## SAMARITAN LITERATURE AND ITS MANUSCRIPTS

# ALAN D. CROWN DEPARTMENT OF SEMITIC STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA

Despite the interest in Samaritan writings, in particular their Pentateuch, no single volume has been devoted to the comprehensive study of Samaritan literature. In the nineteenth century two scholars, Brüll<sup>1</sup> and Heidenheim<sup>2</sup> published a number of texts and some introductory matter on Samaritan literature, but their works were far from global. During the past century there have been several attempts at comprehensive descriptions either in the form of descriptive articles or chapters in books. The majority of these have been surveys of the whole field of Samaritan literature in older works which, unfortunately, despite the progress of scholarship, have remained the standard references, particularly for newcomers to the field of Samaritan studies. The best known of these presentations have been that of Montgomery<sup>3</sup> which is now nearly ninety years old, those of Gaster<sup>4</sup> which are at least seventy years old and that of Loewenstamm<sup>5</sup> which, though considerably younger that its predecessors, is still twenty years out of date. Among younger encyclopaedia articles we might note that most are part of a general discussion of the Samaritans and either ignore developments in Samaritan studies within the last twenty years or like that of R.T. Anderson<sup>6</sup> are rather too brief to do more than

<sup>1</sup> Adolph Brüll, Zur geschichte und literatur der Samaritaner (Frankfurt, 1876).

<sup>3</sup> E.g. see chapter 14, 'The languages and literature of the Samaritans', in J.A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans* (Philadelphia, 1907; 2nd edn, New York: Ktay, 1968).

<sup>5</sup> Ayalah Loewenstamm, 'Samaritan language and literature', in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter), vol. 14, 752–8.

<sup>6</sup> R.T. Anderson, 'Samaritans' in *The Anchor Bible dictionary* (London, New York: Doubleday, 1992), 940–7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Moritz Heidenheim, Bibliotheca Samaritana, texte aus Samaria und studien zum Samaritanismus 1. Die samaritanische Pentateuch-version II. Die samaritanische liturgie. Eine auswahl der wichtigsten texte. III. Commentar zum samaritanischen Pentateuch von Marqah der Samaritaner (Leipzig and Weimar, 1884–96; repr., Amsterdam: Georg Olms, Philo Press, 19<sup>7</sup>1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Gaster's third Schweich lecture (*The Samaritans, their history, doctrines and literature*, London: Schweich Lectures for 1923, 1925 (repr. by Gordon Press, 1976 and 1980), 96–158 is entitled 'Samaritan literature'. See also his article 'The Samaritan literature' (Supplement to the author's article 'The Samaritans'): in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. (Leiden: Brill, 1925), reprinted as "Die samaritanische litteratur" in Dexinger and Pummer, *Die Samaritaner*, Weger der Forschung, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesselschaft, 1992), 141–86.

scratch the surface of the subject while pointing to the significant

Although there have been extensive studies of the Samaritan Pentateuch since the Western world became aware of it in the early seventeenth century, it is only since the beginning of the century that individual works, for example, the *Tibat* (or *Memar*) Marqe7 or types of work, for example, the Liturgy8 or halakhic writings,9 have come under analysis and been described with some degree of care. The result is that a substantial amount of new material is currently available that needs to be described in any comprehensive survey of Samaritan literature. Two such surveys which take cognizance of the new material currently are available, these are Abraham Tal, 'Samaritan literature' The Samaritans, ed. Alan D.Crown (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989), 413-67 and the same author's briefer survey, 'Halakhic literature' in Crown, Pummer and Tal, A companion to Samaritan studies (Tübingen: Mohr, 1993), 108-11. Both these latter ignore the Samaritan Hellenistic material about which evidence is not abundant, but do cover all other recent researches in the whole spectrum of Samaritan literature. A third survey, that of Baillet<sup>10</sup> is somewhat diffuse for it intermeshes with a wide-ranging study of the history, chronology, calendar and other matters of the Samaritan religion and their life.

The current discussion is somewhat indebted to more recent surveys but departs from them in that it attempts to incorporate what is currently known about Samaritan Hellenistic literature and to focus attention on the relevant manuscripts of each class or individual work of literature with special, but not exclusive, reference to manuscripts in the British Library. It thus may serve as a guide to new researchers in the various segments of the field of Samaritan literature who may wish to know where to look for the best manuscripts.

#### Hellenistic Literature

In their chronicles the Samaritans claim to have had an extensive early literature which was lost to them in the course of various

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> John Macdonald, Memar Marqah (The teaching of Marqah) 2 vols (Berlin: BZAW, 83, 1963). Z Ben-Hayyim, Tibåt Marqe: a collection of Samaritan midrashim (Jerusalem: IASH, 1988). Gerhard Wedel, Kitab at-Tabbah des Samaritaners Abu'l-Hasan as-Suri; kritische edition und kommentierte übersetzung der ersten teils (Berlin: Fachbereich Altertums-wissenschaften der Freien Universität Berlin, 1987).

<sup>8</sup> A.E.Cowley, The Samaritan liturgy, 2 vols (Oxford: O.U.P., 1909).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> R. Boid, *Principles of Samaritan Halachah*: studies in Judaism in late antiquity, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989), 476. *Idem*, 'The Samaritan Halachah', in *The Samaritans*, ed. A.D. Crown (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1989), 624–49.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> M.Baillet, 'Samaritains', Supplément au dictionnaire de la Bible, fascicules 63-64a (1990), 774-1047.

oppressions particularly at the hands of Emperor Hadrian<sup>11</sup> whose persecution left them in a depressed and depleted state until their revival in the third century under the aegis of their hero, Baba Rabba.<sup>12</sup> Although this claim has been disputed as a pretension of the Samaritans there are three factors which should lead us to consider it seriously. The first is that there was indeed a Samaritan Hellenistic literature as we shall show below. This might have been the literature that they spoke of since we know of no parallels to this material in Hebrew. The second reason why we should take this claim seriously is that we find references to Samaritan writings in some of the Church Fathers including some discussion of content<sup>13</sup> and some refutation of Samaritan arguments. This refutation would betoken some knowledge of Samaritan works, although these may well have been written rather later than the time of Hadrian.

The third reason is that we find in Samaritan chronicles a number of independent traditions some of which have considerable antiquity and some of which are of doubtful antiquity. Despite scholarly scepticism about the value of all of these traditions and their ever manifest willingness to treat Samaritan evidence as secondary and always corrupt, recent studies have shown that some of these traditions have a core of historical accuracy<sup>14</sup> which bespeak a long transmission history which we cannot always trace. For example, the chain of Samaritan High Priests which is of fundamental importance in Samaritan history and chronology is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> According to the book of Joshua, chapter 47 but Abu l-Fath places the loss of books in the reign of Commodus (AF cap.37). The books lost are claimed to have been The book of choice selections, (some sort of land register?) Hymns and praises which were used when the sacrificial rite was offered, the Book of the Imams (Tulidah?) and the Annals. It is interesting that the extant Samaritan works, are of the types mentioned by Abu l-Fath, i.e., liturgies, the genealogical register and chronicles.

<sup>12</sup> It is the accepted truism in scholarly literature that Baba should be assigned to the fourth century, but the Samaritan chronicles put him in the third century and make him a younger contemporary of Judah Hanassi living at about the same time as Origen whose Hexapla took note of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The events of the chronicles would seem to place the beginning of Baba's career in the interregnum in Palestine between 235–238 C.E. when the country was threatened by border tribes and it continued through the reign of Gordianus who fought the Persians in 243. The third century was a century of comparative and relative peace for the Samaritans who seem to have used their military training in the middle of the century, at the time when the Romans had few garrison troops in central Palestine, to maintain their own standing force of about three thousand men at Neapolis. It was at this period that the great Samaritan religious reformers worked, that their liturgy began to take its shape and they began to formulate their massoretic tradition about the copying of the Pentateuch. One notes the likelihood that the scribe of Codex Alexandrinus had a copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch before him.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Photius says (in the name of Eulogius) 'He (Dositheus, the Samaritan) adulterated the Mosaic octateuch with myriads of spurious changes of all kinds, and he also left behind with his believers certain other works he had composed – foolish and outlandish and contrary to the laws of the spirit.' For further discussion of early patristic views of Samaritan writings see Bruce Hall, Samaritan religion from Hyrcanus to Baba Rabba, Mandelbaum Studies in Judaica, 3 (Mandelbaum Publishing: Sydney, 1987).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> For example see the notes to the Arabic text in Paul L. Stenhouse, 'Kitab al-Tarikh of Abu'l Fath' (University of Sydney Ph.D thesis, 1981).

clearly of independent transmission but we have no manuscripts of any antiquity which show how the chain was remembered and recorded. We must also note the many Greek words in the chronicles, some of which are thoroughly corrupted but which can be detected beneath the translations through Arabic and Hebrew. Analysis of the sources show that at least one Greek source lay directly behind the Arabic of the Samaritan Arabic Book of Joshua and suggests a base manuscript in Greek transmitted through the Byzantine period. Moreover, the survival of fourth-century B.C. Samaritan material from the Wadi Daliyeh caves 17 is now a substantive indication of the probability that there were ancient Samaritan literary materials.

Of the first period of Samaritan writing, namely, the Hellenistic period, there are now no extant manuscripts. However, for the sake of presenting a tolerably complete skeleton survey some comments are made here about the literature of this period. Criteria for establishing what was a Samaritan text are not at all clear. While we know the name of Samaritans such as the sophist, Syricius and Marinus the philosopher, it is not clear to what extent works associated with their names can be described as Samaritan. References to Mt Gerizim, once adopted by scholars as a clue to the Samaritan origins of a text are no longer accepted as best evidence of Samaritan authorship. 18 There are other writers whose works have been lost and whose identity as Samaritans is somewhat dubious. Among these we must include Thallus, a writer who is remembered in some Patristic texts and is said to have written a euhemeristic chronicle of world history in three books down to the time of the 167th Olympiad (112/109 B.C.). It is not at all clear that Thallus was a Samaritan. 19 Without any actual trace of any of Thallus's writings we are in no position to judge whether he was indeed a Samaritan who wrote the foundation material on which later Samaritan chronicles might have been based or whether he was the first Samaritan author to make reference to Jesus Christ as interpreters of Africanus apud Syncellus would have us believe.

