case of geographical names, is subjoined:

Gen. viii.4, for Ararat, Sarendib, מרכדיב.

- x.10, ,, Shinar, Tsofah, צופה (?Zobah).
- 11. ,, Asshur, Astun, עסטון.
- ,, Rehoboth, Satcan, מטבן (?Sittacene).
- ,, Calah, Laksah, לקסה.
- 12. ,, Resen, Asfah, עספה.
- 30. ,, Mesha, Mesbal, מסבל.
- xi.9, ,, Babel, Lilak, לילק.
- xiii.3, ,, Ai, Cefrah, כפרה (?Cephirah, Josh. ix.17).
- xiv. 5, ,, Ashteroth Karnaim, Afinitth Karniah, עפינית קרניה.
- ,, Ham, Lishah, לישה.
- 6, ,, El Paron, Pe'ishah, &c., פרום פלישה.
- 14, ,, Dan, Banias, כניאם.
- 15, ,, Hobah, Fogah, פוגה.

Gen. xiv. 17, for Shaveh, Mifneh, מפנה.

- xv. 8, ,, Euphrates, Shalmah, שלמאה.
- 20, ,, Rephaim, Chasah, חסאה.
- xx. 1, ,, Gerar, Askelun, עמקלון.
- xxvi. 2, ,, Mitsraim, Nefik, נפיק (?Exodus).
- xxxvi.8,9,&c. ,, Seir, Gablah, גבלה (Jebal).
- 37, ,, Rehoboth, Fathi, פתי.
- Num. xxi. 33, ,, Bashan, Bathnin, בתנין (Batanaea).
- xxxiv.10, ,, Shepham, 'Abamiah, עבמיה (Apamaea).
- 11, ,, Shepham, 'Afamiah, עפמיה.
- Deut. ii. 9, ,, Ar (ער), Arshah, ארשה.
- iii. 4, ,, Argob, Rigobaah, ריגובאה (Ραγαβα).
- 17, ,, Chinnereth, Genesar, ננמר.
- iv. 48, ,, Sion, Tur Telga, טור תלגא (Jebel et Telj).

3. In 1070 an *Arabic* Version of the Sam. Pent. was made by Abu Said in Egypt, on the basis of the Arabic translation of Saadjah Haggaon. Like the original Samaritan it avoids Anthropomorphisms, besides occasionally making some slight alterations, more especially in proper nouns. It is extant in several MS. copies in European libraries, and is now in course of being edited by Kuenen, Leyden, 1850-54, &c. It appears to have been drawn up from the Sam. Text, not from the Sam. Version; the Hebrew words occasionally (page 430) remaining unaltered in the translation.¹² Often also it renders the original differently from the Samar. Version.¹³ Principally noticeable is its excessive dread of assigning to God anything like human attributes, physical or mental. For יהוה אלהים, "God," we find (as in Saadiah sometimes) *^, "the Angel of God;" for "the eyes of God" we have (Deut. ix.12) *^% "the necessary," &c. Again, it occasionally adds honourable epithets where the Scripture seems to have omitted them, &c. Its language is far from elegant or even correct; and its use must likewise be confined to the critical study of the Sam. Text.

4. To this Arabic version Abu Barachat, a Syrian, wrote in 1208 a somewhat paraphrastic commentary, which has by degrees come to be looked upon as a new Version- the *Syriac*, in contradistinction to the *Arabic*, and which is often confounded with it in the MSS. On both Recensions see Eichhorn, Gesenius, Juynboll, &c.

III. SAMARITAN LITERATURE.

It may perhaps not be superfluous to add here a concise account of the Samaritan literature in general, since to a certain degree it bears upon our subject.

