

SAMARITAN STUDIES

By THE REV. JOHN BOWMAN, M.A., B.D., D.Phil.

HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

I. THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE SAMARITANS

THE Samaritans today number approximately 300 souls. They were once a large community. Josephus¹ describes their territory as one of the three divisions of Western Palestine. They had a senate² of their own which induced Rome to recall Pilate. They had a diaspora³ throughout most of the Roman Empire. They were a constant worry⁴ to the Jews with whom and with whose Mosaic religion they had so much in common. The Jewish attitude to them varied: they are Israel⁵ or they are not Israel. The earlier Rabbinic sources are the more tolerant.⁶

¹ *B.J.* III. iii. 4.

² Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. iv. 2.

³ They had had a community in Egypt since the time of Alexander. Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* XI. viii. 6. There was a Samaritan community in Rome c. A.D. 500. According to T. B. Gittin 45a Samaritans were in Babylon in the fourth century A.D. Cf. Montgomery, *The Samaritans (The Samaritans in Diaspora)*, (Philadelphia, 1907), pp. 148-53.

⁴ In the time of Antiochus III they sold many Jews into slavery, Josephus, *Antiq.* XII. iv. 1. They deliberately misled Jews as to the appearance of the New Moon; important as it was for calculating Jewish Festivals, M. Rosh HaSh II. 2.

On one occasion they tried to desecrate the Jerusalem Temple on the eve of Passover, Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. ii. 2. On another occasion attacked Jewish pilgrims on the way to Jerusalem, Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. vi. 1.

⁵ In M. Demai iii. 4 Samaritans are regarded as like the Jewish Am-Haaretz, and not Gentile. In M. Demai v. 9 a distinction is made between an Israelite (a Rabbinic Jew (cf. M. Tohoroth iv. 1)) and a Samaritan; but a distinction is also made between a Samaritan and a Gentile. The attitude to the Samaritans was not constant, e.g. T. B. Ber. 47b cites one opinion that the Samaritans did observe the written Law, and in what they observed were more strict than Jews. On the other hand M. Shebiith viii. 10 gives an opinion that he who eats the bread of the Samaritans is like one who eats swine's flesh. Yet the Talmudic Tractate Kuthim declares that Samaritans will be as Jews when they give up their faith in Mount Gerizim and acknowledge Jerusalem and the Resurrection of the Dead.

⁶ One finds the same conspiracy of silence in action against the Sadducees; e.g. cf. how after A.D. 70 the Rabbinic Beth Din was given the title Sanhedrin and the Rabbis' ideas of what its powers should always have been were projected back into the past.

There was, of course, Biblical authority 2 Kings xvii. 24 f.¹ that the Samaritans were non-Israelite incomers and that their religion was a mixture of Yahwism and their former idolatry.² The old libel sticks.

The differing attitude of the Four Gospels to the Samaritans is typical of Judaism. In the Gospel of St. John considerable prominence is given to the Samaritans. Matthew (Matt. x. 5) merely mentions that Jesus commanded the twelve disciples not to enter the cities of the Samaritans. Mark does not mention them at all. Luke (Luke ix. 52 f.) mentions the churlish refusal of the Samaritan village to give Jesus hospitality, but also recounts (Luke x. 33-7) the parable of the Good Samaritan, and states too (Luke xvii. 11-18) that the only leper who returned of the ten healed, was a Samaritan. Luke's attitude to the Samaritans is friendly,³ Matthew's attitude hostile, while Mark's attitude is non-existent.⁴ John's attitude to the Samaritans is different. In the story of the woman at Jacob's well (John iv. 4), the writer makes it quite plain that salvation is of the Jews (verse 22). Yet Jesus admits to the Samaritan woman of his being the Messiah (verse 26). The Jewish term Messiah is used in the Johannine account, but the Samaritan woman was not looking for a Jewish Davidic Messiah.⁵ Several times in John's Gospel, Jesus is

¹ Even if the 2 Kings xvii account were to be taken to mean that *all* Northern Israelites were deported, this is not borne out by other Biblical references to the remnant of Israel in the north after 721 B.C., cf. even 2 Chron. xxx. 6 where Hezekiah sends messengers to Northern Israel: "O people of Israel, return to the Lord, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, that he may turn again to the remnant of you who have escaped from the hand of the kings of Assyria." Chronicles was the first Jewish apologetic against the Samaritans, but does admit here that the northern people were a remnant of Israel.

² Cf. 2 Kings xvii. 33, 34. Even if it once had been true, by New Testament times they had had over 700 years to learn better.

³ Even so, cf. Luke xvii. 18 where the Samaritan is described as "this stranger".

⁴ The fact that Mark does not mention Samaritans may be due to deliberate disregard.

⁵ In John iv. 19 the Samaritan woman is made to say that she perceives that Jesus is "a prophet". For the Samaritans there was, and could be, no prophet after Moses, with one exception, their Messiah or Taheb, the prophet like Moses promised in Deut. xviii. 18. There is the very distinct possibility that the Samaritans understood the Taheb to be Moses returning to earth again. In John's Gospel whereas occasional reference is made to the prophets having

declared to be the prophet which was to come—the expectation based on Deut. xviii. 18. The use of this verse as applied to the Messiah is not attested in Rabbinic writings; ¹ it was the basic text for the Samaritan Messiah or Taheb. In fact, in John vii. 40-3 a division arose among the people as to whether Jesus was that prophet of Deut. xviii. 18 or the Davidic Messiah. Who suggested on that occasion that he was that prophet, the prophet like Moses? Were there Samaritans among the crowd? Gentiles are mentioned but once in John's Gospel and not by Jesus but by the Jews.² The Greeks who came to him (John xii. 30) were obviously Greek Jews up at Jerusalem for the Festival.

In the prologue John the Baptist testifies of Him (John i. 15-17). Andrew in telling Peter testifies (John i. 41) of Him. Nathaniel testifies of Him (John i. 49). The next testimony is that of the Samaritans that He is the Christ, the Saviour of the World (John iv. 42). The Samaritans are further thrown into prominence by John in that the Jews say that Jesus is a Samaritan testified of Jesus, more often it is Moses who is called as witness. And those who recognize Him see Him as that Prophet that is to come (cf. John i. 21; vi. 14; vii. 40) a prediction based on Deut. xviii. 18 the Samaritan Messianic proof text. Deut. xviii. 18 along with Deut. xxvii. 1-7 (reading Gerizim for Ebal (verse 4)) forms part of the extra Samaritan Tenth Commandment in all the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch MSS. This Samaritan Tenth Commandment is old. It stresses that God is to be worshipped on Mt. Gerizim, and then stresses the hope of the coming of the Taheb, the prophet like unto Moses. It is significant that in John iv. after the discussion on where and how to worship God, the Samaritan woman asks if Jesus is the Taheb. The two subjects are both dealt with in the Samaritan Tenth Commandment.

¹ It is possible that it was so used earlier. One is always faced with the difficulty in using Rabbinic sources to know whether the Mishnah and Talmud really represent first century Judaism, or a deliberately edited "Normative Judaism" of later times when the Rabbis had become dominant. In any case Rabbinic Judaism did not stress belief. Haggadic statements only show how any one individual interpreted such and such a verse, or what opinion he suggested could be held. Samaritanism has a creed, a simple creed, which is recited privately before every service and publicly at the beginning of every service. This creed is very old; but Judaism had nothing like a credal statement till the time of Maimonides. Even thereafter emphasis was on orthopraxis, not orthodoxy. See further "Faith in Samaritan Thought" (pp. 308 sqq. below).

² When Jesus said (John vii. 34) that He would go, they would not be able to find Him, the Jews (verse 35) are represented as asking themselves whether he would go to "the dispersed among the Gentiles and teach the Gentiles". In John's Gospel the only non-Jewish community Jesus meets are the Samaritans.

and has a devil. In three other cases (John vii. 20 ; viii. 52 ; x. 20) they say He has a devil. When the Jews say He is a Samaritan and has a devil, Jesus denies the charge of having a devil, and ignores the allegation of being a Samaritan. Obviously He was not a Samaritan.¹

In the great speech on the shepherd of the sheep (John x), Jesus says He has other sheep not of this fold (the Jewish fold) (John x. 16). There will be one shepherd and one flock. He is obviously thinking of Ezek. xxxiv. 22-4, God will judge between His sheep and David His servant will be their shepherd. In Ezek. xxxvii. 15 ff. the prophet is told to take a stick and mark it for Judah and another and mark it for Ephraim, and make them into one stick, the symbol of the re-united Israel and Judah. Later in that chapter we have again the claim that one shepherd will be over them ; David of Judah is to be that shepherd (Ezek. xxxvii. 24). Whatever date we assign to Ezekiel the inhabitants of Northern Israel in his days were Samaritans. It is possible that Jesus when He talks of " the other sheep not of your fold ", is thinking of the Samaritans, the only non-Jewish group in this Gospel who had been approached and who had accepted Him.