<sup>15</sup> A new edition of the *Tulidah* is being published by Moshe Florentin. At the Congress of Samaritan Studies in Paris, 1992, Florentin cast some doubt on Bowman's view that the eleventh-century manuscript of the *Tulidah* in Nablus was the archetype. Even if it was the archetype text the tradition of the priestly chain had the be preserved and transmitted and there is no current manuscript of this chain.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Published by T.W.J. Juynboll, Chronicon Samaritanum Arabice conscriptum, cui titulus est liber Josuae (Lugduni Batavorum: Luchtmans, 1848).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Still largely unpublished after twenty years.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> R. Pummer, 'Argarizin-A Criterion for Samaritan Provenance', Journal for the Study of Judaism, 18 (1987–88),18–25.

<sup>19</sup> Though he has been described as a Samaritan by a number of scholars this attribution depends on an interpretation of Josephus (*Archaeological Journal*, 18:167) derived by emending the text to read Thallus, where his name does not actually appear. The relevant passage has been interpreted differently by Rigg who argues that while the passage indeed speaks of a Samaritan it makes no reference to Thallus and our only information is still that of the Church Fathers.

A second writer of the period, Theodotus, likewise, is not certainly a Samaritan despite claims that his description of Shechem, preserved by Alexander Polyhistor and quoted in Eusebius's *Praeparatio evangelica* indicates authorship by a Samaritan. Whether he was a Samaritan or not Theodotus made the statement in his poem, *On the Jews*, that Shechem was a holy city, an unlikely claim to have been made by a non-Samaritan.

Other Hellenistic writers claimed to have been Samaritan are the tragic poet, Ezekiel, Pseudo-Eupolemus and Cleodemus-Malchus. The fragmentary literary remains of these writers are preserved in a quaternary form in the text of Eusebius's Praeparatio evangelica, where he quotes (apparently via Josephus, though his words do not make it clear whether he was checking Josephus's version with a direct copy) Alexander Polyhistor's history Concerning the Jews, in which are embedded extracts from other authors. Although some of the data quoted appear to be Samaritan in character we cannot know whether the appearance results from a presentation by a Samaritan compiler or whether it is a result of a pagan Hellenistic writer presenting us with a syncretistic account. After all there were a large number of pagans resident in Samaria<sup>20</sup> who would have been aware of the traditions of the Samaritans amongst whom they lived and who might well have known the Pentateuch in its Judean version.

The evidence for claiming that Cleodemus-Malchus was Samaritan rests in part on a study of the writer and in part on a study of what are alleged to be his writings. In so far as his person was concerned, according to Eusebius, Cleodemus was described by Alexander Polyhistor as 'the prophet who is also called Malchas' (*P.E.* 421b). Freudenthal<sup>21</sup> argues that since prophecy among the Jews was regarded as closed, the only Palestinians who could use the term prophet were either the Christians (who were not yet in existence), or the Samaritans (on the assumption that the use of the term in relation to Simon Magus and Dositheus bespeaks a Samaritan tradition). He also associates the term Malchus with the Samaritans (though he ignores the words of Malalas who does use this term of a number of Samaritan rebel leaders), claiming that the name was rare in its time. In fact we know today from a number of sources that it was a common name of the period among pagans as well as Jews.

The determination that Cleodemus was a Samaritan from the study of the remnants of his writing is made on very slim ground indeed, namely that the association between Hercules and the descendants of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> See Rita Egger, Josephus Flavius und die Samaritaner, NTOA 4 (Göttingen, 1986). Egger discusses the problem of confusing Samarian pagans with Samaritans.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Jacob Freudenthal, Hellenistische studien: Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhalten. Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer geschichtswerke (Breslau: Jüdische-theologisches Seminar, 1875). [Reprinted from the Jahresbericht des jüdische-theologischen Seminars, 1874–75].

Abraham via his concubine Keturah was derived from an equation of Hercules with Zeus Zenios and Zeus Hellenios at the temple on Gerizim. This sort of syncretistic comment is alleged to be Samaritan. The pagan temples at Gerizim are known to have been unrelated to any Samaritan temple and the hypothesis can scarcely be supported.

The suggestion that Pseudo-Eupolemus was a Samaritan seems to be espoused more strongly by scholars. The fragments known as Pseudo-Eupolemus are the two sections of the work of Eupolemus quoted by Eusebius via Alexander Polyhistor (P.E. chapters xvii and xviii) which are so different from the rest of the writings of Eupolemus that they are attributed to a different author. It is argued that Pseudo-Eupolemus was neither a Jew nor a pagan but a Samaritan. In a midrash on the life of Abraham, Pseudo-Eupolemus states that the city of Ur from which Abraham stemmed was called Samarina and that the temple of Melchizedek to which Abraham was admitted for worship was on the 'Mount of the Most High' which he takes to be Mt Gerizim. It is difficult, but not impossible, to accept that a pagan would compose such a midrash when the Pentateuch would indicate the association of Melchizedek with Ierusalem. Heinemann<sup>22</sup> demonstrated that the question of Melchizedek's association became an important issue in the Rabbinic-Samaritan polemics which surfaced both in Talmudic and Aggadic literature, a factor which would make it even more likely that Pseudo-Eupolemus was a Samaritan. Wacholder<sup>23</sup> may well be correct in his assessment that the Samaritan known as Pseudo-Eupolemus 'must be counted among the earliest Biblical historians writing in Greek'.

Two types of Samaritan writing survive from this period, the Hebrew Pentateuch (although our earliest manuscripts are those in the Palaeo-Hebrew script from Qumran which are akin to the Samaritan text type as it must have been before the fixing of the Samaritan text in the period of Baba Rabba:<sup>24</sup> We have no dated manuscripts of the Pentateuch in the Samaritan majuscule character from before the tenth century) and the Samaritan Greek version or Samareitikon (of which there may be some surviving manuscripts)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Joseph Heinemann, 'Anti-Samaritan polemics in the Aggadah', *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, 3 (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), 57-69.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Ben-Zion Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus" Two Greek fragments on the life of Abraham', Hebrew Union College Annual, 34 (1963), 83-113.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> For these texts see P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and J.E. Sanderson, Qumran Cave IV Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek biblical manuscripts DJD IX (O.U.P., 1992). Emanuel Tov has observed that 'in view of the recent finds in Qumran it is now believed that at the base of the Samaritan Pentateuch lies a non-sectarian Palestinian text similar to several texts that have been found at Qumran and which for this purpose are named 'proto-Samaritan.' These sources contain early non-sectarian texts on one of which the Samaritan Pentateuch was based. In its present form, the Samaritan Pentateuch contains a clearly sectarian text. However, when its thin sectarian layer is removed, together with that of the Samaritan phonetic features, the resulting text probably did not differ much from the texts we now label 'proto-Samaritan'. See 'Samaritan Pentateuch', Companion to Samaritan studies, eds, A.D. Crown, R. Pummer, A. Tal (Tübingen: Mohr, 1993).

and, to these we may add, perhaps, the Samaritan book of Joshua though that is a matter of debate.

In the third century C.E.<sup>25</sup> under the aegis of the Samaritan hero, Baba Rabba, as the final stage of a long evolutionary process, the Samaritans canonized a separate recension of the Pentateuch<sup>26</sup> which included the specific characteristics which we come to recognize as Samaritan.<sup>27</sup> This century was a century of comparative and relative peace for the Samaritans. It was at this period that their great religious reformers worked, that their liturgy began to take its shape and they must have begun to formulate their traditions about the copying of the Pentateuch.28 It was the Samaritan council which was responsible for the fixing of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the beginning of the liturgical development which we note as the literature of the Aramaic period (below).29 We are told that Baba sought out the members of the council who had survived the preceding troubled years and set about reconstituting the council<sup>30</sup> to serve as peripatetic instructors to the Samaritan communities in the district which each of them supervised. The revival of the council by Baba was followed by the building of a number of synagogues in those parts of Palestine Prima in which there were strong concentrations of Samaritans.<sup>31</sup> These synagogues were built not only as places of worship in the regions beyond the immediate reach of Mt Gerizim but were also to serve as the centres of Samaritan scholarship

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> It is the accepted truism in scholarly literature that Baba should be assigned to the fourth century, but the Samaritan chronicles put him in the third century and make him a younger contemporary of Judah Hanasi who lived at about the same time as Origen, whose Hexapla took note of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The events of the chronicles would seem to place the beginning of Baba's career in the interregnum in Palestine between 235–238 C.E. when the country was threatened by border tribes and it continued through the reign of Gordianus who fought the Persians in 243.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> For a discussion of this point see the author's 'Redating the schism between the Judaeans and the Samaritans', Jewish Quarterly Review, 82 (1991), 17-50.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> One of the interesting conclusions of S. Talmon about the Samaritan Pentateuch is that it did not simply evolve into its present form but, at some stage, it was subject to a very careful editorial processing by a group of Samaritan sages. See S. Talmon, 'The Samaritan Pentateuch', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 2:3 (1951), 144–50. The only period in the history of the text when this might have been possible is in the time of Baba Rabba as noted.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> James Fraser, 'The history of the Defter of the Samaritan liturgy' (University of Melbourne Ph.D thesis, 1970) demonstrates that experiments with folio layout must have been carried out at this time by Samaritan scribes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> The role of the Samaritan council is discussed in detail in my 'Samaritan religion in the fourth century', *Nederlands Theologische Tijdschrift*, 41:1 (1986), 29–47 at 42–4. Note also the discussion in *idem*, 'Redating the schism'. In addition to that discussion one should note that there was a leader of the community, termed in b*Sanhedrin* 90a 'The Patriarch of the Samaritans', in a context which places him in the second century C.E. We must assume that this Patriarch was the head of the Samaritan Council/*Boule*, which existed in the time of Josephus and which was recognized by the Romans as having authority over the Samaritans.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> Such a tradition seems to have a historical basis and it speaks for the probability that Baba lived in the early part of the third century otherwise there would have been no possibility of survivors in the interval since the Hadrianic persecution.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Cf. A.D. Crown, 'Samaritans in the Byzantine orbit', Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester, 69 (1986), 96–138.

and law giving – they functioned like the local midrash schools of the Jewish synagogues for, according to Abu'l-Fath, each of the synagogues had 'a place.....in the southern part....so that anyone with a personal problem could ask the *Hukama* about it and be given a sound answer'.<sup>32</sup> In other words, the synagogue was to serve the local community for the interpretation of the law. The counsellor was in the position of the *Hakham*/sage in the Rabbinic tradition of the period.