1. *Chronicon Samaritanum*.- Of the Pentateuch and its Versions we have spoken. We have also mentioned that the Samaritans have no other book of our Received Canon. "There is no Prophet but Moses" is one of their chief dogmas, and fierce are the invectives in which they indulge against men like Samuel, "Magician and an Infidel," \$#%¹⁴ (page 431) (*Chron. Sam.*); Eli; Solomon, "Shiloh" (Gen. xlix. 10), "*i.e.* the man who shall *spoil* the Law and whom many nations will follow because of their licentiousness" (DeSacy, *Mem.* 4); Ezra "cursed for ever" (*Lett. To Huntington*, &c.). Joshua alone, partly on account of his being an Ephraimite, partly because Shechem was selected by him as the scene of his solemn valedictory address, seems to have found favour in their eyes; but the *Book of Joshua*, which they perhaps possessed in its original form, gradually came to form only the groundwork of a fictitious national Samaritan history, overgrown with the most fantastic and anachronistic legends. This is the so-called: Samaritan Joshua," or *Chronicon Samaritanum* (&^%), sent to Scaliger by the Samaritans of Cairo in 1584. It was edited by Juynboll (Leyden 1848), and his acute investigations have shown that it was reworked into its present form about A.D. 1300, out of four special documents, three of which were Arabic, and one Hebrew (*i.e.* Samaritan). The Leyden MS. in two parts, which Gesenius, *De Sam. Theol.* P.8. n. 18, thinks unique, is dated A.H. 764-919 (A.D. 1362-1513); -the Cod. In the Brit. Museum, lately acquired, dates A.H. 908 (A.D. 1502). The chronicle embraces the time from Joshua to about A.D. 350, and was originally written in, or subsequently translated into, Arabic. After eight chapters of introductory matter begins the early history of "Israel" under "King Joshua," who, among other deeds of arms, wages war, with 300,000 mounted men- "half Israel"- against two kings of Persia. The last of his five "royal" successors is Shimshon (Samson), the handsomest and most powerful of them all. These reigned for the space of 250 years, and were followed by five high-priests, the last of whom was Usi (?-Uzzi, Ezr. vii.4). With the history of Eli, "the seducer," which then follows, and Samuel "a sorcerer," the account by a sudden transition runs off to Nebuchadnezzar (ch. 45), Alexander (ch. 46), and Hadrain (47), and closes suddenly at the time of Julian the Apostate.

We shall only adduce here a single specimen out of the (page 432) 45th chapter of the Book, which treats of the subject of the Pentateuch:-

Nebuchadnezzar was king of Persia (Mossul), and conquered the whole world, also the kings of Syria. In the thirteenth year of the subjugation they rebelled, together with the kings of Jerusalem (Kodsh). Whereupon the Samaritans, to escape from the vengeance of their pursuer, fled, and Persian colonists

¹² *E.g.* Ex. xliii. 12, כל פטר רחם (Sam. Ver. כל פחזיה רחם) remains ^\$\$: אוא 3, בעל אשה (Sam. Ver. אחא (מחון) is given &^%.

¹³ Thus עירה, Gen. xlix, 11 (Sam. Ver. קרחה "his city"), the Arab. Renders %&*; Gen. xli. 43, אברך (Sam. Ver. כרוז = אטוא), the Arab. Translates *^&^% = אב רך.

¹⁴ A word, it may be observed by the way, taken by the Mohammedans from the Rabbinical (בעיקר) כופר.

took their place. A curse, however, rested upon the land, and the new immigrants died from eating of its fruits (Joseph. *Ant.* ix. 14. §3). The chiefs of Israel (*i.e.* Samaritans), being asked the reason of this by the king, explained it by the abolition of the worship of God. The king upon this permitted them to return and to erect a temple, in which work he promised to aid them, and he gave them a letter to all their dispersed brethren. The whole Dispersion now assembled, and the Jews said, "We will now go up into the Holy City (Jerusalem) and live there in unity." But the sons of Harun (Aaron) and of Joseph (*i.e.* the priests and the Samaritans) insisted upon going to the "Mount of Blessing," Gerizim. The dispute was referred to the king, and while the Samaritans proved their case from the books of Moses, the Jews grounded their preference for Jerusalem on the post-Mosaic books. The superior force of the Samaritan argument was fully recognized by the king. But as each side- by the mouth of their spokesmen, Sanballat and Zerubbabel respectively- charged the other with basing its claims on a forged document, the sacred books of each party were subjected to the ordeal of fire. The Jewish record was immediately consumed, while the Samaritan leaped three times from the flames into the king's lap: the third time, however, a portion of the scroll, upon which the kind had spat, was found to have been consumed. Thirty-six Jews were immediately beheaded, and the Samaritans, to the number of 300,000, wept, and all Israel worshipped henceforth upon Mount Gerizim- "and so we will ask our help from the grace of God, who has in His mercy granted all these things, and in Him we will confide."