In dealing with the Samaritan woman's claims, Jesus showed that salvation was of the Jews, but that He, Jesus, was the fulfilment of the Samaritan Messianic hope. He saw a rich harvest ready in Samaria. The fields are white in harvest² (John iv. 35 ff.). They would reap there what they as Jews have not sown. It is perhaps not without significance that the Samaritan woman is placed soon after the story of Nicodemus (John iii) ; whereas the Jew failed to understand Jesus' teaching of the need for spiritual rebirth, the Samaritan woman seemed impressed by Jesus' teaching about a day when men would worship God neither at Gerizim nor Jerusalem only, but anywhere

¹ It is interesting that in Matthew's reference to the Samaritans, the Disciples are told to concentrate on the lost sheep of Israel ; but there Israel means merely Judah.

² Professor C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (C.U.P. 1954), p. 316, is indeed right in stressing the ultimacy, the finality of the appearance and work of Christ as denoted by Jesus' answer that the fields are already white for reaping ; but the saying may also reflect the preparedness of the Samaritans to receive the Gospel.

in spirit and truth. Just as Jesus' teaching on the one flock one shepherd, was drawn from Ezekiel, a section of Ezekiel closely associated with the re-unification of Northern Israel and Judah, so John iii. 5 on the need for man to be born of water and of the spirit seems to echo Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, the sprinkling with clean water, and the giving of a new heart and new spirit. Jesus' use of the ideas of Ezekiel far transcends their original content, yet it may be significant that both are drawn from this section in which Ezekiel looks forward to the unification of divided Israel.

Is it possible that the Gospel writer while not giving up the Jewish claim that salvation is of the Jews, is showing that Jesus is the fulfilment of all Israel's hope, the hope of Judah and also of the Samaritans who claimed to be the descendants of Northern Israel? If that were so, one might expect to find in the Gospel of John elements which would appear to Jews as Samaritan, and the fact that this was so might lead them to dub Jesus a Samaritan. And when this was done, the writer of the Gospel would deliberately not refute such a charge, hoping thereby to show that there was an element in his version of Jesus' teaching consonant with Samaritan belief. In short, is it not possible that the author of John is trying to make a bridge between Samaritans and Jews in Christ?

But in what way could Jesus' teaching be like the Samaritan? First it is essential to give in brief some Samaritan Theology. There is a Samaritan Theology.¹ Emphasis in Samaritanism is on belief, not on the doing of religious practices as with the Jews.

God created by Ten Words.² With the first Word, "Let

¹ There is little Samaritan Halakah, as they never evolved an Oral Law like the Rabbis, but try to keep the Written Law *au pied de la lettre*. Instead of developing a blueprint to cover all life's actions, actual or putative, like the Jewish Halakah, they concentrated on Theology. The Samaritans are very conservative, and their Theology is very rudimentary. It is possible that Judaism itself once stressed belief as much as the fulfilling of ritual acts, but with the creation of Normative Judaism put the emphasis on the fulfilling of religious requirements. Yet there are various Jewish haggadoth which may once have been constituent parts of some early Jewish Theology. For further development of these points see "Faith in Samaritan Thought", (pp. 308 sqq. below).

² The subsequent statement of Samaritan teaching about Creation, Fall of Man and Original Sin is taken from the Malef which contains the teaching on Bible and Theology taught by Samaritans to Samaritan children. The work may not be old

there be light", God created: "the light, from which was the Holy Spirit which He caused to rest in the loins of the prophets and which He manifested in the image of our Lord Moses in the unseen world and the seen." This light—the Holy Spirit—is regarded as the pre-existent Moses. Creation was for the sake of Moses, who is the highest of all creatures seen or unseen, the source of all light. Adam was created on the sixth day: the angel of the Lord formed him of dust from the earth; God breathed the breath of life into him. Adam was like us, but at the same time different from us as we are now. Adam was like the angels. Adam had no evil impulse. Adam and Eve did not have sexual intercourse¹ in Eden. Eden was holy, and sexual intercourse was impure. Adam and Eve in the Garden were clothed in light. The wicked spirit Belial entered the serpent and enticed Eve. Adam listened to Eve because of the evil

but it is unlikely to contain any innovation, especially as it was used for the teaching of children. In any case its statements can be paralleled by those of the Liturgy, especially is this the case in its teaching about the pre-existent Moses.

¹ This is explicitly stated in the Malef. However, the Malef J. R. (G) 1169, fol. 69b on the ten words of creation says of the ninth. His saying: Be fruitful and multiply (Gen. i. 28) and by this word did the mystery of God take place in man, in the loins of the male was the origin of the seed; and in the belly of the female that very seed is fixed until when it is completed, it returns to the earth. And the human race is (thereby) increased. This section of the ten words of creation precedes the ten commandments; it is brief and takes no account of the Fall story. While there is systematization of belief to some extent in Samaritanism, it would be wrong to look for a fully integrated Theology. Samaritanism probably found it difficult to reconcile Gen. i, ii. In fact it did not try to do so. This section summarizes the ten words of creation and gives them concisely and with little haggadic development.

The Malef, fol. 70a in its section on the ten words of creation while giving them concisely and without haggadic development in general does however stress the primacy of the light of Moses, e.g. "The First (Word) 'And God said, let there be light'. Now the creation of the angels was thus, and the coming into existence of the light from which all the luminaries and the Image and the Spirit were derived. But the origin of the whole was the light of Moses." Cf. also the hymn for the Sabbath of Mo^ced Hag ha-Matzoth, Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy*, (O.U.P., 1909), i. 228-9. What is important is not that here the command to multiply is recognized as Divine, but that there should be a carefully formulated Samaritan story of pre-fallen Man which regarded intercourse in Eden as impossible because unclean. Perhaps the apparent contradiction was not unnoticed by the Samaritan compiler, but he gave the story associating intercourse with fallen man because it was an old tradition which could not be ignored.

impulse he received from her, who in turn had received it from Belial. Adam ate the forbidden fruit. Adam would have died at once, had it not been for the fact that the image¹ of Moses, which was the light of the First Day, was concealed in Adam. "Behold", said God, "Adam has become like one *from him*." (Not as Jews and Christians interpret it, "Like one of us".) The Samaritans say that Moses was the one *from him*,² to know good and evil. Adam on leaving the Garden had his garment of light stripped off and so had Eve; they were given tunics of skin, i.e. fleshly bodies so the Samaritans understand this, and in the skin was the evil impulse. The Samaritans read in the curse put on Adam "thy dust"³ instead of dust. "Dust thou art, and to thy dust shalt thou return." They maintain that this teaches the return of the spirit to the flesh, to its own body's flesh at the resurrection for both spirit and body to be judged. Thereafter the spirit receives a new body of light, and clad in light, not flesh, enters Paradise. Adam on leaving Eden knew Eve eight days thereafter. As a result Cain and his twin sister were born. Then Abel and his twin sister. Those descended from Cain are the sons of Belial.⁴ They are not in the image of God.

¹ Cf. Montgomery (op. cit. p. 228) who knew of a similar concept of the drop of light which passed from Adam through the forbears of Moses until it was fully incarnated in the prophet. Montgomery's remark that this is merely "a replica of the Islamic legend of 'the Light of Mohammed'" proves nothing as to which is the earlier the Samaritan or the Mohammedan legend.

² Gen. iii. 22. This interpretation "from him" may well be old and have had a share in building up the pre-existent Moses legend.

³ Gen. iii. 19. The reading "thy dust" is attested in the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch MSS. This would point to an early proof text for the resurrection being devised by the Samaritans, and before their Bible text was fixed.

⁴ The sons of Belial. The children of Belial are mentioned in Deut. xiii. 13. In the Malef Belial is the name given to the angel-like spirit who enters into the serpent and entices Eve. The reason given by the Malef why Cain's sons are called sons of Belial is that Cain's sister and wife was called Alalah. They were children by Alalah. This is not very convincing. It is possible that the Samaritans had a similar legend to that in Pirke de R. Eliezer (cf. Friedlander's translation, Kegan Paul, 1916, p. 150 and p. 158 f.). It is clear in the Pirke de R. Eliezer that Cain was the result of an illicit union between Sammael and Eve. Pirke de R. Eliezer dwells on the fact that in Gen. v. 3 Seth is said to be in Adam's own likeness after his image; such is said of neither Cain nor Abel. The Samaritans do not deny Adam's paternity of Cain and Abel; but despite the unconvincing etymology of the name sons of Belial, it is not without significance

They are fallen man *par excellence*. Only after Cain had murdered Abel, did Adam repent to God of his own sin. For 100 years, during which period he kept a vow of sexual abstinence, did he repent. After God forgave him, Adam knew Eve again, and Seth and other children were born. God who accepted Adam's repentance, established from him the pure line from which arose the prophet Moses. Apart from the pure line which the Samaritans as the true Israel possess, all mankind is fallen.