We may assume that part of the activity of the Samaritan sages was establishing a canonical text of the Samaritan Pentateuch out of all the versions of that text available to them and establishing the traditions by which is was to be copied henceforth.<sup>33</sup> There is reasonable evidence that some of the features of the arrangement of the Samaritan text which we regard as specifically Samaritan – the decorative finials of Samaritan manuscripts and the layout of some parts of the same manuscripts were established by the time that the great uncial manuscript, Codex Alexandrinus was copied, perhaps in Caesarea.<sup>34</sup>

Baba Rabba's sages canonized a distinctive version of the Pentateuch with some 6,000 variants from the Masoretic text.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> AF, iv, 181.

<sup>33</sup> Recent discussion of the activity of the Samaritan sages (see 'Samaritans in the Byzantine orbit', 111–12) has been extended by I.R.M. Bóid, 'Use, authority and exegesis of Mikra in the Samaritan tradition', *Mikra*, ed. M.J. Mulder, (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988), 595–633. There is a clear implication that the halachic exegetical activity of the Samaritan sages included the fixing of the text. (However, the evidence of what Bóid terms 'recension C' of Abu 1-Fath's *Kitab* (see 604) must be discounted. This recension belongs to the expanded version of the text of which numerous manuscripts exist. Stenhouse set aside these expanded versions in his edition of Abu 1-Fath's *Kitab* because they incorporate so much late material that they obfuscate the state of the text in Abu 1-Fath's lifetime. Without considerable exegesis to demonstrate the sources and age of the expansions we cannot accept what they say if they enlarge upon Abu 1-Fath's text. However, Bóid is correct in pointing to the need for an edition of the expanded material and one is in fact in the course of preparation in the Sydney 'School of Samaritan studies').

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> The evidence for this suggestion has been examined in my Studies in Samaritan manuscripts III 'Columnar writing and the Samaritan massorah', *BJRUL*, 67 (1984), 349-81. Note S. Lieberman's words about scholarly co-operation in Caesaria at this time, 'The martyrs of Caesarea', *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves*, vii (1939-44) (New York, 1944), 345-446 at 398.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. F. Dexinger, 'The limits of tolerance in Judaism: the Samaritans', in Jewish and Christian self definition, ed. E.P. Sanders (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 88-114. Dexinger, correctly points up the fact (108-9) that the additional commandment making Mt Gerizim the sacred mountain was the limit of tolerance for the Jews of the Samaritans. James D. Purvis, 'The Samaritans and Judaism' in Early Judaism and its modern interpreters (Philadelphia, Atlanta: Fortress, Scolars Press, 1986), 81-98, reaches a similar conclusion about the rôle of the Samaritan Pentateuch in forcing a breach with the Jews. His neat summary reads 'At some time subsequent to the building of their temple the Samaritans produced an edition of the Pentateuch in which their theological legitimacy was decisively declared and through which the cultic traditions of Jerusalem were declared illegitimate. This was accomplished by deliberate textual manipulation to underscore the sanctity (and necessity) of Shechem/Gerizim as the divinely ordained center of Israel's cultic life... It was this contention, not simply the existence of a Samaritan temple, which drove the permanent wedge between Samaritans and Jews' (89). It is clear from this summary that Purvis both misreads the time scale of the deliberate changes to the text though he tries to bring it down to after the destruction of the Samaritan temple (90) and takes no account of the integration of the changes with the reform programme which changes the nature of Samaritanism in the third century.

None of the palaeo-Hebrew texts from Qumran which have similarities to the Samaritan version are at all close to the Samareitikon cited by Origen in his Hexapla.<sup>36</sup> It is clear enough today that a substantial number of the Samaritan variants relate to Samaritan hermeneutics and exegesis of the text. They are not merely the crystallization into a particular text type of textual variants such as one finds in some of the Oumran pre-Masoretic texts. Furthermore it has also been made clear in recent studies that the Samaritan tendency to remove anthropomorphisms in the Pentateuch text came about under the influence of the fusion of Samaritan and Hellenistic cultures and that their hermeneutic style developed in an Aramaic milieu and follows the Septuagint and does not precede it.<sup>37</sup> Macuch<sup>38</sup> concludes that the Samaritan Pentateuch was fixed over a period that extended into the first Christian centuries. We might supplement Macuch's conclusions with the observation that while the Samaritan-Qumran materials may have been proto-Samaritan they were not the Samaritan version in the forms in which it is now known.<sup>39</sup> The Samaritan version took shape, to be formulated in the fashion we find it today, at some time later than the direct textual evidence from Qumran allows us to see. We may be justified in arguing that it took place some time after the Qumran site was deserted for the second time for there is no other evidence from Qumran of this version. In other words we are looking at the period between 135 C.E. and Origen's citation of the Samareitikon which would put us squarely into the period of intensive activity of Baba's lifetime. One contrary argument to these conclusions might be indicated by Stephen's speech, in Acts, which appears to draw upon the Samaritan Pentateuch, giving the impression that the Samaritan Pentateuch was in existence at that time. However, a recent re-examination of the evidence testifies

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> See also Dexinger, 'Limits of tolerance', 108.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. R. Macuch, 'Les bases philologiques de l'herméneutique et les bases herméneutique de la philologie chez les Samaritaines', Etudes samaritaines, Pentateuque et Targum, ed. J-P. Rothschild and G.D. Sixdenier (Louvain-Paris: Peeters, 1988),149–58. John Lightfoot, Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae, ed. R. Gandell (Oxford, 1859), makes an interesting observation (358) on the exchange of the names, Ebal and Gerizim in Deuteronomy xi:29 and xxvii:12–13. Having drawn our attention to Rabbinic complaints about the expansion of Deut. xi:30 he suggests that the reason no complaints were heard about the exchange of Gerizim and Ebal is that these changes were made after the lifetime of Eliezer b. Jose, i.e. after the second century A.D. The argument from silence is, of course, dangerous, but not without merut

<sup>38 &#</sup>x27;Les bases philologiques', 154.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Cf. D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews. *The palaeo-Hebrew Leviticus scroll* (Winona Lake: AASOR, 1985) where the words 'proto-Samaritan' regulary indicate that the text is not the Samaritan Pentateuch. Judith E. Sanderson, *An Exodus scroll from Qumran*, Harvard Semitic Studies 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) seems to find 4 Q Palaeo Exod<sup>m</sup> rather close to the Samaritan version but not identical with it.

against Stephen having drawn on the Samaritan version as we know it today.<sup>40</sup>

Manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch are too numerous to list separately. Reference is made to a number of them in the guide to collections and catalogues of manuscripts by J-P. Rothschild.<sup>41</sup> However, it is estimated that there are at least 750 complete Pentateuch manuscripts in existence.<sup>42</sup> Some seventy five of these are of twentieth-century provenance, some forty-six belong to the nineteenth century, in other words a large number of Pentateuchs belong to the period when it was de rigueur for pilgrim travellers to the Holy Land to visit the Samaritans. The numbers are not so great from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, thirty, stemming from the eighteenth century, the majority of which were written or restored or rebound by the priest, Tabiah b. Abraham b.Isaac b.Sadagah b.Hassebhi,43 of the Levitical family based at Nablus between 1747 and 1785. Three of his manuscripts are in the Rylands Library, namely Rylands 18, 100 and 116. There are eleven Pentateuch manuscripts of seventeenth-century provenance. The sixteenth century was marked by persecution and dislocation, and the Samaritans probably lost many of their manuscripts, as quite a number, some thirty-two pentateuchs were written in Nablus between 1500 and 1552. One scribe, Hassebhi b. Joseph, appears to have replaced many of the lost scrolls of his day. His manuscripts include B.L. Add. MS 19011, Keble College, Oxford, 83 (Hassebhi's 13th Torah) Bodley Marsh 15 (5th Torah) B.L. Or.10271 (8th Torah) Ben Zvi 25 (10th Torah) B.N. Sam. 22 (parts only). There are many single quires and folios of codices and sections or fragments of Pentateuch scrolls in the hand of this scribe. Some of these fragments have been identified within Rylands Samaritan manuscripts which were put together from many disparate texts in nineteenth-century restorations.

From the period of the Samaritan literary and liturgical revival (see below) there are extant quite a substantial number of Pentateuchs – at least sixty from the fifteenth century, fifty from the fourteenth century, thirty-seven from the thirteenth century

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> Cf. W.F. Albright and C.S. Mann, 'Stephen's Samaritan background', *The Anchor Bible: the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. J. Munck (New York, 1967), Appendix V, 285–300. For an assessment of the arguments see Hall, *Samaritan religion* 35-7. Hall considers the arguments for and against Stephen's quoting the Samaritan Pentateuch and produces valid arguments against this having happened.