2. From this work chiefly has been compiled another (page 433) Chronicle written in the 14th century (1355), by Abu'l Fatah.¹⁵ This comprises the history of the Jews and Samaritans from Adam to A.H. 756 and 798 (A.D. 1355 and 1397) respectively (the forty-two years must have been added by a later historiographer). It is of equally low historical value; its only remarkable feature being its adoption of certain Talmudical legends, which it took at second hand from Josippon ben Gorion. According to this chronicle, the Deluge did not cover Gerizim, in the same manner as the Midrash (*Ber. Rab.*) exempts the whole of Palestine from it. A specimen, likewise on the subject of the Pentateuch, may not be out of place:-

In the year of the world 4150, and in the 10th year of Philadelphus, this king wished to learn the difference between the Law of the Samaritans, and that of the Jews. He therefore bade both send him some of their elders. The Samaritans delegated Ahron, Sumla, and Hudmaka: the Jews, Eleazar only. The king assigned houses to them, and gave each an adept of the Greek language, in order that he might assist them in their translation. The Samaritans rendered only their Pentateuch into the language of the land, while Eleazar produced variations in the respective Pentateuchs, asked the Samaritans the reason of it. Whereupon they replied that these differences chiefly turned upon two points. (1.) God *had* chosen the Mount of Gerizim: and if the Jews were right, why was there no mention of it in their Thora? (2.) The Samaritans read, Deut. xxxii. 35, נִקְרָה לְיוֹם, "to the *day* of vengeance and reward"- the Jews לִי נִקְרָה, "*Mine* is vengeance and reward"- which left it uncertain whether that reward was to be given here or in the world to come. The king then asked what was their opinion about the Jewish prophets and their writings, and they replied, "Either they must have said and contained what (page 434) stood in the Pentateuch, and then their saying it again was superfluous; or more; or less;¹⁶ either of which was again distinctly prohibited in the Thora; or finally they must have *changed* the Laws, and these were unchangeable." A Greek who stood near, observed that Laws must be adapted to different times, and altered accordingly; whereupon the Samaritan proved that this was only the case with human, not with Divine Laws: moreover, the seventy Elders had left them the explicit command not to accept a word beside the Thora. The king now fully approved of their translation, and gave them rich presents. But to the Jews he strictly enjoined, not even to approach Mount Gerizim. There can be no doubt that there is a certain historical fact, however contorted, at the bottom of this (comp. The Talmudical and other accounts of the LXX.), but we cannot now further pursue the subject. A lengthened extract from this chronicle- the original text with a German translation- is given by Schburrer in Paulus' *Neue Repertorium*, 1790, 117-159.

3. Another "historical" work is the *^%&@&** on the history and genealogy of the patriarchs, from Adam to Moses, attributed to Moses himself; perhaps the same which Peterman saw in *Nablus*, and which consisted of sixteen vellum leaves (supposed, however, to contain the history of the world down to the end). An anonymous recent commentary on it, A.H. 1200, A.D. 1784, is in the Brit. Mus. (No. 1140, Add.).

¹⁵ *%&^&^&*&^&^%&^&^*(Bodl.; Imp. Library, Paris). Two copies in Berlin Library (Peterman, Rosen) recently acquired.

¹⁶ Compare the well-known *dictum* of Omar on the Alexandrian Library (Gibbon, ch. 51).

4. Of other Samaritan works, chiefly in Arabic- their Samaritan and Hebrew literature having mostly been destroyed by the Emperor Commodus- may be briefly mentioned Commentaries upon the whole or parts of their Pentateuch, by Zadaka b. Manga b. Zadaqa;¹⁷ further, by Maddib Eddin jussuf b. Abi Said b. Khalef; by Ghazal Ibn Abu-I-Surur Al-Safawi Al-Ghazzi¹⁸ (A.H. 1167-8, A.D. 1753-4, Brit. Mus.), &c. Theological works chiefly in Arabic, mixed with Samaritanisms, by Abul Hassan of Tyre, *On the religious Manners and Customs of the Samaritans and the World to come*; by Mowaffek Eddin Zadaka el Isralli, *A Compendium of religion, on the Nature of the Divine Being, on Man, on the Worship of God*; by Amin Eddin Abu'l Baracat, *On the ten Commandments*; by Abu'l Hassan Ibn El markum Gonajem ben Abulfaraj' Ibn Chatar, *On Penance*; by Muhaddib Eddin Jussuf Ibn Salamah Ibn Jussuf Al Askari, *An Exposition of the Mosaic laws*, &c. &c. Some grammatical works may be further mentioned, by Abu Ishak ibrahim, *On the Hebrew Language*; by Abu Said, *On reading the Hebrew Text* ' @\$@*. This grammar begins in the following characteristic manner:-

"Thus said the Sheikh, rich in good works and knowledge, the model, the abstemious, the well-guided Abu Said, to whom God be merciful and compassionate.