The Samaritans compare the two Cherubim¹ over the ark of the Law with the two Cherubim stationed at the gate of Eden to guard the way to the Tree of Life. The Law is the tree of life, eternal life; all who eat of its fruit are potentially inhabitants of Paradise now. The Law is the one way to eternal life. Adam after having sinned had to have the sentence of death passed on him and his descendants. This was the only way in which he could lose the body of the flesh with its evil inclination,² and regain the body of light which was his before he sinned. After the resurrection he becomes a spiritual being clad in light as he originally was. Note that man could not share in eternal life until Moses the Light of the World³ came with the Law; but even then and now too, eternal life is only for the true Israel as the Samaritans regard themselves.

Turning now to John we note the emphasis on the Word, but must admit that there is no developed Logos doctrine in Samaritan that Cain's progeny are called after the name of the tempting spirit Belial of the Samaritan Temptation story. The New Testament John viii. 44 obviously knew of a similar story of the paternity of Cain.

¹ For Cherubim over the ark of the Law, Exod. xxv. 18 ff. For Cherubim at the east of the Garden of Eden, Gen. iii. 24.

² Yetzer ha-Ra.

³ Montgomery also knows of their title, cf. *ibid.* p. 226, but is perhaps rash in alleging it has been derived from Christianity. Montgomery did not see it as part of a comprehensive Samaritan Midrash on Moses. There is a Birth Story of Moses read on the anniversary of his birth, and also during Tabernacles, which gives the complete Moses doctrine. The story is read at a special service.

Marqah in his Memar in the fourth century A.D. witnesses to the central place Moses held in Samaritanism. Unfortunately the whole Memar is not existent; the birth story of Moses is missing. (The missing part of Marqah seems to be referred to in the Molad Mosheh J. R. (G.) 865 read on the anniversary of Moses' birth.) But even so, Marqah can say of Moses that it was on his account that the world was made. Moses is for Marqah the Pure One, the Light on earth. Cf. Montgomery, *ibid.* p. 226.

Theology. In Samaritan Theology light is important : so too in John ; one thinks of John i. 4, In Him was life : and the life was the light of men. John (cf. John i. 8) was not the light, but came that he might bear witness of that light : (John i. 9) which was the true light even the light which lighteth every man coming into the world. (John i. 10) He was in the world, and the world was made by Him and the world knew Him not. (John i. 12) But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the children of God. Very important are Jesus' references to Himself as the light of the world. (Cf. John viii. 12, ix. 5.) Those that believe in Him can become children of light.

To contrast Samaritan ideas with the Johannine: The Johannine pre-existent Christ is active in creation. It is not clear that the light of the First Day, equated in Samaritanism with the Holy Spirit who is Moses, is active in creation. But it is stated that the light of Moses was the origin of the light of the stars and of the spirit of prophecy, i.e. it was used in creation, and was working in men before the coming of Moses in the flesh. In John (John i. 9), the light, the true light lighteth every man which cometh into the world. In Samaritanism this light was in Adam and was transmitted from him through the prophets, i.e. the patriarchs, to Moses. It is not in every man, at the most it was in some Israelites before the coming of Moses. Even after Moses revealed the Law it was made available for Israelites, but not for Gentiles. The Samaritan light which God called into being by His word on the First day of creation was the Holy Spirit and the pre-existent Moses.¹ In John the Holy Spirit is the spirit of Jesus, and Jesus is the light. We have here the identification of Holy Spirit and the Light as in Samaritanism.

As to John viii. 48 there is sufficient in the Johannine picture of Jesus which would suggest to Jews that Jesus was not as the Scribes and Pharisees if we can judge these by the later Rabbinic writings. His emphasis on faith, on belief instead of the fulfilment of ritual religious acts would seem strange. If there is any historical foundation for the speeches in John viii, it is not surprising that the Jews regarded him as a Samaritan. It seems

¹ This may (if we understand Jesus for Moses) be equated with John i. 10, "He (the true light) was in the world, and the world knew Him not".

quite beside the point to interpret John viii. 19 the Jews' question as to "where is your Father?" as an allegation of illegitimacy founded on the Virgin Birth.¹ In any case, the Jews (John vi. 42) had said "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" It is even more tendentious to read into the allegation that Jesus is a Samaritan that this is a reference back to this allegation of illegitimacy, because Samaritans were supposed on the basis of 2 Kings xvii to be illegitimate Jews. In John viii. 33 the Jews declare themselves to be freeborn descendants of Abraham and do not need to be set free. They fail to understand that they are slaves to sin. In verse 39 when they reiterate that Abraham is their father, Jesus points out that their conduct in seeking to kill Him is not the conduct of Abraham, but of Cain. "You do what your father did." Their retort: "We were not born of fornication" is not a reference to any libel on the Virgin Birth. That should be clear enough from the second part of the sentence: "We have one Father even God." According to the Fall story in Pirke de R. Eliezer (ch. xxxi, ed. Friedlander, pp. 150 f.) Sammael using the Serpent as intermediary seduced Eve, and Cain and Abel were born of this fornication. Pirke de R. Eliezer points out that only with Seth was it said that Adam begat in his own likeness, after his image. This had not been said of Cain and Abel. The Samaritan Fall story does not mention the seduction of Eve by Belial, but the sons of Cain are called the sons of Belial. Jesus in John viii. 44 says that his Jewish opponents were of their father the Devil, and it is because they are of his nature that they cannot accept the truth which Jesus tells. Now this was an amazing statement by a Jew about Jewish teachers. Those to whom it was addressed would not have regarded it possible for a Jew to have said that of other Jews. If Jews raked up the old story of 2 Kings xvii. 24 f. about the Cuthean and other settlers of devastated Ephraim, and the Samaritans being the resulting mixed race, their opponents went further and alleged that Jews were no better than Gentiles. The progeny of Cain were the peoples of the land, and these people did marry some of the progeny of Seth. To call Jews, sons of the Devil would be quite in character for a Samaritan;

¹ Cf. *The Fourth Gospel*, Hoskyns and Davey (Faber & Faber, 1940), ii. 392 ff.

for Jews to call Jesus a Samaritan should not be taken literally,¹ it was as if He were acting the Samaritan in expressing such opinions. Even if John's Gospel was written in Ephesus, it is quite wrong to think of the Samaritan Jewish dispute as a local affair.² Samaritans were throughout the Empire. All that space allows in this communication is to point out the possibility that this Gospel sets out the teaching of Jesus in a way that would make it more attractive to the Samaritans; but it does not stop at that; it professes that even Jews regarded it as such. The point of contact between John's Gospel and Samaritan Theology seems to be the ascribing to the pre-existent Christ what Samaritan Theology ascribes to the pre-existent Moses. Further there is the making available for men *now* the possibility of becoming sons of light, of ridding themselves of the burden of the sinful flesh now, which for the Samaritan can only be done in Samaritanism at the end on Resurrection Day, Moses acting there as intercessor only for Samaritans. The Law gave to the Samaritan Eternal Life. To the Christian this comes by belief in Christ. True, for Samaritans Moses intercedes now and at the end. Christ does this for the Christian irrespective of whether he is Samaritan or Jew. And what John saw Christ doing in his generation has been made available by His Spirit, the Spirit of God for the world outside all Israel (both Samaritan and Jewish).

II. FAITH IN SAMARITAN THOUGHT

THE Samaritan Bible is the Pentateuch. The Samaritan interprets the Biblical text literally. There is practically no halakic development as in Rabbinic Judaism based either on

¹ Montgomery (*The Samaritans*, pp. 154-5) asserts that in John viii. 48 the term "Samaritan" means "fool". He believes that this must be the case since Ecclesiasticus speaks of "the foolish race that sojourn in Shechem", and the writer of the Testament of Levi states: "From this day will Shechem be called the city of Fools". One does not find this convincing. Had the term "Samaritan" been a recognized synonym for fool, one would have expected to find examples of the term itself so used.

² From Josephus, *Antiq* XIII. iii. 4, we know how in Egypt they argued with the Jews before Ptolemy as to whether Mt. Gerizim or Mt. Zion was the place chosen by God for this worship.

tradition or artificial Exegesis. Samaritanism in practice is both severer and more lenient than Judaism; severer in that the legal demands of the Torah must be literally obeyed without any modification such as was beloved of the Rabbis; more lenient in that the commandments are not extended in scope either as a fence about the Law or to cover all life as the Rabbis attempted to do. Samaritanism did not present a blueprint for every action in life, but a blueprint for belief. It has always been wrong to speak of Orthodox Judaism at any time in the history of Rabbinic Judaism. Orthodoxy there never was nor is there any; orthopraxis there once was, and is, though today the observance of full orthopraxis is hard indeed. The Rabbinic Judaism which made itself normative from the second century A.D. on, and which is set out in Mishnah and the Talmuds, stresses not only the practice of all that is laid down in the 613 laws of the Torah, but also of the vast mass of additional laws and prohibitions which the Rabbis developed. Rabbinic Judaism offered salvation by works, not by faith. In vain might Maimonides in the Middle Ages draw up thirteen principles which a man must believe, or, he declared, such a one was not a Jew. Samaritanism stressed works—the fulfilment of the 613 laws of the Torah; but faith was equally stressed. There exists for the instruction of children a Samaritan manual¹ which they must learn that they may be sound on the doctrines of their religion and the facts of their history. There is no reason to see this as a late innovation. The doctrines therein set out can be found in their ancient liturgy.