<sup>41</sup> J-P. Rothschild, 'Samaritan manuscripts', The Samaritans, 771-94.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> Maurice Baillet, 'Les divers états du Pentateuque samaritain'. Mémorial Jean Carmignac, =RQ, 13.1-4 (1988), 531-45, is the source of the estimates which follow. Baillet was not aware of the Garrett collection. No catalogue of the collection in the Ben Zvi Institute exists and there are at least one hundred single codexes in libraries which may never have been considered by Baillet. His figures, therefore, have been increased by ten percent to come more closely to the known number of Pentateuch manuscripts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> For additional data see Companion, 223.

and seventeen from the twelfth century. Some of the more important of these, either because they are reasonably complete or because they demonstrate specific idiosyncracies of Samaritan scribal traditions, are to be found in British libraries. They include the work of one man who was probably the most important scribe of the earliest period, namely Abi Berakhata b. Ab Zahuta b. Ab Nefusha b. Abraham Sareptah who is also known to us by his Arabic cognomen, Abu'l Barakhat b. Abu'l Sarur b. Abu'l Faraj and again as Abi Berakhatiya b. Ab Sasson.<sup>44</sup> Between 1197 and 1225 he wrote a substantial number of manuscripts; one of the best and most complete of these is Rylands Sam. MS 1. Other important manuscripts of this early period are B.L. Or. MS 6461 of 1339-40, the fifth Pentateuch written by its scribe, B.L. Cotton Claudius B viii an early example of the Damascus genre written in part by the same scribe who wrote B.L. Add. MS 22369, a manuscript which exhibits some significant Samaritan masoretic traditions.

The most important of the triglot manuscripts (see below Aramaic writings) which presents a Hebrew, Arabic and Aramaic text is the B.L. Or. MS 7562 of the fourteenth century.

There are very few dated Samaritan manuscripts still extant from the eleventh century and earlier. A number of early manuscripts cannot be dated directly but an approximate date may be attributed from codicological evidence. At least nine such manuscripts still exist.<sup>45</sup> Of earlier manuscripts there are some relics<sup>46</sup> – two fragments from Columbia University Library and the Bodleian are alleged to be of ninth-century date, one manuscript from the John Rylands Library (Sam. Codex vii) has a bifolium which is alleged to be of ninth-century origin, but probably is not, for our evidence suggests that its script and size belong to a period at least three centuries later when the small pocket size of manuscript began to be used. There are almost certainly incomplete Pentateuchs of equivalent age from the Samaritan Geniza that found their way into the Firkowitch collection.<sup>47</sup>

Whether there was a specific Greek translation of the Samaritan version is uncertain. In his *Hexapla* Origen referred to the *Samareitcon* and a long debate has been conducted as to whether this was simply a reference to the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch or

<sup>44</sup> For additional data see Companion, 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> Baillet appears not to have counted the scroll, *Katava Kadisha*, in the Spiro collection, New York. This scroll is discussed in the Sassoon collection catalogue and was bought from that collection.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> One must discount the specimen in the Ambrosian Library alleged by Baillet to be of tenth century date.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> See James Fraser, 'Documents from a Samaritan Genizah in Damascus', *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* (1971), 85-92.

to an independent Greek version.<sup>48</sup> Glaue and Rahlfs<sup>49</sup> appeared to have settled the argument with their discovery of the Giessen papyri which preserved fragments of a Greek text of Deuteronomy 24–29 which they claimed was from the Samariticon as it represented a tradition rather different from the Septuagint and apparently that of the Samaritans, but that conclusion has again been challenged.

The fundamental reason for the identification of these fragments as part of the Samariticon was the reading of Gerizim in Deut. 4 in place of Ebal, that is the Samaritan version of this verse. In addition to this there is agreement in Deut. 25:7 and 8 between the Samaritan Targum and these fragments in a form which seems to indicate that the Greek fragments were drawn from a Samaritan milieu. All things considered Glaue and Rahlfs date the text before the days of Origen on the ground that the Hexapla quotes the Samareiticon, but they indicate that the dependence on the Septuagint apparent in the fragments (although they maintain that the text is far enough from the Septuagint to indicate an independent translation) would argue for a text younger than the Septuagint. They decline to offer a more precise dating than this for they argue that the provenance of the fragments (which were found in Egypt) lead to no conclusion in that the translation itself may have been done elsewhere where Greek and Samaritan lived in close proximity. Although Emanuel Tov<sup>50</sup> has argued that the fragments represent a revision of the Septuagint rather than being drawn from the Samariticon Noja<sup>51</sup> suggests that not only are the Giessen fragments part of the Samariticon but that there may well be other fragments in existence that have been improperly identified and which will come to be identified as the Samariticon in due time. Waltke<sup>52</sup> supports Glaue and Rahlfs's conclusions and supports his argument with the view that the Samaritan Pentateuch reached its final form before the time of Origen. At this time the evidence is inconclusive and we cannot argue strongly that the Giessen papyrii are parts of a Samaritan manuscript.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> For a summary of the arguments see Jacob Wasserstein, 'Samareitikon', Companion, 209-10

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> P. Glaue and A. Rahlfs, 'Fragmente einer griechischen Übersetzung des samaritanischen Pentateuchs', NKGW, Philol.-hist. Klasse, (1911), 167-200, 263-6, 1 plate. (repr. Berlin, 1911), as Mitteilungen des Septuaginta unternehmens der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Heft 2, Fragmente einer griechischen Übersetzung des samaritanischen Pentateuchs], and idem, 'Fragmente einer Übersetzung des samaritanischen Pentateuchs', RB, 8 (1911), 628f.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> E. Tov, 'Pap. Giessen 13, 19, 22, 26: a revision of the LXX?', Revue Biblique 78 (1971), 355-83.

<sup>51</sup> S. Noja, 'The Samareitikon', The Samaritans, 408-12.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> B.K. Waltke, 'Prolegomena to the Samaritan Pentateuch', *Harvard Theological Review* <sup>57</sup> (1965), 434–64. *Idem*, 'Prolegomena to the Samaritan Pentateuch (Harvard University Ph.D thesis), (University Microfilms, 1965).

## Works of the Aramaic Period

Samaritan literature from the fourth to the tenth centuries was almost certainly composed in Aramaic with perhaps a little liturgical material in Hebrew and some writings in Arabic at the end of this time. Three most important types of literature are known to us from the Aramaic period. The first is the translation of the Pentateuch into Aramaic, the Samaritan Targum, the second is philosophical in the form of Pentateuch commentary and the third is liturgy.

The Targum is known to us in three fundamental text types. The oldest type of text as in manuscript B.L. Or. MS 7562, might well reflect the activities of Baba Rabba and his sages, and might well be of the same age as the canonization of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Tal<sup>53</sup> argues for a date close to the writing of Targum Onkelos which, depending on one's view of the age of that Targum,<sup>54</sup> could put it as a product of the same school which fixed the form and text of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The Aramaic of this text is close to that of Onkelos and still retains affinities with that of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The second text type as reflected by MS Nablus 6<sup>55</sup> (= MS 6 of the Shechem synagogue) represents a stage of Aramaic used in Palestine during the period of the composition of the Palestinian Talmud from the fourth century onwards. This Targum must have been composed close to the period of the invasion of the Moslems before Arabic came into common use among the Samaritans. One might argue for one of the periods of intense literary activity among the Samaritans as a date for the retranslation of the Targum, perhaps during the fourth century when the great liturgists, Amram Darrah and Ninnah were writing or, if this is considered to be too close to the first translation into Aramaic, the ninth century when Aramaic was manifestly still understood and there was an active period of composition in Aramaic (see below, *Tibåt Marge*).

The third type should be seen as a conflation of Aramaic and Arabic by scribes who no longer understood Aramaic and therefore made many errors, producing a bastardized text. Tal<sup>56</sup> presents us with the following list of the most important MSS of the Targum in types one and two. MSS Nablus 3, 4, 6; Vat. Sam. 2; B.L.Or. MS 7562; Leningrad Sam. MS no. 182; B.L. Or. MS 1442; Cambridge

<sup>53</sup> Abraham Tal, 'Samaritan Literature', The Samaritans, 447-8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup> For a good discussion of the date of Targum Onkelos see *Encyclopaedia Miqra'it*, 8 (1982), 742-8.

<sup>55</sup> When Shechem/Nablus numbers are quoted from others, the numbers are presented as found in the source. Elsewhere in this text, when the Nablus number is given it refers to the number allotted to the film collection of copies of the Shechem Synagogue MSS in the Jewish National and Hebrew University Library. In general, there is a coincidece between the JNUL numbers and those quoted from secondary sources since these too relied on the films in the JNUL rather than the source manuscripts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> Abraham Tal, The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: a critical edition, 3 vols (Tel Aviv. Tel Aviv. University Press, 1983) III. An introduction, 16.

Trinity College R.15.56; Leningrad Sam. 183; Bodley Opp. Add. 8° 29; Barberini Or. 1; B.L. Or. MS 5036 fol. 24; Leningrad Sam. MS 178 fol. 4; Leningrad Sam. MS 184.

Other than the Samaritan Targum the only extant large work of this period is the Mimar/Memar Margah by which the work is commonly known to the scholarly world. An older name was the Arabic Safinat Marge, that is, the box or chest of Margah and the most recent edition<sup>57</sup> utilizes a Samaritan Aramaic translation of the Arabic name of the collection in the form Tibåt Marge. The Tibåt Marge is really a collection of writings of different ages and origins which became one work through the circumstance of the miscellaneous parts of the manuscript having been stored together in a chest.<sup>58</sup> The largest part of the work falls within our period. The component parts of the collection are: Book 1: The Book of Wonders: eleventh to thirteenth centuries C.E. Book II: A commentary on Exodus 15, The song of the sea of Margah's day (late third or early fourth century). Books III-V: Commentaries on Deuteronomy, and Book VI: A series of Midrashim, On the twentytwo letters of the alphabet, sometime after Margah's flowering perhaps between the sixth and the tenth centuries, but most likely in the ninth century. None of the extant manuscripts of the work may be dated before the fourteenth century C.E.<sup>59</sup>

According to Ben-Hayyim<sup>60</sup> the more important manuscripts of the *Tibåt Marqe* are B.L. Cod. Harley 1595; JNUL Sam 8° 27; B.L. Or. 7923; Berlin Or. 4° 1086 I, II; Torino MS H1; B.L. Or. MS 12296; JNUL Sam 8° 47.