"Praise be unto God for his help, and I ask for His guidance towards a clear exposition. I have resolved to lay down a few rules for the proper manner of reading the Holy Writ, on account of the difference which I found, with respect to it, among our co-religionists- whom may God make numerous and inspire to obedience unto Him!- and in such a manner that I shall bring proofs for my assertions, from which the wise could be in no way differ. But God knows best!

"Rule 1: With all their discrepancies about dogmas or religious views, yet all the confessors of the Hebrew religion agree in this, that the n of the first pers. (sing. Perf.) is always pronounced with Kasra, and that a ' follows it, provided it has no suffix. It is the same, when the suffix of the plural n is added to it, according to the unanimous testimony of the MSS., &c.

The treatise concludes, at the end of the 12th Canon or Rule:-

"Often also the perfect is used in the form of the imperative. Thus it is reported of a man of the best reputation, that he had used the form of the imperative in the passage (Ex. iii. 13), וואמרו לי מה שמו - 'And they shall say to (page 436) me, What is his name?' He who reported this to me, is a man of very high standing, against whose truthfulness nothing can be brought forward. But God knows best!

"There are now a few more words to be treated, of which, however, we will treat *viva voce*. And blessed be His name for evermore."

5. Their Liturgical literature is more extensive, and not without a certain poetical value. It consists chiefly of hymns (Defter. Durrant) and prayers for Sabbath and Feast-days, and of occasional prayers at nuptials, circumcisions, burials, and the like. We subjoin a few specimens from MSS. in the British Museum, transcribed into Hebrew characters.

The following is part of a Litany for the dead:-

אדני · יהוה · אלהים · ברחמיך · ובד · ובשמך
ובכבודך · ובאדוניך · אברהם · ויצחק · ויעקב ·
ואדניך · משה · וכו"

Lord Jehovah, Elohim, for thy mercy, and for Thine own sake, and for Thy name, and for Thy glory, and for the sake of our Lords Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and our Lords Moses and Aaron, and Eleazar, and Ithamar, and Pinehas, and Joshua, and Caleb, and the Holy Angels, and the seventy Elders, and the holy mountain of Gerizim, Beth El. If Thou acceptest [חשים] this prayer [מקרא] = reading], may there go forth from before Thy holy countenance a gift sent to protect the spirit of Thy servant, %\$%# [N. son of N.], of the sons [----]. O Lord Jehovah, in Thy mercy have compassion on him (&^ [or] her), and rest his (her) soul in the garden of Eden; and forgive him (&^ [or] her), and all the congregation of Israel who flock to Mount Gerizim Beth El. Amen. Through Moses the trusty. Amen, Amen, Amen.

The rest is a part of a hymn (see Kircheim's *Carme, Shomron* emendations on Genenius, *Carm. Sam.* iii.):-

1.

There is no God but one,
The everlasting God,
Who liveth for ever;

¹⁷ &%%& (13th century, Bodl).

¹⁸ Under the title &%&&^%&

God above all powers,
 And who thus remaineth for ever.
 (page 437) 2.
 In Thy great power shall we trust,
 For Thou art our Lord;
 In thy Godhead; for Thou hast conducted,
 The world from beginning.
 3.
 Thy power was hidden,
 And Thy glory and mercy.
 Revealed are both the things that are revealed,
 And those that are unrevealed
 Before the reign of Thy Godhead, &c. &c.