Samaritanism has a Theology, in a sense that Judaism has no Theology; Samaritanism has a Creed in a sense that Judaism very definitely has not. The Samaritan Creed is old. It appears for example in page 3 of the Samaritan Liturgy,² vol. 1, in the opening prayer of the Eve of Sabbath service. "I am that I am, My Lord, we worship none but Thee nor have we (any other) faith but in Thee and in Moses Thy prophet and in Thy scriptures of Truth and in the place of Thy worship, Mount Gerizim, House of God, the Mount of rest, inheritance and the

¹ The Malef Gaster MS. 1169 in the John Rylands Library cf. p. 303 n. 1 above.

² Edited by A. E. Cowley, Oxford Univ. Press, 1909.

divine presence, and in the Day of Vengeance and Retribution."

But before every service the Samaritan priest in his alb purifies himself by washing the hands, mouth, nose, face, and right and left foot, reciting while doing so versicles of Scripture. While washing the face he says the Creed, proclaiming and saying, "there is no God but One. Yahweh is our God, Yahweh is One. There is no God but One. My faith is in Thee, Yahweh, and in Moses the son of Amram, Thy servant, and in the holy Torah, and in Mount Gerizim, House of God, the chosen and hallowed (place), the choicest of the earth. There is no God but One." The Creed here has but four points of belief; the fifth, mentioned in the introductory prayer for the Eve of Sabbath service, belief in the Day of Vengeance and Retribution, is omitted. That the Day of Vengeance is omitted in one form of the Creed does not imply that this is a later addition. The Samaritan belief in the Day of Vengeance based on their reading of Deut. xxxii. 35 is old; ¹ already the LXX knew of it. In some forms of the Samaritan creed the Taheb or Samaritan Messiah is also mentioned in connection with the Day of Vengeance and Retribution. In the Samaritan Tenth Commandment, which declares Mount Gerizim is the place where God is to be worshipped, an appendix follows telling of the coming of the one like Moses, ² the Taheb. ³ The belief is old; in fact it is significant that in John iv the Samaritan woman having stressed (verse 20) the claims of "that Mountain" (i.e. Mount Gerizim) at Shechem as against Zion, and having been enlightened by Jesus as to the manner of true worship, asks (verse 25) if he is the Messiah, or as she as a Samaritan would say, Taheb. One could argue from the mention of the Taheb/Messiah after "that mountain" that the writer ⁴ of the Fourth Gospel knew

¹ Cf. "Early Samaritan Eschatology" by John Bowman in *The Journal of Jewish Studies*, vi, no. 2, 63-72, September 1955.

² Cf. *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*, Von Gall, Giessen, 1918, p. 159, where Deut. xviii. 18 *inter alia* is inserted after Exod. xx. 21.

³ The Taheb is the Samaritan name for the Messiah. The Taheb has nothing to do with any Davidic Messiah, but is the one like Moses. As to the identity of the Taheb, cf. the article mentioned under note 2, p. 67 *ibid*.

⁴ Dr. Jeremias of Göttingen, with whom I discussed this matter at the Society for New Testament Studies at Bangor in September 1955, would agree to this suggestion.

the Samaritan Tenth Commandment in the form in which it appears in the Samaritan Bible.

The prayer in which the Samaritan creed appears is one of the earliest prayers of the Samaritans, probably dating from the service of their Temple which was destroyed by John Hyrcanus in the second century B.C. This prayer belongs to a small number of Samaritan Liturgical pieces which Cowley, the great Samaritan expert, was prepared to recognize as representing the earliest level of the Samaritan Liturgy. In that form of the Samaritan Creed there is mention of belief in God, belief in Moses, in the Scriptures, and in Mount Gerizim and in the Day of Vengeance. It may be that the Taheb doctrine was still outside orthodoxy.¹ Interesting, however, is the fact that there are five points of belief just as there are five fingers to the hand. This may be significant. (The Samaritans do not lay Tefillin as do the Jews, but take Deut. vi. 8 (thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hands) as referring to the Ten Commandments² of Deut. v. 6-21). Above we have sought to demonstrate that the Samaritans have an Article of Faith. But what of their attitude to belief? Each of the five tenets of the Article of Faith is a statement of faith, an intellectual statement of faith, but more than that. There is faith³ in each of the points of belief.

¹ For the growth of the Taheb doctrine, cf. the above mentioned article. At the earliest stage there was no agent but God Himself who would effect deliverance on the Day of the Lord. This was not associated with the End of the World. Later the Taheb, returning one, or restorer, appears as God's agent. With the growth of the belief in Immortality among the Samaritans, there was a tendency among Samaritan sects that denied the resurrection, still to regard the Taheb as merely ushering in a new period of worldly prosperity for the Samaritans in this world. As a result the orthodox Samaritan Theologian Marqah of the fourth century A.D. plays down the Taheb doctrine; in so far as he allows it at all he transfers the Taheb's activities to the end of time.

² Philo, *De Decem Oraculis XII*, divided the Ten Commandments into two groups of five. The Samaritan reading in Deut. vi. 8 is ידִיךְ not דִיךְ associating the Ten Commandments, in two groups of five with the five fingers of one's two hands.

³ While Samaritan Hebrew vocabulary is Pentateuchal and therefore retains the primitive conception of the אֱמֶן, its derivatives for the Samaritans tend to have the intellectual element which Professor C. H. Dodd (*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1954, p. 180) rightly regards as "more prominent in the Greek, while the moral element is more prominent, as it is fundamental, in the Hebrew".

Obviously they give precedence to faith in God in his Unity. Samaritan Liturgy echoes the pathetic faith and trust in God. They use, however, another verb פִּתְּרָא of trust in God. The root פִּתְּרָא with them implies belief in God,¹ not just simple trust but intellectual assent. Their faith in Moses is closely associated with faith in God just as the name of Moses is ever closely associated with that of God throughout their liturgy. There is almost a Samaritan Christology in the name of Moses.²

In John's Gospel, iv. 39, 41, 42, the Samaritans believe in Christ. If by the first century the Samaritans' belief in the Taheb was already incorporated in the fifth article of their creed, and if they saw in Jesus their Messiah or Taheb, we might use the Johannine statement as a guide to the nature of the meaning of faith in Samaritan thought. Faith and knowledge have much in common in John. The Samaritan woman knew³ that Messiah/Taheb cometh, John iv. 25. It was the fifth article of their creed. When she told the Samaritans of Him, they first believed in Him⁴ because of what she said, cf. John iv. 39; but after coming to Him and hearing Him they believed not just because of what she said, but because they had heard Him for themselves and as a result recognized and acknowledged "that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the World". The intellectual basis of their belief is surely strongly marked. The woman at the well had stated the general fact of her belief, "I know that Messias cometh". Now the Samaritans know for themselves that Jesus is He, verse 42; their belief has been fulfilled, and they are convinced that it is so. As in the woman's question to Jesus at the well, John iv. 25, it is unlikely

¹ I.e. credence in.

² Not only in that Moses and the Taheb seem one and the same, but Creation was for the sake of Moses, who is identified with the Holy Spirit. While Samaritanism is strictly monotheistic, the name of Moses is often associated by them with that of God. Moses prays for Samaritans now and at the End on the Day of Vengeance and Recompense.

³ The verb used is not, however, γινώσκειν.

⁴ John iv. 39. Many of the Samaritans ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν; this may stress "the moral element of personal trust or reliance inherent in the Hebrew and Aramaic phrase", as Professor Dodd writes of this construction (ibid. p. 183); but John iv. 42 shows the intellectual basis of their belief. We should, however, not over-emphasize the intellectual, as שָׂדֵי carries the meaning of knowing by means of the whole personality and not merely by the intellect.

that the Samaritans here in John iv. 42 used the word Christ, but rather Taheb. For the Samaritan the Taheb was the one like Moses, or Moses *redivivus*. It is significant that the Samaritans when they acknowledge Christ hail him as the Saviour of the World, John iv. 42, the title which they give to Moses in their liturgy. Elsewhere¹ I have sought to demonstrate that the Fourth Gospel seeks to state the Christian message in a form acceptable to the Samaritans while not jettisoning the fact that salvation is of the Jews, John iv. 22. In the Fourth Gospel no claim is made for the Davidic Messiahship² of Jesus; He is the prophet that was to come; the one like Moses.³

I have suggested above that the Samaritan connotation of faith can be understood as not unlike that given to faith in the Fourth Gospel, where *πίστις* and *γνώσις* have much in common. Can the Samaritan creed be found hinted at in the Fourth Gospel? In chapter iv the fourth and fifth points Gerizim and the Taheb are mentioned. Jesus condemns them for worshipping they know not what (verse 22). This has nothing to do with false Gods,⁴ but presumably the hidebound formalism of Samaritanism is condemned which existed along with their stress on faith. Still they had faith and recognized Christ. The fields were white already to harvest, verse 35, though Jews had not sown the seed there (cf. verse 38).