### The 'Defter' and the First Period of Liturgy Writing

Tal,<sup>61</sup> almost certainly correctly, traces the beginning of Samaritan prayer to the substitution of prayer for the *Tamid* sacrifice though this must be dated some centuries earlier than he suggests (i.e. to the period of the rapprochement between the Samaritans and Hyrcanus after the latter had destroyed their temple).<sup>62</sup> It is very probable that at this time the liturgy was principally a series of appropriate readings from the Torah selected to match the occasion. As these were replaced by texts written for the occasion the readings were abbreviated into single sentences or even words representing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> Z. Ben-Hayyim, *Tibåt Marqe* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1968).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</sup> On the keeping of Samaritan manuscripts in chests see A.D. Crown, 'Studies in Samaritan practices and manuscript history V. Samaritan bindings: a chronological survey with special reference to Nag Hammadi techniques', BJRUL, 69 (1987), 425-91.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 34

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61 &#</sup>x27;Samaritan Literature', The Samaritans, 450.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup> See the discussion of the end of the Samaritan temple in my 'Redating the schism between the Judaeans and the Samaritans',  $\mathcal{J}QR$ , 82 (1991), 17–50.

paragraphs strung together in a qatena called a *qataf*.<sup>63</sup> In general it can be said that the older the liturgy the greater the proportion of Pentateuchal material represented in the form of the *qataf*, and the purer the Aramaic of the 'custom written' texts.<sup>64</sup> The more abbreviated the *qatafim*, the younger the liturgy tends to be.<sup>65</sup>

Sir Arthur Cowley, in the introduction to his study of the Samaritan liturgy<sup>66</sup> observed that there were three main periods in the writing of the Samaritan liturgy. He made his observations on the basis of language and the fact that poems in substantial number are attributed to composers who were also scribes of manuscripts. (Unfortunately we do not have manuscripts of the earlier periods of composition). These scribes can be dated either from one of the Samaritan chronicles or, in the case of the later scribes, from references to them in the manuscripts. There are at least seventy such scribes listed in Cowley and we note that recent editions of the liturgy have additions by contemporary liturgists. The tradition of expanding the liturgy did not stop once it was begun in the fourth century. He indicates that the main periods of composition were, first, the fourth century C.E. when Aramaic was the literary language, the second period fell in the tenth and eleventh centuries when Aramaic was no longer the vernacular but was still the language of liturgy and the third period was the fourteenth century and after, when Hebrew, mixed with Aramaisms had become the liturgical language. He uses the term defter to describe the core corpus of the liturgy,67 but this may be a misnomer as the word probably refers to the codex format in which the liturgy was written. However, the foundation collection or register of liturgical pieces, whatever title we give it,68 had fifty-nine of its ninety-three poems originating in the fourth century C.E.69 It served the liturgical needs of the community until the fourteenth century, when separate books began to be written for the festival services. We should note that liturgies for Passover, Weeks and other occasions which are written separately, independent of the corpus or defter, are most probably written in or after the third period of liturgical composition. Even

<sup>63</sup> J. Macdonald, 'Comprehensive and thematic reading of the law by the Samaritans', JJS, 10 (1959), 67–74, suggests that the word is derived from the Arabic, qatf, curtailment.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup> Unfortunately Cowley's edition of the liturgy, still the best available today, ignores the *qatafim* totally so that one is forced to consult the manuscripts for every scholarly judgement that has to be made on these. Cowley's work must be read in conjunction with that of Z. Ben-Hayyim, whose major study of the liturgy is in *LOT* III/2. This work is accessible only to Hebraists.

<sup>65</sup> Macdonald, 'Comprehensive and thematic reading', indicates that he has seen the Exodus qataf presented in eight folios in some festival liturgies.

<sup>66</sup> The introduction is in vol. 2, vii-xcviii.

<sup>67</sup> The word derives from the Greek, diftera, and then its Arabized form, defter.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> See Fraser's discussion of titles in 'History of the defter', 37-42. He seems to prefer Gaster's *kenosh* as the title of the collection.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>69</sup> Samaritan liturgy, 460.

though some of the independent books carry signature marks that indicate that they were to be regarded as parts of a longer whole they belong to the later period of copying. Some early copies of the *defter* survive and are likely to be from the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, but the majority cannot be dated.

Cowley's *The Samaritan liturgy* is now nearly ninety years old, but it remains the best text available to us today, despite many imperfections. Among the more serious of its imperfections we should note the lack of quotation of the Pentateuch text which still forms the core of all liturgy and is the major segment in every liturgical manuscript. For this reason serious study of the liturgy must begin with the manuscripts, in particular, the *defter* manuscripts.

The liturgical writing of the period began with the work of Amram Darrah (the elder) who may have been reconstructing or replacing the earlier hymnal. Amram Darrah, or Amram b. Sered is identified as the father of Marqah by the *Tulidah*.<sup>70</sup> His work is known as the *durran* presumably to be related to his nickname but generally translated 'the string of pearls'.<sup>71</sup> Other writings which followed Amram's style are given the same name.

Marqah (Marcus), Amram's successor as a liturgist, tended to use an alphabetic accrostic in his poetry, but an alphabet that was not strictly in the order that we have it today. He was depending on the aural rather than the visual and wrote his poems for chanting. It is evident that he experimented with layout on the folio, presumably of the codex rather than the scroll, for the line length was fixed so that his name appeared as an accrostic in the second part of the line. This sort of flexibility might have been more difficult in the scroll than the codex. Marqah was both scribe and liturgist and we may assume that some of the canons of text copying that were visible in later manuscripts were of his invention.<sup>72</sup> The third liturgist of the early period was Marqah's son, Nina (Nonus). The language of this first period is Aramaic which is free from Hebraisms or Arabisms and it was clearly the vernacular as well as the literary language of the day.

Of all the manuscripts of Defter and liturgy preserved in Western libraries the only complete exemplars have their origin in the eighteenth century or later. The older manuscripts have serious gaps or are composite and extensively restored. The earlier manuscripts differ considerably from the later and their order varies greatly. The single most important is held to be B.L. Or. 5034 the core of which (pre-restoration) dates to 1258 C.E. This manuscript has been extensively described in two theses by

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup> Samaritan liturgy, 450-1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup> Ibid., 452.

<sup>72</sup> On this conclusion see 'History of the defter'

J.G. Fraser.<sup>73</sup> Other early and valuable defter codices, Harley 5481 and 5495 contain far more than liturgy and may well have been put together from fragments from the Samaritan Geniza at Damascus. For this reason the suggestion that they contain a regional variation (Damascene) of the Samaritan liturgy must be treated with reserve.<sup>74</sup> Other important *defter* manuscripts are Rylands Sam. MSS 11 and 18, Berlin Or. 4° 532, B.N. Sam. MSS 8 and 25, Vat. Sam 3, Gotha 57 and 58, and Keble College, Oxford, 84.

Grammatical, and Liturgical Works and the Pentateuch in the Arabic Period

The Arabs conquered Palestine in 634 C.E. and we assume that shortly thereafter the Samaritans became bilingual using Aramaic for religious purposes and Arabic for secular purposes. Gradually the knowledge of Aramaic became passive and Arabic replaced Aramaic as the language of secular literature and such writings as commentaries, grammars and chronicles.<sup>75</sup> By the end of the tenth century Samaritan works are starting to be written in Arabic. We note a series of grammatical works, and an anonymous lexicographical dictionary, hamelis (MS B.N. Sam 9), which relates the Hebrew of the Samaritan Pentateuch with equivalents in Aramaic (the Targum) and Arabic. The latter column was a late addition to the text. A work with a similar title is known from the thirteenth century, compiled by the priest Pinhas b. Joseph. (Cambridge, Christ College Add. 5.13; JNUL Sam. 8° 31). The grammatical works include Ibn Darta's Rules regarding the reading, probably called forth by the breakdown of the traditions among the Samaritan scribes about the diacritical marks inserted into codexes. In addition to the Rules regarding the reading, there is extant the same scholar's *Treatise on the vowels*, (early twelfth century), and the Prolegomenon, the first true, Samaritan grammar written by Abu Ibrahim b. Faraj b. Maruth in the twelfth century.

We have no precise information about the date of the first Samaritan Arabic translation of the Pentateuch but we are aware that five Arabic text types circulated among the Samaritans. The first was a version based primarily on the *Tafsir* of Sa'adyah Gaon (882–942). It is plausible to assume that when the Samaritans first felt the necessity for an Arabic translation, when Arabic ceased to be their vernacular, in the late tenth century, they adapted the *Tafsir* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</sup> 'History of the defter', and 'The British Library manuscript Or. 5034 of the Samaritan Defter' University of Melbourne M.A. thesis, 1965.

<sup>74</sup> The suggestion was made by Cowley and is examined by Fraser, 'History of the defter'. Fraser is somewhat sceptical of the claim though his evidence relates mostly to the fragmentary nature of the sources in this congeries of materials.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>75</sup> An excellent study of the changing linguistic situation is to be found in H. Shehadeh, 'The Arabic translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch', *The Samaritans*, 481–516.

because of a lack of a translation of their own. The best example of this Sa'adyanic type is B.L. Or. MS 7562.