IV. We shall only briefly touch here, in conclusion, upon the strangely contradictory rabbinical laws framed for the regulation of the intercourse between the two rival nationalities of Jews and Samaritans in religious and ritual matters; discrepancies due partly to the ever-shifting phases of their mutual relations, partly to the modifications brought about in the Samaritan creed, and partly to the now less now greater acquiescence of the Jews in the religious state of the Samaritans. Thus we find the older Talmudical authorities disputing whether the Cuthim (Samaritans) are to be considered as "Real Converts" גירי אמה, or only converts through fear- "Lion Converts" גירי אריוח in allusion to the incident related in 2 K. xvii. 25 (*Baba K. 38; Kidush 75, &c.*). One Rabbi holds כוחי כגוי "A Samaritan is to be considered as a heathen;" while R. Simon b. Gamaliel- the same whose opinion on the Sam. Pent. we had occasion to quote before- pronounces that they are "to be treated in every respect like Israelites" (*Dem. Jer. ix. 2; Ketub. 11, &c.*). It would appear that notwithstanding their rejection of all but the Pentateuch, they had adopted many traditional religious practices from the Jews- principally such as were derived direct from the Books of Moses. It was acknowledged that they kept these ordinances with even greater rigour than those from whom they adopted them. The utmost confidence was therefore placed in them for their ritually slaughtering animals, even fowls (*Chul. 4a*); their (page 438) wells are pronounced to be conformed to all the conditions prescribed by the Mishnah (*Toseph. Mikw. 6; comp. Mikw. 8, 1*). See, however *Abodah Zarah* (Jer. v. 4). Their unleavened bread for the Passover is commended (*Git. 10; Chul. 4*); their cheese (*Mas. Cuth. 2*); and even their whole food is allowed to the Jews (*Ab. Zar. Jer. v.4*). Compare John iv. 8, where the disciples are reported to have gone into the city of Samaria to buy food. Their testimony was valued in that most stringent matter of the letter of divorce (*Mas. Cuth. li.*). They were admitted to the office of circumcising Jewish boys (*Mas. Cuth. l*)- against R. Jehudah, who asserts that they circumcise "in the name of Mount Gerizim" (*Abodah Zarah, 43*). The criminal law makes no difference whatever between them and the Jews (*Mas. Cuth. 2; Makk. 8*); and a Samaritan who strictly adheres to his own special creed is honoured with the title of a Cuthi-Chaber (*Gittin, 10b; Middah. 77, 5*), &c. This intermediate stage of uncertain and inconsistent treatment, which must have lasted for nearly two centuries, is best characterized by the small rabbinical treatise quoted above- *Massecheth Cuthim* (2nd cent. A.D.)- first edited by Kirchheim (ירושלמי שבע מסי קטנות) Francf. 1851,-the beginning of which reads:- "The ways (treatment) of the Cuthim (Samaritans), *sometimes* like Goyim (heathens) *sometimes* like Israel." No less striking is its conclusion:

"And thy are the Cuthim not permitted to come into the midst of the Jews? Because they have mixed with the priests of the heights" (idolaters). R. Ishmael says: "They were *at first* pious converts (גירי צדיק = real Israelites), and why is the intercourse with them prohibited? Because of their illegally begotten children,¹⁹ and because they do not fulfil the duties of יבם (marrying the deceased brother's wife);" a law which they understand, as we saw above, to apply to the betrothed only. (page 439)

"At what period are they to be received (into the Community)?" "When they abjure the Mount Gerizim, recognize Jerusalem (viz., its superior claims), and believe in the Resurrection."²⁰

¹⁹ The briefest rendering of ממזרים which we can give- a full explanation of the term would exceed our limits.

²⁰ On this subject the Pent. contains nothing explicit. They at first rejected that dogma, but adopted it at a later period, perhaps since Dositheus; comp. The sayings of Jehudda-hadassi and

We hear of their exclusion by R. Meir (*Chul.* 6) in the third generation of the Tanaim, and later again under R. Abbuha, the Amora, at the time of Diocletian; this time the exclusion was unconditional and final (*Jer. Abodah Zarah*, 5, &c.). Partaking of their bread²¹ was considered a transgression, to be punished like eating the flesh of swine (*Zeb.* 8, 6). The intensity of their mutual hatred, at a later period, is best shown by dicta like that in *Meg.* 28, 6. "May it never happen to me that I behold a Cuthi." "Whoever receives a Samaritan hospitably in his house, deserves that his children go into exile" (*Synh.* 104, 1). In Matt. X.5 Samaritans and Gentiles are already mentioned together; and in Luke xvii. 18 the Samaritan is called "a stranger" (ἀλλογενής). The reason for this exclusion is variously given. They are said by some to have used and sold the wine of heathens for sacrificial purposes (*Jer. ib.*); by others they were charged with worshipping the dove sacred to Venus; an imputation over the correctness of which hangs, up to this moment, a certain mysterious doubt. It has, at all events, never been brought home to them, that they really worshipped this image, although it was certainly seen with them, even by recent travelers.

Massudi, that one of the two Samaritan sects believes in the Resurrection; Epiphanius Leontius, Gregory the Great, testify unanimously to their former unbelief in this article of their *present* faith.
²¹ *ns*, Lightfoot "bucella" (?).