In chapter v of John, Jesus, when speaking with Jews in Jerusalem, condemns them for not having the love of God in them, verse 42, not believing in Moses, verse 46, nor in his writings, verse 47; cf. also verses 37, 38, where the Jews, it is stated, have not heard God's voice, nor have His word in them;

¹ See I above, pp. 298. sqq.

² Despite John vii. 41, 42. In any case not only do we twice in John's Gospel find Jesus acclaimed by people as the prophet of Deut. xviii. 18 (cf. John vi. 14 and John vii. 40) but Jesus Himself in John iii. 34 and John xii. 49 applies to Himself the proofs of the true prophet mentioned as such in Deut. xviii. 18, 19.

³ The use of Deut. xviii. 18 as applied to the Messiah is not attested in Rabbinic writing.

⁴ Even if the 2 Kings xvii. 33, 34 account had once been true, by New Testament times they had had over 700 years to learn better. Rabbinic Judaism speaks with several voices about the Samaritans but T. B. Ber. 47b cites the opinion that the Samaritans did observe the Written Law, and in what they observed were more strict than Jews.

had they believed in Moses they would have believed in Him of whom Moses testified. One is reminded of points 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the Samaritan Creed, Belief in God, Belief in Moses,¹ Belief in the Law, and Belief in the Taheb.

Belief in Mount Gerizim or in Jerusalem is naturally not inserted.² Such had been condemned in connection with the Samaritans in chapter iv. 21 ff. If we had here the basis of a creed in chapter v. 45-7 it, with the corresponding points in the Samaritan creed, might point to a common creed for Jew and Samaritan. Undoubtedly whether there was a formal creed or not, Belief in God, in Moses, in the Law, was basic to both Jew and Samaritan; the Samaritan, however, added as article 4 that Mount Gerizim is where to worship God, the Jews, Jerusalem. Denial of belief in the divine origin of the Torah, Jews held, excluded a man from the world to come, M. Sanh. XI¹. In John chapter iv. the Samaritans seem, while criticized, to appear more to advantage than the Jews in chapter v. 36-47. Samaritanism was a form of Judaism but of pre-Rabbinic Judaism. Samaritanism stressed faith, sometimes faith in the wrong things, e.g. Mount Gerizim, but faith as well as works was important. Rabbinic Judaism shifted the emphasis from faith to works. The shift in emphasis was only taking place in the first century. It is possible that Faith, as opposed to works in Paul and James respectively, reflects in the early Christian Church what was becoming a burning issue in Judaism. Samaritanism may help us to rediscover a picture of a pre-Rabbinic creed gathering up in five points those things in which one must have faith. *A priori* it is unlikely that Judaism before the blueprint for practice had been developed (and it was not finalized for several centuries) had found it unnecessary to provide its devotees during the Hellenistic epoch with a guide to right belief. M. Sanh. XI¹ excludes from the world to come those that deny belief in the resurrection or in the divine origin of the Torah. Earlier M. Ab. 1¹¹ Abtalion warns against heresy and

¹ Even in Judaism (though there were other prophets and not one prophet Moses), also as in Samaritanism, Moses' position is unique among the sons of Adam. In the same way for Jews the position of the Law is unique among the rest of the books of the Bible.

² Nor was it to be expected.

unbelief. With the reaction in Judaism against belief because of Christianity's stress on belief, emphasis on belief was dropped, but Samaritanism preserved it with of course the substitution of Mount Gerizim for Zion. The antiquity of the Samaritan creed can be seen by the fact that there is no mention of the resurrection unless this is implied in the Day of Vengeance. By the fourth century Samaritans believed in the resurrection. In the Jewish Tractate Kuthim (i.e. Samaritans), which dates from between the second and third centuries, the question is asked, "When will we accept them (the Samaritans)?" To this the answer is given, "When they deny belief in Mount Gerizim and confess (faith in) Jerusalem and in the resurrection of the Dead". This statement is important because it shows that the Jews themselves demanded some sort of assent to a credal statement and further it is significant that the points wherein they want the Samaritans to be corrected are points 4 and 5 of the Samaritan creed. It goes without saying that Jew and Samaritan would agree on belief in God, in Moses and the Law. In which case we have from the Rabbinic side an unintentional testimony to the Samaritan creed. It is perhaps the oldest creed to have survived, and the importance of which is that it is a Hebrew creed, that its articles of faith are primitive and virtually uninfluenced by Hellenism. It would have been recited from the fourth century B.C. to summarize wherein Samaritans differed like the Jews from the heathen Seleucids and Ptolemies and also as Samaritans from the Jews themselves. It is, too, at this period that the Samaritan Sect finally broke with Judaism. Its importance lies in the fact that we need not wait until the fourth century A.D. for the emergence of a credal statement. The idea of a symbol of Belief such as eventually resulted in the Nicene Creed was not without precedent, even in a Hebrew milieu.

III. SAMARITAN LAW AND LITURGY

COWLEY (*Sam. Lit.*, O.U.P., 1909, vol. ii. p. xxi) probably did not realize how truly he had written when he stated: "The reading of the Law, . . . was no doubt the original, as it always remained

the essential, part of the Liturgy." Cowley was thinking of the fourth century A.D. and the work of Baba Raba, the great Samaritan leader of that period. But I venture to suggest that the reading of the Law had already long been established as the basis of synagogal worship, in fact that the reading of the Law, in certain fixed ways had been the main content of worship before the Samaritan schism. If one wants to form a picture of the liturgical service which formed a pattern for the conduct of Divine Service in the synagogue, we find it in Neh. viii on the one hand, and on the other in the Samaritan preparatory service held in the courtyard of their synagogue before the eve of Sabbath service at this present day. Both are entirely made up of readings from the Law.

Neh. viii raises certain problems. Actually there is a double narrative in this chapter as to how the reading of the Law took place and was carried through. In the first, Neh. verses 1-3, the people ask Ezra to come and read in the Law and this he does. In the second, Neh. verses 4 ff., the initiative is with Ezra, and the priests and Levites read the Law. Attention should be paid to what is read. They read *in* the Law. It is not all the words of the Law that are read as Josiah, cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 2, had "read all the words of the Book of the Covenant". Secondly they read the Law *Mephorash*.

Mephorash: this word has been variously understood. Both the R.V., "distinctly", or the R.V. margin, "with an interpretation", have had their defenders. The R.V. "distinctly" has much to commend it, in view of Ezra. iv. 18 where *Mefarash* describes how the king's letter was read. But does 'distinctly', while a safe translation, give the full sense of Neh. viii. 8? In this verse we are perhaps justified in calling in the evidence of Post-Biblical Hebrew. After all, where else does *Mikra* occur in the Bible in the sense it does in this sentence? The Rabbis, cf. T. B. Megillah 3a, understood *Meforash* here as meaning interpretation. But one ventures to ask whether *Meforash* refers to the Book and not to how they read. Are we to understand that the Book was divided up into sections? But even if this is inadmissible can it be that they read the Law divided into sections? The last two words of the sentence are translated in

the R.V. as "so that they understood the reading", or in the margin, "and caused them to understand the reading". Both are infelicitous. Mikra as "reading" in the O.T. is only here. True in Ber. ii. 1 and Meg. 3a Mikra means reading, but Sotah v. 2 gives two examples of Mikra as Biblical text or verse. Witton-Davies¹ was right in suggesting Mikra as section, and we would do well to translate the end of Neh. viii. 8 "and they understood each section."

Supposing that to be the correct translation of the last two words of Neh. viii. 8, what sort of section could we expect in the time of Ezra? It would certainly not be a verse. The earliest sections were the Parashiyyot not the fifty-four weekly Parashahs in the one yearly cycle, nor the 158 or 154 Sedarim of the three yearly cycle, but the small Parashahs or paragraphs. It is important to note that this use of "Parashah" as meaning "short section" or "paragraph" is old: e.g. in M. Sotah vii. 8 we are told how King Agrippa read the Law at the end of Sukkoth in the eighth year. This ceremony was held in the Temple Court, he and the priests were on a platform there erected. The origin of the ceremony is indebted to Deut. xxxi. 10 where the Priests, Levites etc. are to read the Law to the people at the close of the first day of Sukkoth in the eighth year, and to Deut. xvii. 18, 19 where the king is told to read the Law. That the ceremony mentioned in the Mishnah is indebted to Deut. xxxi. 9-13 is clear from the fact that Deut. xxxi. 10 is itself quoted in M. Sotah vii; but the Deuteronomic instruction regarding the king's reading of the Law implies only private study. Neh. viii is not cited in Mishnah Sotah vii. 8, nor is 2 Kings xxiii where we have the Biblical occurrence of a public reading of Deuteronomy to the people by the king. Yet Mishnah Sotah vii. 8 probably owes something to 2 Kings xxiii; e.g. the choice of the place of reading—the Temple Court. But Mishnah Sotah vii. 8 probably owes something to Neh. viii as to how it was read, e.g. on a platform specially set up. It may be that the connection as to how it was read both in Neh. viii and Mishnah Sotah vii. 8 does not end merely with that.