The second text type was the Old Arabic translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch (OASP). The circumstances under which the Old Arabic translation came into being are still shrouded in some uncertainty. We have good reason to believe that the Samaritan community in Nablus was using a newly made translation in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and we are aware that an Arabic version of Samaritan authorship existed in the Levant in the eleventh century. This translation is as old as the oldest Samaritan Arabic works of Tabya b. Darta, Yusuf al-'Askari and Abu l-Hasan as-Suri, which appeared from the first half of the eleventh century and onwards. Unfortunately the only evidence connected to this fundamental event in the history of the Samaritans is the preface of the Bibliotheque Nationale manuscript Arabe 6 (copied before the year 1514) which leaves unresolved the problem of the identity of the first Samaritan translator(s) of the Pentateuch into Arabic. Samaritan oral tradition attributes the OASP to Abu l-Hasan as-Suri. 76

Manuscripts of the old Arabic translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch are found as a rule in trilingual or bilingual manuscripts written in Samaritan characters, that is, with the text written in separate ruled columns, two or three columns to the page, with the Hebrew version in the right hand column and the Aramaic in the second column and the Arabic in the third. There are indications from the Massoretic format of the columns that the Hebrew always had priority in the conception of the scribes and that the Arabic was a second cousin.<sup>77</sup> The language of this version is Samaritan Middle Arabic as written by non-Muslims. The oldest known manuscript of this group is Shechem (Synagogue) 6, a triglot of Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic, copied in 1204 C.E.

In second half of the thirteenth century the Samaritan community in Egypt had another Arabic version of their Pentateuch, the revised text of Abu Sa'id. The task of this thirteenth-century Egyptian scholar was two-fold – revision in order to eliminate Sa'adyanisms in the existing texts, called by him 'pure heresy' and the addition of marginal notes. Manuscripts of Abu Sa'id's Revised Text (ASRT) are generally written in Arabic characters but with the section headings written in Hebrew characters. Shehadeh considers that this revision was based on the text we now identify as Cambridge Add. MS 714.78 Though B.L.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup> Abu l-Hasan is otherwise known to us as Ab Hasda (Isda) b. Ab Nefusha b. Ab Nesanah, c. mid 11th century.

<sup>77</sup> On this, more below. Fraser, 'History of the defter', reached the same conclusions but from a different direction from the writer, viz. by examination of the ruling rather than the text layout.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>78</sup> 'Arabic translation', 512.

Or. MS 2688 copied in 1223–24 is the oldest manuscript of this type: B.N. MS Arabe 5 is the best preserved.<sup>79</sup>

Two other Arabic Pentateuch text types are identified by Shehadeh.<sup>80</sup> The first of these is the composite version – a combination of two versions in the same manuscript, i.e. of the following permutations: Old version/Abu Sa'id's revised text, the *Tafsir*/ one of the preceding versions, old version or Abu Sa'id's revised text/a version of modern Christian Arabic translation of the Bible.

The final type is a conflated version based primarily on the modern Christian Arabic translation of the Bible but including excerpts from one or other text types. This version is found in a number of modern Samaritan manuscripts.

Shehadeh<sup>81</sup> allocates the more than fifty manuscripts of the Samaritan Arabic version of the Pentateuch to one or other of the types of texts. To the Sa'adyanic type he allocates Rylands Sam. MS 2, B.L. Or. MS 7562. To the OASP he allocates B.L. Add. MS 19011, B.L. Or. MS 1450, Nablus 6 (trilingual), Nablus 8, 15, 18, 20; Cambridge Add. 714, Bodley Or. 139, Bodley Or. 345, Barberini Or. 1. Of Abu Sa'id's revised text. he finds B.L. Or. 2688, B.L. Or. 1446, B.L. Or. 10754, B.N. Arabe 5, B.N. Arabe 6, Berlin Petermann I:3, Adler 1808, Leiden Or. 1222, Sassoon 404, Berlin Or. fol. 534 Of the mixed text types he notes Rylands Gaster Sam. MS 18612; Bodley Sam. MS c 4; JNUL Sam.1.

The second period of liturgical writing began in the tenth century when Aramaic was still in use for the synagogue service but was starting to be contaminated by Arabic. Hebrew was beginning to penetrate the sacred poetry and for the first time Hebrew was used for the liturgy, but the Aramaic and Hebrew languages were never mixed in a single composition. The composers of this second period have left no biographical traces other than their poetry and prose writings. We have no sample of their hands in any surviving manuscripts though we must assume that if their successors were typical of their ancestors they must have been scribes and copyists. Among the writers of this second period we note Ab Gillugah, (Abu Hamad) b. Tabya b. Oalah the tenth to eleventh-century liturgical writer from whom only a single, long Aramaic piyyut 'O God of mercy who doeth good to everyone' [SL, 75-77; LOT III/b, 288-298] and a prayer 'I pray before you' [SL 77-78] are extant.82 and the twelfth-century translator, Ab Hasdah (Isda) of Tyre, the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>79</sup> For the argument behind these conclusions, see 'Arabic translation', and Shehadeh's entry 'Arabic versions of the Pentateuch' Companion, 22–4.

<sup>80 &#</sup>x27;Arabic versions', 22-4.

<sup>81 &#</sup>x27;Arabic translation', 505f.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>82</sup> His name is probably derived from the Aramaic root glg which is equivalent to Sbh and to 'md in Arabic, both having the meaning of praise. This poet should not be confused with the twelfth-century philanthropist, Ab Gilluga, a wealthy man mentioned in Samaritan chronicles.

author of the Kitab at Tabakh, who wrote several pieces for the liturgy.83

The third period of liturgical writing was marked by the fourteenth century renaissance in spiritual life under the aegis of Pinhas b. Joseph who wrote at least two Torah MSS,<sup>84</sup> and who is regarded as the father of a new generation of liturgists. His own father, Joseph HaRabban was also a liturgist of note. Pinhas's two sons, Eleazar and Abisha, were both liturgists, but the latter of exceptional fame, being the author of about seventeen pieces. Another composer and scribe of the same period was Abdalla b. Salamah. All of these composers were scribes who have left their mark not only in the liturgy but in the form of manuscripts of the Pentateuch, some complete and others fragmentary, now in Western libraries.

In this third period the language of the liturgy was a hybrid of Hebrew and Aramaic with a strong admixture of Arabic, which is identified by grammarians as 'Samaritan'. We find that this mixture of Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic started to replace Aramaic as the language of the tashqils, the identity inscription in manuscripts, especially in Pentateuch manuscripts. At this time the register of liturgical works in the defter began to be restricted to the Sabbath and weekday services. The festival services were supplied with special prayer books and a new collection was written for weddings and circumcisions (the Book of joyous occasions or Mimar ashama). There is a vast number of manuscripts for each of the special occasions of the Samaritans but all of them were written subsequent to this period.

The John Rylands Library is well endowed with liturgical manuscripts of value. Among the more important are Rylands Sam. MSS 11 and 18, Berlin Or. 4° 532, B.N. Sam. 8 and 25, Vat. Sam. 3, Gotha 57 and 58, and Keble College, Oxford, Sam. MS 84. Other valuable manuscripts are Rylands Sam. 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 27; Bodley Sam. d.3; B.L. Or. 7924; B.N. Sam. 62; (Book of Joyous Occasions) B.L. Harley 5514; Berlin Or. 4° 529, 530, 531, 533, 535, 536, 537, 538, 538, 539; MS Petermann 6:7; B.L. Add. MSS 19005, 19006, 19007, 19008, 19009, 19010, 19017, 19018, 19019, 19020, 19650,19651, 19652, 19654, 19655, 19790, 19791, 25880, Or. 1448, 1449, 2689, 2690; B.N. Sam.19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26 (Special seasons and occasions). The list is not exhaustive and catalogues should be consulted.85

<sup>83</sup> Also known as Abu l-Hasan as-Suri, the same man who is alleged to have translated the Pentateuch into Arabic. The epithets Abu l-Hasan and Ab Hisda were assigned to him as tokens of respect and honour. It is still uncertain whether he was a priest or not. Most works by Abu l-Hasan are known to us only by name or by brief description of contents such as altawba, al-isara, maratib musa. Although he wrote piyyutim in Hebrew and Aramaic only three prayers are extant. (Samaritan liturgy, 70-2, 79-81, 875-7)

<sup>84</sup> No 470 in 'Studies in Samaritan Manuscripts', IV.

<sup>85</sup> See J-P. Rothschild's entry in The Samaritans.

Chronicles, Commentaries, Theological and Polemic Works of the Arabic Period

There are several basic chronicles which stem back to the period when Arabic began to displace Aramaic in writing Samaritan literature and to the literary renaissance of the fourteenth century. Others are late versions which pretend to have sources of high antiquity. One chronicle, which was alleged to be the oldest known to us is the *Asatir*, a name invented by Moses Gaster<sup>86</sup> for what is not really a chronicle but is a midrash on the life of Moses, not dissimilar in style and content to parts of the *Tibåt Marqe*. It was written, almost certainly, in the tenth century and not the third century as claimed by Gaster.<sup>87</sup> Apart from one seventeenth-century manuscript, all the manuscripts available are modern copies.<sup>88</sup>

The Tulidah or 'genealogy' was written in Aramaic and Hebrew by Eleazar b. Amram in 1149. This text was one of the sources for Abu l-Fath's Kitab al Tarikh and the core text, with its marginal glosses, is a useful source of information about the priests and the more important Samaritan families. It begins with a discussion of the meridian of Mt Gerizim in Aramaic and then gives lists of the patriarchs from Adam to Moses and lists of the sons of Aaron from Eleazar to Ozzi and the High Priests from the destruction of the Tabernacle to Eleazar's own time. Lists of important Samaritan families are also included from Baba's time to the twelfth century, with such brief references to wider world history as seemed necessary to establish the chronological context. The work was continued by Jacob b. Ishmael who added a list of the Jubilees that had been reckoned from the settlement in Canaan to his own day, 747 A.H./1346. Other scribes developed the list down to the time of Jacob b. Aaron in 1859.

What is claimed to be the autograph manuscript is in Nablus and has been published by Bowman.<sup>89</sup> This manuscript is an interesting object lesson in the way a manuscript can be glossed and enlarged over the centuries and is also a useful codicological exemplar. Almost every modern version differs from the source by bringing the events up-to-date in the lifetime of the copyist. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>86</sup> Moses Gaster, The Asatir, the Samaritan book of the secrets of Moses together with the Pitron or Samaritan commentary and the Samaritan story of the death of Moses (London: Oriental Translation Fund, N.S. 26, 1927).