¹ *The Century Bible, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther*, p. 223.

In passing we might note that it could be argued that Neh. viii looks back to 2 Kings xxiii. Ezra takes the king's place in the reading of the Law; for one or both of two reasons: (a) in this chapter, cf. the incident of Sukkoth, Neh. viii. 17, there is a recalling of the people to the practices of the days of Joshua, the accredited successor of Moses, just as 2 Kings xxiii recalls the people to the Mosaic Covenant. In any case Neh. ix which must be taken along with Neh. viii, is parallel to 2 Kings xxiii in that the people swear to abide by the Law. But (b) there is also the significant fact that in Neh. viii the priest takes the place of the king, probably denoting the beginning of the Theocracy. But as to the time when this event took place, in Sukkoth in the eighth year, Neh. viii stands near Deut. xxxi. 10, 11. But there may have been old elements in the picture given in Mishnah Sotah vii. 8. There we are told the sections—the Parashahs which the king read. These on the whole are small. Just how small a Parashah could be is to be seen from M. Taanith iv. 3 where it is stipulated that the Maamad who read daily in the Temple the verses of creation, Gen. i, appropriate to the day of the week, could split the Parashah if it was too long.

I suggest that the Torah was read to the people in Neh. viii. 8 in sections, not necessarily immediately consecutive sections, but sections representative of the teaching of the Law. Certainly that was what was done in M. Sotah vii. 8 by the king; there, however, the sections were taken only from Deuteronomy—an obvious looking back to Deut. xvii. In the Modern Samaritan preparatory service before the eve of Sabbath service, the Law is read in the courtyard of the Synagogue not by one individual, but by all the Priests the Levites, cf. Neh. viii (note there is no valid reason to alter |יקרא| verse 8 to the singular if we realize that in this section of that chapter, it is the Levites and possibly too the priests who are reading). The Parashahs in the modern Samaritan service range from the first chapter of Genesis to the end of Deuteronomy. The emphasis is on the Sabbath, and relevant Parashahs in the Law find considerable place, just as sections on Sukkoth were presumably read on the day which Neh. viii describes, cf. *ibid.* verses 14, 15. The Samaritan Parashahs of a manuscript written in 1944 are the same as those of

a MS. J.R.(G.) 1852 written in the seventeenth or eighteenth century. There is a long interval of time between the days of Ezra and the eighteenth century. It was probably soon after the people heard the Law read by Ezra and the priests the levites and had sworn to obey it, on this day that Neh. viii. purports to describe, that the Samaritans were cast off. If, of course, Neh. vii. 73b-x should really follow after Ezra x, schism had already started before the events recorded in Neh. viii. But the Samaritans have the same Torah as the Jews; true, there are variant readings, some of which are patently to the glory of Gerizim, yet in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Jewish we find section divisions which are in principle strikingly similar and which sometimes agree exactly. I refer to the Qatzim of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the little Parashah which correspond to the Petuhot and Setumot divisions of the Jewish Bible.

In the Samaritan Pentateuch MSS. the number of Qatzim in any one book of the Pentateuch is always carefully listed at the end of the book; we, of course, find the same thing done for the comparable Petuhot and Setumot divisions in the masorah of the Jewish Bible. In the printed Jewish Bible we find the Setumot and Petuhot marked by D and D respectively. The insertion of D and D to denote such divisions is found in late codices. Whereas Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* introduces the signa D and D the Leningrad Bible Codex, its basic text, (like also all the present day Synagogue Scrolls in this respect), indicates the Petuhah either by leaving an unfinished line with space for three triliteral words and beginning the new section on the next line; or if there is not such space at the end of the last line of the completed Petuhah, the next line is left entirely blank and the new open section begins on the line following that left vacant. The Setumah in the Leningrad Codex begins either with an indented line like that at the beginning of our paragraphs, if the previous line is filled; or if the previous section ends in the middle of the line, a minor break is made in the line, and the new Setumah section begins on the selfsame line as the previous one. From the amount of space left vacant between paragraph and paragraph, one could know by that alone whether the little parashah is setumah (closed) or petuhah (open). The proper way in which

either type of Parashah is to be written is set out in *Masekta Sopherim* ch. i, para. 18. The historical importance of *Masekta Sopherim* has in the last few years been vindicated by the Dead Sea MSS. The *Petuhot* and *Setumot* divisions were extended from the Torah to the *Haftarot*, though the *Petuhot* and *Setumot* of the latter have not been so rigidly established as those of the Torah. The *Petuhot* and *Setumot* divisions are already seen in the Qumran Isaiah texts. If the *Petuhot* and *Setumot* sectionalisation of the Torah precedes that of the *Haftarot*, then even if one does not accept my hypothesis that the Law was sectionalized for liturgical use before the Samaritan schism, yet such sectionalisation must date from before the second century B.C. If the Samaritans have borrowed from the Jews in this treatment of the text of the Law, it must have been no later than the middle of the fourth century B.C. Actually the Samaritans believe God revealed the Law to Moses in the existing *Qatzim*.

The late Haham Gaster in *Studies and Texts*, i. 503 ff., "The Biblical Lessons", seized on a highly significant fact that there is a real relationship between the paragraph divisions in the Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Samaritan Hebrew Text. But it is not enough to compare the first few chapters of Genesis as he did, cf. *ibid.* pp. 518-19 with striking results and then regard the matter established for the whole Law. In the first place there are 240 *Qatzim* in the Samaritan text of Genesis as against 43 *Petuhot* and 48 *Setumot* in the Masoretic Genesis. The Samaritans do not distinguish between *Petuhot* and *Setumot*; where the Samaritan *Qatzim* and Jewish *Parashahs* do agree, the *Qatzim* agree either with both *Petuhot* and *Setumot* or with the beginning of the one and ending of the other, or vice versa. It may be that the distinction between *Petuhot* and *Setumot* came not at the first stage in the paragraphing of the Pentateuchal text. But note the discrepancy in the paragraphing of Genesis, between 240 *Qatzim* on the one hand and 91 *Parashahs* (*Petuhot* and *Setumot*) on the other. In Exodus the Samaritan text has 200 *Qatzim* and the Jewish 98 *Parashahs* (*Petuhot* and *Setumot*). In Numbers the Samaritan has 218 *Qatzim* and the Jewish 158 *Parashahs* (*Petuhot* and *Setumot*). In Deuteronomy the Samaritan has 166 *Qatzim* and the Jewish 158 *Petuhot* and *Setumot*. In the whole Samaritan

Torah there are 960 Qatzim while in the Jewish there are 769 Parashahs both Petuhot and Setumot. It is plain that the Qatzim and the Jewish Parashahs are not by any manner of means identical. But examination shows that they are not all different. Some are indeed identical and those that are identical have played or still play a part in the Jewish or Samaritan Liturgy. Take for example Gen. i-ii. 3 which the Samaritans call the Qatze ha-Beria; there the Qatzim and Petuhot entirely agree. We know from M. Taanit iv. 3 of the liturgical use of Gen. i in the Temple service. Every Samaritan service begins with the Qatze ha-Beria. Take the Qatzim which are read as the preparatory service in the courtyard of the synagogue half an hour before the evening service begins. There are twenty sections read. Fourteen of these Qatzim agree entirely with Jewish paragraph divisions, some starting with Setumah and ending with Petuhah and vice versa it is true, however. The other six begin or end with one of the Jewish paragraph divisions. Or we may take the portions read by the High Priest in M. Yoma vii. 1, Lev. xvi. 1-34, Lev. xxiii. 26-32, Num. xxix. 7-11. The paragraphing of these citations agrees in both Samaritan and Jewish Bibles. Then again with the paragraphs of the king, cf. Mishnah Sotah vii, one finds complete agreement between Samaritan and Jewish paragraphing.

With the references in M. Megillah iii. 5 the sections of the Jewish Torah read at Pentecost, New Year, Tabernacles, and Rosh Hodesh agree with the Samaritan Qatzim exactly while the section read on the Day of Atonement is an aggregate of 6 Qatzim Lev. xvi. 1-34; the portion read on the Day of Fasting Lev. xxvi. 3-46 is itself three sections in the Jewish text, but eight Qatzim in the Samaritan, only the first of which Lev. xxvi. 3-13 agrees with one of the three Jewish divisions. But in the case of two of the readings by the High Priest for the Day of Atonement M. Yoma vii. 1, Lev. xxiii. 26-32 and Num. xxix. 7-11 we find absolute agreement between Samaritan and Jewish paragraph divisions. In the remaining reading Lev. xvi. 1-34 five Samaritan Qatzim are equivalent to one Jewish Petuhah. It is interesting that the High Priest after reading Lev. xvi. 1-34 and Lev. xxiii. 26-32 used to roll up the scroll of the Law, and put it in his bosom and

say, " More is written here than I have read out before you ". In other words he read only the two selected Parashahs. In some of the above examples it can be argued that the places where the divisions are made are purely sense divisions and do not denote a common tradition. But the word for word agreement in the beginning and end of sections is, however, hardly other than the result of a common policy. A common policy existed only before the Samaritan schism, when it would seem likely that sections were indeed already chosen for liturgical use. It is more likely that only after the schism the *whole* Law would be divided into sections, not only so but it was thereafter that the Jewish recension was divided into two forms of paragraphs, Petuhot and Setumot.

The Samaritan weekday morning and evening services still stress the Law as the essential part of the Liturgy. In six days the whole Law is read in Qataf form. The whole series of Qetafim or digests read on the weekdays is gathered up and gone through again in the first half of the Samaritan Sabbath morning service, with one difference ; this consists in references in the Sabbath recapitulation of the weekday Qetafim, to the Sabbath itself. Qetafim are a sort of digest of the Law, in the words of the Law ; rarely full verses are used, but generally snippets of verses which in the Qetafim spread out over the six weekdays and recapitulated en bloc on Sabbath, make up an intelligible shortened form of the Law. The references to Sabbath in the Qataf of the Law read on Sabbath (of which consist the only points of difference between the ordinary Sabbath Qataf and that of the six weekdays) when listed, are found to be snippets of the Parashahs read at the preparatory service on the eve of Sabbath. This fact helps to establish the relation between Qetafim and Parashahs.

Having established a relationship between the references to the Sabbath in the Sabbath morning Qataf of the Law, and the full Parashahs dealing with the Sabbath, read at the Friday evening preparatory service, we can go farther and reconstitute from the rest of the Qetafim common to weekday and Sabbath what Parashahs were read by the Samaritans in the six weekdays and on the Sabbath morning service. First it is necessary to find

into what particular Qatz the individual piece or pieces of Qataf fall. It is interesting to note whether such Qatzim agree with Petuhot and Setumot divisions. Actually in the whole of Genesis, 4 Qatzim out of 64 agree with Jewish paragraphs; 11 Qatzim and Jewish Parashahs have a common beginning and one a common ending. In Exodus out of 51 Qatzim, 16 Qatzim and Jewish Parashahs completely agree, while 8 have a common beginning or ending. In Leviticus 4 Qatzim out of 23 entirely agree with Jewish Parashahs; 5 have the same beginning or ending as the Parashahs. In Numbers, 12 out of 39 Qatzim agree with Jewish Parashahs; 12 others have the same beginning or ending as Jewish Bible paragraphs. In Deuteronomy 16 Qatzim out of 64 agree with Jewish Parashahs; 20 others have the same beginning or ending. We may summarize the findings thus: there is complete correspondence between more than one fifth of the Qatzim from which the Qetafim are derived, and the Jewish Parashahs either Setumah or Petuhah. However, in addition, there are as many again which do show some point of contact. Therefore we may say that just under half of the Qatzim in question are identical or related in some way to Jewish Parashahs. The ratio is not constant for the various books, being higher for Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy than for Genesis. If one studies my tables of Qatzim, each of which is represented by a phrase or phrases in the Qataf of the whole Law read on Sabbath morning, one will see that to go through the whole series of these Qatzim *in toto* with the addition only of Tishbahot and Segudot makes a very lengthy service. It is likely that we have a twofold process at work in connection with the Qetafim. The Parashahs originally used were "Qataffed" to make space for liturgical compositions, and then when the Qataf form was established in the liturgy, Parashahs originally not represented, could now be drawn on to provide a word or phrase for the Qataf which now represents more Parashahs in the Torah than could ever have been originally read. Do those Qatzim and Parashahs which do agree represent a basic stock of passages read before the schism?

The actual form of the Qataf was established carefully, and one can find the very same sentences chopped up and affixed to

the very same other truncated sentences in Samaritan Liturgical MSS. of the twelfth or fourteenth centuries and those of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. But the Qetafim were older than that. Already in the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, eighth or ninth century A.D., reference is made (ch xxxviii) to the Samaritans having the law in *Notarikon*—shorthand—an obvious but perhaps none too friendly reference to the Qetafim. Farther back we perhaps can go to a *Baraitha* on T.B. *Sotah* 35b that the notarii of the Ammin got the Law from the stones set up by Joshua (cf. Deut. xxvii. 2, 3, 4, Joshua ix. 4, 3, 6-32); and therefore their texts were defective. This may refer to the Samaritans and their abbreviated forms of the Law, their digests known as Qetafim. The Qataf form must be old, but it is likelier that the reading of passages in full, selected from throughout the whole Law, is older, since the custom is known and approved by both Jews and Samaritans; cf. *Mishnah Sotah* vii. 8 paragraphs of the king, and the Samaritan service for Sabbath eve.

If one wants to get a picture of a modern Samaritan service one should read *Neh. viii.* There we have reference to expressions of blessing and praise (verse 6) mentioned before the readings from the Law. In the days of *Sukkoth* mentioned at the end of the chapter they read Law every day, and on Sabbath, *Sukkoth* Festival and *Shemini Asereth* (these last two forming two Festivals). Of the days of *Sukkoth* five are ordinary days. I venture to maintain that what happened at that *Sukkoth* set the pattern for Samaritan Liturgy. They had there a pattern for weekday and Sabbath. When they left the Jews, they took the Law and a pattern of how to use the Law as liturgy. In the fourth century A.D. *Marqah* and *Amram Darrah* composed set liturgical compositions which were interposed between the free brief expressions of blessing and praise and the readings from the Law. But the brief expressions of blessing and praise also were retained. The Qataf form of reading the Law was introduced then into services to curtail the time spent on reading the Law even in *Parashahs*. The Law, every word of the five books, could not be read in one service. Already by the time of *Ezra*, or so the *Chronicler* thought, some definite section, division of the Law, had been achieved to allow for set representative passages of

the Law to be read in a manageable time in Divine Worship. The Samaritans adopted this, since it had been devised and approved before the schism. Later, when liturgical compositions were inserted, the Samaritans still contrived to give the Law the main place, if not the only place, in Divine Worship, by use of the Qataf form which allowed for even greater brevity of time in reading, but great comprehensiveness.

It is true to say that the Samaritans more than any other community in the Jewish nexus bear witness, albeit unwillingly, to the work of Ezra, as pictured in Neh. viii. The Law is still the central element in all their services. They have the yearly reading of the Law in fifty-four big Parashahs week by week at the noon service on Sabbath the climax of the week's devotion. Though these seldom agree with the Jewish Parashahs, like the Jews, the Samaritans begin the new yearly cycle of the reading of the Law at the end of Sukkoth. Like the Jewish yearly cycle the weekly Parashah, say at Passover, has nothing to do with the Passover story. The Samaritans, however, include in the Qataf at Passover complete sections from Exodus dealing with the Passover story. At the end of the morning service these complete sections are read again by themselves. Judaism, too, on Festivals inserts in the liturgy paragraphs from the Bible relating to the Festival in question. These, as also in the case of the Samaritan Qetafim and Festival Biblical paragraph readings, are read from the Prayer Book. Have we something in common here? Are the Biblical citations in the Jewish Festival Liturgy the last relic of a Jewish Divine service, based on readings of Parashahs from the Law, into which selections of Biblical paragraphs, pieces germane to any special Festival could be inserted? The old form of Divine Service, the reading of a cento of little Parashahs, a selection of small sections in full, is not dropped. The Samaritans are too conservative; it is relegated to the preparatory service before the eve of Sabbath service.

EVE OF SABBATH SAMARITAN PREPARATORY SERVICE

Gen. i. 31; Gen. ii. 1-3; Exod. xvi. 4-10; Exod. xvi. 11-21; Exod. xvi. 22-7; Exod. xvi. 28-36; Exod. xx. 8-11; Exod. xxiii. 10-13; Exod. xxiii. 20-7;

(Exod. xxx. 11-16 Said on the Sabbath of the Conjunction); Exod. xxxi. 12-17; Exod. xxxiv. 18-26; Exod. xxxv. 1-3; Lev. xix. 23-32; Lev. xxiii. 1-8; Lev. xxiii. 15-22; Lev. xxiv. 1-9; Lev. xxv. 47-xxvi. 2; Lev. xxvi. 3-13; Lev. xxvi. 42-6; Num. vi. 23-7; Num. x. 1-11; Num. xv. 32-6; Num. xxviii. 1-10; (Num. xxviii. 11-15 Said if the beginning of month occurs on the eve of the Sabbath); Deut. v. 12-15; Deut. vi. 4-9; Deut. vi. 20-5; Deut. x. 12-xi. 1; (Deut. xvi. 1-8 Said on Sabbaths of the First Month) (Deut. xxx. 11-14 Said on the last two Sabbaths before Pentecost); Deut. xxxi. 9-13; Deut. xxxiii. 1-7; Deut. xxxiii. 8-11; Deut. xxxiii. 12-17; Deut. xxxiii. 18-19; Deut. xxxiii. 20-1; Deut. xxxiii. 22-3; Deut. xxxiii. 24-7; Deut. xxxiii. 28-9; Deut. xxxiv. 1-4; Deut. xxxiv. 5-7; Deut. xxxiv. 8-9; Deut. xxxiv. 10-12.