<sup>87</sup> See Tal's evaluation, 'Samaritan literature', The Samaritans, 465-7.

<sup>88</sup> See the heading Asatir, in Catalogue of the Samaritan manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, II (nos. 274–280). Robertson indicates there that the copies supplied to Gaster were made from a parchment copy in the hands of the High Priest at Nablus. A writing on parchment would probably, but not certainly, indicate a text before the fourteenth century.

<sup>89</sup> John Bowman, Transcript of the original text of the Samaritan chronicle Tolidah (Leeds: LUOS, 1954). A new edition is about to be published by Moshe Florentin offering alternative readings to those in Bowman's version.

Rylands library holds three copies (Rylands Gaster Sam. MSS 281–283) which have been identified in the catalogue by the name of the modern, updating scribe. Bodley Or. 651 is another version of the *Tulidah* which was published by Adolph Neubauer and is sometimes known by the title Chronicle Neubauer.<sup>90</sup> Moritz Heidenheim published the same text in 1870, apparently unaware of Neubauer's prior publication.

The Kitab at-Ta'rikh of Abu l-Fath was written in Arabic by Abu l-Fath in the fourteenth century (1355) at the instigation of the High Priest, Pinhas ben Joseph. This chronicle uses sources now lost to us and has been drawn on by the Samaritans who have built round it by continually adding material to bring it up-to-date so that there is a shorter, original version and a longer, extended and much glossed version. It has been plagiarized, summarized, précised. abstracted, paraphrased and edited for several other chronicles which have been presented as different, old chronicles. As yet there is no edition or translation available of the extended version which has some interesting and important material. It covers the history of the Samaritans and their theory of the structure of time according to periods of Divine Favour and Disfavour from the creation of the world to the time of the scribe. The original version has been edited by Stenhouse<sup>91</sup> but the translation only was published.<sup>92</sup> The only published Arabic text is still that of Vilmar. 93 Manuscripts of the text are written either in Arabic or in Arabic in Hebrew characters with a Hebrew translation in a parallel column.

The more important manuscripts of the fundamental text are Rylands Sam. 260; Berlin Or. 4° 471; Petermann I:5 and 8; Bodley, Huntington 350; B.N. Sam. 10 and 17; Sassoon 36; Stuttgart Würtembergische Landesbibliothek MS Or. 4° 18; Leningrad Saltykov Tschedrin State Public Library MS Sam. VI 20; B.L.Or. 2080, B.L. Or. 1447, B.L. Or. 10875; New York, JTS ENA 1356; Yale, Landsberg MS 663; Bibliotheca Apostolica Sbath MS 744; JNUL Sam. 8° 5. Amplified versions with extensive material bringing the text up-to date include Rylands Sam. MS 234; New York, JTS Sulzberger 3473; Berlin Or. 4° 963; Boston Mugar Library Barton MS 7; Girton College, Cambridge Sam. MS 18; B.L. Or. 7927, Bibliotheca Apostolica Sbath MS 742.

The Book of Joshua, sometimes identified as the Arabic Book of Joshua to distinguish it from the Hebrew text made famous by Gaster, was compiled from a number of sources and translated into

<sup>90</sup> Adolph Neubauer, 'Chronique samaritaine suivie d'un appendice contenant de courtes notices sur quelques autres ouvrages samaritains', *Journal Asiatique*, 14.6e series (1869), 385-470. [repr. Paris, 1873].

<sup>91 &#</sup>x27;Kitab al-Tarikh of Abu'l Fath'. See n.14.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>92</sup> Kitab al Tarikh of Abu'l Fath, Mandelbaum Studies in Judaica 1 (Sydney: Mandelbaum Publishing, 1985).

<sup>93</sup> Eduard Vilmar, Abulfathi annales Samaritani (Gotha, 1865).

Arabic by an unnamed Samaritan scholar in the thirteenth century. The principal manuscript (Leiden Or. 249) on which all other copies are based was written in 1362 and was extended in 1513. The text is known in a number of manuscripts all of which differ. The chronology of the chapters in the original manuscript is disturbed perhaps because the sections were rebound incorrectly. The compiler claims that he used a Hebrew source for the first part and behind the Arabic text one can find sources in Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew. Most manuscripts are modern and are infrequently found in the Arabic script, but tend to be bi-columnar, Arabic in Hebrew script with a Hebrew translation. The text was edited by Juynboll<sup>94</sup> and a translation by Crane<sup>95</sup> has been published.

Moses Gaster<sup>96</sup> published what he claimed to be the Hebrew source on which the Samaritan Arabic version of the Book of Joshua is based. Unfortunately there are no manuscripts of this work older than the late nineteenth century and even though it has some very interesting features it must be considered to be a modern compilation based on a translation from the Arabic version of Joshua with some additional material from the extended version of Abu'l Fath.97 Its Hebrew is biblical Hebrew contaminated by Samaritan forms which Ben-Hayvim showed to have developed in the period of the Samaritan literary renaissance. However, preserved in the text are some Christological elements which are found in an Ethiopic parallel text. 98 Because this work was central to Gaster's study of the Book of Joshua the majority of manuscripts extant today came from his library and are in the John Rylands Library or the British Library. The Book of Joshua is inseparable from the following chronicle with which it is usually written. This chronicle, which brings the history up to date from Joshua to modern times, was published separately as the New chronicle by Adler and Seligsohn<sup>99</sup> (it is sometimes called *Chronicle Adler*) who did not appear to recognize that it was normally found in association

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>94</sup> T.W.J. Juynboll, Chronicon Samaritanum Arabice conscriptum, cui titulus est liber Josuae (Lugduni Batavorum: Luchtmans, 1848).

<sup>95</sup> Oliver T. Crane, The Samaritan chronicle or the book of Joshua, the son of Nun (New York: John Alden, 1890). A translation of the Scaliger codex.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>96</sup> Moses Gaster, 'Das Buch Josua in hebräisch-samaritanischer Rezension. Entdeckt und zum ersten Male herausgegeben', *ZDMG*, 62 (1908), 209–79, 494–549 (Repr. Leipzig, 1908).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>97</sup> For an edition of the text and discussion of the problems see A.D. Crown, 'A critical reevaluation of the Samaritan Sepher Yehoshua', University of Sydney Ph.D, 1966. A note attached to Dropsie/Annenberg MS NS2 of 1907 says 'Murjan ist der eizenliche verfasser des Samarit. Joshua Buches ed. Gaster'. Which Murjan this is is not clear, but, presumably it was someone who had been a recent scribe. We may suggest that the Murjan was Ab Sakhwa/Murjan b. Asad (1901).

<sup>98</sup> On this point see Georg Graf, 'Zum alter das samaritanischen Buches Josue', *Biblica*, 23 (1942), 62-7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>99</sup> E.N. Adler and M. Seligsohn, 'Une nouvelle chronique samaritaine', *Revue des études Juifs*, 44-6, (1902-03), 188-222 (44); 70-98, 160, 223-54 (245); 123-46 (146). (Repr. Paris, 1903).

with the so-called Samaritan Hebrew Book of Joshua. Adler conjectured that his manuscript was the *Ta'rikh* attributed to Sadaqa by Abu 1-Fath. Seligsohn, Adler's co-editor of the *New chronicle*, rightly, doubted the antiquity of the manuscript and noted that it draws heavily on the *Tulida* and the *Kitab at-Ta'rikh*. In fact, when it is presented in conjunction with the Hebrew version of the Book of Joshua, the *New chronicle* is always introduced with the note that this is the *Sefer Hayamim*. Its scribe was Ab Sakwa ibn 'As'ad ibn Isma'il ibn Ibrahim ha-Danfi and we should consider the *New chronicle* to be, in effect, the *Sefer Hayamim*.

Related to the *Tulidah* is the *Shalshala* or Chain of the High Priests which is the list of High Priests to the time of the updating scribe of the text, Jacob b. Aaron. Jacob may well have been the compiler rather than merely a copysist. Moses Gaster, who published the Hebrew text and translation in 1909, considered that the *Shalshala* was the source of the various manuscripts of the *Tulidah* and was expanded into them in the tenth or twelfth century. While the theory is plausible, the relative paucity of manuscripts of the Shalshala and the absence of manuscripts older than those in the John Rylands Library, provides no evidence to indicate an origin earlier than Jacob b. Aaron.

One other chronicle which should be noted is the so-called *Chronicle II* extensively excerpted by Macdonald<sup>100</sup> and his students, and reprinted in some modern collections of Jewish documents. A fourteenth century C.E. date has been suggested for the work which contains parallels to the Massoretic books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles and Psalms – in effect it seems to represent a mélange of Jewish Biblical texts and material drawn from the *Kitāb at-Ta'rikh* or other chronicles. Macdonald dated his manuscript to 1026 H/1616, but it was undoubtedly copied in 1326 H/ 1908. In fact the chronicle is a modern compilation – no old manuscripts are known and it was written, apparently, by the priestly scribes of Nablus at the end of the last century. It is very closely related to the extended Samaritan Hebrew Joshua version and *New chronicle* of Adler. It contains some interesting material which one can trace to nineteenth-century European textbooks.<sup>101</sup>

The most important manuscript of the Arabic Book of Joshua, after the Leiden text is B.L. Add. MS 19956 (1502). Other manuscripts in one version or another are Rylands Sam. MSS 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270,

<sup>100</sup> John Macdonald, The Samaritan chronicle no. II (or: Sepher Hayamim) (Berlin: BZAW 107, 1969).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>101</sup> The so-called twelve tables of Roman law represented in Gaster MS 863 (utilized as a base manuscript by Macdonald for his edition) are translated directly from a textbook of Roman law. The tables are found in my transcript of this manuscript in my Sydney Ph.D thesis.