QATZIM FROM WHICH THE QETAFIM ARE CONSTRUCTED

(The References are according to the Samaritan Hebrew Text as edited by Von Gall, *Der Hebraischer Pentateuch der Samaritaner* Giessen 1918.)

Gen. ii. 8-14; Gen. ii. 15-20; Gen. iii. 1-8; Gen. iv. 25-v. 2; Gen. v. 21-4; Gen. vi. 7-12; Gen. vi. 17-22; Gen. vii. 1-5; Gen. vii. 17-23; Gen. viii. 1-5; Gen. viii. 15-21a; Gen. viii. 21b-ix. 1; Gen. xii. 1-6; Gen. xii. 7-9; Gen. xiii. 14-18; Gen. xiv. 18-24; Gen. xv. 1-11; Gen. xv. 17-20; Gen. xvii. 1-8; Gen. xvii. 21-6; Gen. xviii. 13-19; Gen. xix. 18-23; Gen. xx. 1-7; Gen. xx. 14-18; Gen. xxi. 22-26; Gen. xxi. 27-33; Gen. xxii. 1-6; Gen. xxii. 7-10; Gen. xxii. 11-14; Gen. xxii. 15-19; Gen. xxiv. 1-7; Gen. xxiv. 10-14; Gen. xxiv. 34-41; Gen. xxiv. 42-51; Gen. xxiv. 62-7; Gen. xxv. 7-11; Gen. xxv. 19-28; Gen. xxvi. 1-5; Gen. xxvi. 12-23; Gen. xxvi. 24-35; Gen. xxvii. 21-33; Gen. xxviii. 1-9; Gen. xxviii. 16-22; Gen. xxxi. 11-16; Gen. xxxii. 4-9; Gen. xxxii. 10-14; Gen. xxxiii. 18-20; Gen. xxxv. 1-5; Gen. xxxv. 6-8; Gen. xxxv. 9-20; Gen. xxxvii. 1-4; Gen. xxxvii. 5-8; Gen. xxxvii. 29-36; Gen. xxxix. 1-6; Gen. xliii. 11-14; Gen. xlvi. 1-7; Gen. xlvi. 14-16; Gen. xlix. 16-18; Gen. xlix. 22-8; Gen. l. 24; Gen. l. 25; Gen. v. 26.

Exod. i. 1-7; Exod. ii. 1-10; Exod. ii. 23; Exod. iii. 6; Exod. iii. 7-13; Exod. iii. 14-17; Exod. iv. 2-5; Exod. vi. 2-9; Exod. vi. 20-28; Exod. ix. 27-34; Exod. xii. 13-20; Exod. xii. 21-8; Exod. xiv. 10-14; Exod. xiv. 19-25; Exod. xiv. 26-xiv. 31; Exod. xv. 1-18; Exod. xv. 22-6; Exod. xvi. 22-7; Exod. xvi. 28-36; Exod. xvii. 14-16; Exod. xviii. 8-12; Exod. xix. 1-9; Exod. xix. 21-5; Exod. xx. 1-7; Exod. xx. 8-11; Exod. xx. 12-17a; Exod. xx. 17b; Exod. xx. 18-21a; Exod. xx. 21b; Exod. xx. 22-6; Exod. xxii. 24-xxiii. 2; Exod. xxiii. 10-13; Exod. xxiii. 20-7; Exod. xxiii. 28-32; Exod. xxiv. 1-11; Exod. xxiv. 12-18; Exod. xxv. 1-9; Exod. xxvii. 9-19a; Exod. xxvii. 19b-21; Exod. xxviii. 1-5; Exod. xxviii. 15-21; Exod. xxviii. 22-30; Exod. xxviii. 36-43; Exod. xxix. 29-37; Exod. xxix. 38-46; Exod. xxxi. 12-17; Exod. xxxii. 9-14; Exod. xxxii. 21-9; Exod. xxxiii. 1-4; Exod. xxxiii. 5-11; Exod. xxxiii. 17-23; Exod. xxxiv. 1-9; Exod. xxxiv. 10-17; Exod. xxxiv. 18-26; Exod. xxxv. 1-3; Exod. xxxvi. 2-7; Exod. xxxix. 32-43; Exod. xl. 33-7.

Lev. ii. 4-16 ; Lev. iii. 12-17 ; Lev. vi. 1-6 ; Lev. vii. 11-21 ; Lev. ix. 12-21 ;
 Lev. ix. 22-x. 2 ; Lev. x. 8-10 ; Lev. xi. 39-47 ; Lev. xv. 25-33 ; Lev. xviii. 1-23 ;
 Lev. xix. 1-8 ; Lev. xix. 9-19 ; Lev. xix. 23-32 ; Lev. xix. 33-7 ; Lev. xxi. 1-9 ;
 Lev. xxi. 10-15 ; Lev. xxii. 26-33 ; Lev. xxiii. 1-8 ; Lev. xxiv. 1-9 ; Lev. xxvi. 1-2 ;
 Lev. xxvi. 3-13 ; Lev. xxvi. 42-6 ; Lev. xxvii. 34.

Num. iii. 1-4 ; Num. iii. 27-32 ; Num. iv. 13-16 ; Num. v. 5-10 ; Num. vi. 13-21 ;
 Num. vi. 22-7 ; Num. ix. 15-23 ; Num. x. 1-10a ; Num. x. 10b ; Num. x. 29-36 ;
 Num. xi. 1-10 ; Num. xii. 4-13 ; Num. xiv. 11-19 ; Num. xiv. 20-5 ; Num. xv.
 1-7 ; Num. xv. 32-6 ; Num. xv. 37-41 ; Num. xvi. 1-7 ; Num. xvii. 1-5 ;
 Num. xvii. 6-8 ; Num. xvii. 9-15 ; Num. xviii. 20-4 ; Num. xx. 14-22 ;
 Num. xxi. 1-3 ; Num. xxi. 4-7 ; Num. xxiv. 1-2 ; Num. xxiv. 3-10 ; Num. xxv.
 1-9 ; Num. xxv. 10-15 ; Num. xxvii. 12-17 ; Num. xxvii. 18-23b ; Num. xxix.
 35-xxx. 1 ; Num. xxxi. 1-8 ; Num. xxxi. 25-31 ; Num. xxxi. 32-41 ; Num. xxxii.
 6-15 ; Num. xxxii. 28-32 ; Num. xxxiv. 16-29 ; Num. xxxvi. 13.

Deut. i. 1-8 ; Deut. i. 9-18 ; Deut. ii. 2-7 ; Deut. iii. 18-22 ; Deut. iii. 23-6 ;
 Deut. iv. 1-4 ; Deut. iv. 5-8 ; Deut. iv. 9-11 ; Deut. iv. 12-20 ; Deut. iv. 21-4 ;
 Deut. iv. 25-iv. 40 ; Deut. v. 1-5 ; Deut. v. 6-11 ; Deut. v. 12-15 ; Deut. v. 16 ;
 Deut. v. 17 (forming 4 Qatzim) ; Deut. v. 18a ; Deut. v. 18b ; Deut. v. 19-25 ;
 Deut. vi. 10-19 ; Deut. vi. 4-9 ; Deut. vi. 20-5 ; Deut. vii. 12-16 ; Deut. vii.
 17-26 ; Deut. viii. 1-3 ; Deut. viii. 5-10 ; Deut. viii. 11-20 ; Deut. ix. 1-5 ;
 Deut. ix. 25-9 ; Deut. x. 12-xi. 1 ; Deut. xi. 2-9 ; Deut. xi. 22-30 ; Deut. xiii.
 13-19 ; Deut. xiv. 1-8 ; Deut. xiv. 22-7 ; Deut. xviii. 9-16 ; Deut. xx. 1-9 ;
 Deut. xxi. 1-9 ; Deut. xxiii. 16-21 ; Deut. xxiv. 10-13 ; Deut. xxvi. 1-11 ;
 Deut. xxvi. 12-15 ; Deut. xxvii. 9-26 ; Deut. xxviii. 1-11 ; Deut. xxviii. 12-14 ;
 Deut. xxix. 9-12 ; Deut. xxxi. 1-6 ; Deut. xxxi. 7-8 ; Deut. xxxi. 9-13 ; Deut.
 xxxi. 16-18 ; Deut. xxxi. 19-21 ; Deut. xxxi. 24 ; Deut. xxxi. 25-9 ; Deut. xxxi.
 30 ; Deut. xxxii. 1-43 ; Deut. xxxii. 44-7 ; Deut. xxxiii. 1-7 ; Deut. xxxiii. 28-9 ;
 Deut. xxxiv. 1-4 ; Deut. xxxiv. 5-7 ; Deut. xxxiv. 8-9 ; Deut. xxxiv. 10-12.