271, 272; B.L. Or. MS 10319, Boston – Barton MS 8, Barton MS 11; New York, JTS, ENA 1357; B.N. Sam. 30; Dropsie/Annenberg NS MS 33; Sassoon 509, 510; Freie Universität Berlin 37; Girton College, Cambridge MSS 15, 16, 41; Jews College, London MS 27; Bodley Sam. e.16 and 2541; Berlin Or. 4° 1096–1097. Many more modern manuscripts of this series of chronicles are likely to be located in American libraries (e.g. MS 4934, Princeton University Museum, New York, JTS, MS Sulzberger 14).

#### Halakhic/Legal and Polemical Texts

A canonical Samaritan halakha, resembling the Jewish compilations never existed. This is why very few Samaritan halakhic treatises were written, all of them composed after the language shift from Aramaic to Arabic took place, and some scholars doubt that the term 'halakhic' can be applied legitimately to any Samaritan religiolegal literature. The reason for the lack of halakhic compositions written in Aramaic is not at all clear. The very existence of halakha in the community in ancient times is indicated by several precepts 'concealed' behind various passages of the Targum in which the Aramaic translation does not follow the Hebrew original or where the original has a peculiar form. 102 The oldest halakhic/legal and polemical texts thus belong to the period when Arabic was penetrating Samaritan religious writings. They appear at the beginning of the Samaritan renaissance and continue to be written at intervals throughout the period. Many of the manuscripts are worthwhile not only for the sake of their intrinsic content but for the contribution they make to our knowledge of Samaritan Arabic. The first of them to appear were the Kitab al Kafi written by Yusuf ibn Salamah b. Yusuf al-'askari, written in 1041–42 and the Kitab at-Tabakh composed by Abu l Hasan as-Suri between 1030 and 1040. The two works are inter-related and they may have been derived from a common source. They may have been written as part of the general Samaritan response to Karaism and Islam<sup>103</sup> though Bóid<sup>104</sup> suggests that they draw not only on sources written in Arabic but on Hebrew and Aramaic materials composed well before the start of the Samaritan renaissance. The Kitab al Kafi is a halakhic compendium whereas the Kitab at Tabakh (the Book of Insight<sup>105</sup>) is not only a halakhic work since only the first part is devoted to halakhic problems, including dietary regulations, rules of purity,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>102</sup> See A.Tal, 'Halakhic Literature', *Companion*, 108–11 to whom I am indebted for some of the following details.

<sup>103</sup> See Gerhard Wedel, 'The Kitab at-Tabbakh', The Samaritans, 468-80.

<sup>104</sup> R.M. Boid, 'The Samaritan Halachah', The Samaritans, 624-49.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>105</sup> Boid's translation. The meaning usually allotted to this title is the *Book of meats*, after the first chapter of the work which deals with permitted meats. Some, translate the title as *The book of cooking* or *slaughtering*, following the reading *Tabbāh* (after Gaster, in the supplement to his article in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1925).

marriage, observation of feasts, etc. The second part deals with philosophical problems and the third part with Pentateuchal exegesis. It thus has a greater emphasis on matters of religious principle and may well have been in original form an unorganized collection of responses to Jewish polemics against the Samaritans. An important manuscript of the *Kitab at-Tabakh* is Rylands Samaritan MS 143. Portions of the *Kitab* were included also in Rylands Sam. MS 9A.

These works were followed by the Kitab al Khilaf, (the Book of Differences) written by Munajjah ibn Sadaqah in the mid-twelfth century, and the Kitab al-Mirat (Book of Inheritance - a juridic treatise dealing with the precepts of inheritance) written by Saladin's personal physician, 106 Abu Ishaq Ibrahim ibn Faraj ibn Maruth, the son of Abu l-Hasan of Tyre, also known for his grammatical study Kitab at-Tautiyya and the Kitab al-Fara'id, (the Book of Commandments) written by Nafis ad-Din Abu l-Farag b. Ishaq al-Kattar in the fourteenth century. Only a part of the Kitab al-Faraid, survived. The book is divided into chapters, each treating one or more commandments in connection with their order in the Pentateuch. Another halakhic work was the Kitab al Irbat by the scholar Abu l-Barakat (twelfth/thirteenth centuries) The book is concerned with the interdiction of marriage between members of the same family. A later composition on the same subject is also known. These tracts maintained their influence up till the current era and there are many nineteenth and twentieth century manuscript copies especially of the *Kitab at-Tabbakh*. It is probably because of their importance to the priesthood that so many of the older manuscripts have been preserved in the priest's house in Nablus and the majority of manuscripts used by Western scholars for their editions are modern copies

Of later halakhic works the Sarh al Itnayn wa-sab'in Turot, A commentary on the seventy two teachings, composed by Isma'il ar-Rumayhi in the sixteenth century, is known only from quotations given in other sources. The Kasif al-Gayahib, The uncoverer of obscurities, is a systematic halakhic commentary on the Pentateuch. Its first part was written by Muslim ibn Murjan ad-Danfi at the end of the seventeenth century. Ghazal b. Abi as-Surur al Matari and Ibrahim b. Ya'qub ad-Danfi, as well as other persons, completed the work in the course of the eighteenth century. The treatise is divided into four parts, following the order of the books of the Pentateuch from Genesis to Numbers. The fifth part was probably never written.

Two different versions exist of the Kitab al-Itiqadat, the Book of principles, known by Gaster as the Hillukh, which were composed in

the late nineteenth century. The one is by Jacob ben Aaron and the other is by Khidr b. Ishaq. The two are similar in their content and were written to make information regarding Samaritan practices available to European scholars in response to their questions.

Because some of the texts are known to us only in incomplete forms and other halakhic works (Kitab al-Ma'ad - the Tract on the Hereafter) may have been excepted from one of the longer texts, manuscripts are not at all stable in what they contain. The most important manuscripts for the Kitab at-Tabakh are Rylands Sam. 9A, Rylands Sam. 171 and 174, Nablus N125 (1348 C.E.), Nablus N 123 (1397 C.E.), Bodley, Huntington 24 (c. 1670), B.N. Arabe 4521, (1692), B.N. Sam. 36, Cambridge, Girton College 13 and 22, B.N. Sam. 35, New York, JTS ENA 1363, Sassoon 386, Freie Universität Berlin 31, B.L. Or. 12257; for the Kitab al-Mirath, Berlin Or. 4° 966 and 1104, JNUL 8° 34, Freie Universität Berlin 25, Berlin Or. 4º 1104, Rylands Sam. 370, New York, JTS ENA 1361 and Sulzberger 15, B.L. Or. 12302; for the Kitab al-Kafi, JNUL 8º 7, Leipzig, DMG 129, B.L. Add. 19656, B.L. Or. 10813 and 10867, Berlin Or. 4° 965, Cambridge, Girton College 12, Sassoon 385, Freie Universität Berlin 32 and 33; for the Kitab al-Khilaf, Rylands Sam. MS 157, Sassoon 377, 717, 718, and 784, Berlin Or. 4° 523 and 964, B.L. Or. 10863 and 12279; of the Kitab al-Faraid, Rylands Sam. MS 172, Sassoon 719.

Finally, one should note the exegetical works which were written in Arabic of the few Samaritan scholars who wrote commentaries on the Torah. As far as is known a complete commentary on the Torah penned by one author is not available. Yet such works did exist as is explicitly stated in some Samaritan and non-Samaritan sources. Thus, the eleventh century scholar Yusuf b. Salama al-'Askari in his Kitab al-Kafi affirmed that he had written an exegetical commentary on the Torah. On the evidence of Ibn abi Usaybya (1203–69) a thirteenth century physician Sadaqa b. Munajja b. Sadaga as-Samiri ad-Dimasqi, known as Sadaga al-Hakim, had written such a commentary and this Sadaga confirmed that his father Munajja composed a commentary on the Torah. Today only the commentary on Genesis starting with 1:2 and ending with 50:5, is extant. 107 Most Samaritan exeges is of the text is in the form of halakhic commentary in the works cited in the previous section and, for example, one could make a case for the inclusion of Munajia ibn Sadaga, among the list of commentators. Similarly it is difficult to classify the exegetical writings of Abu Sai'd b Abi l-Husain b. Abi Sa 'id whose commentary on Genesis 46:1 has survived as an independent treatise (Rylands Sam. MS 212, 226, 229).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>107</sup> On this material see Haseeb Shehadeh, 'Commentaries on the Torah', Companion, 59-61.

Abu l Hasan as-Suri appears to have begun a commentary on Genesis in 1053 as part of his writings on religio-legal subjects<sup>108</sup> and he wrote a commentary on the Decalogue – Kitab fi Suruh al-'asr kalimat; a commentary on Deuteronomy 32 known as al-Khutba al-gami'a or Sarh 'zinu which is usually included in copies of at-Tabbah. Among the incomplete extant works one of the earliest is that of Nafis al-Din Abu'l Faraj ibn Isaq ibn Al-Kathar, the thirteenth-century author who wrote a commentary on Leviticus 26 called Sarh am baqquti. <sup>109</sup> Isma'il ar-Rumayhi of the sixteenth century wrote a commentary on Deuteronomy and Ghazal b. abi as-Surur (Ab Zahuta) al-Matarr al-Ghazzawi (1702–1759) wrote two commentaries one on Leviticus and the other on Numbers.

Other commentaries were by Muslim/Meshalma ibn Murjan (1699–1738) and his nephew Ibrahim Ibn al-Ayyah who wrote a lengthy commentary on the first four books of Moses. Muslim, a renowned liturgist and scribe, wrote on commentary on Genesis and Ibrahim (1748–1787) a grammarian and liturgist, completed the text to the end of Numbers. None of the commentaries is as yet properly published<sup>110</sup> though this is one of the major tasks still facing Samaritan scholars. Several of Muslim's manuscripts are in the Rylands Library, viz. Rylands Sam. MSS 9, 13, 15, 16 and 19.

From the late nineteenth century onwards new commentaries have been written. 'Amram b. Salama the high priest (1809–74) wrote a commentary in two parts on Exodus; Pinhas (Khadir) b. Isaac the high priest (d. 1898) composed a commentary on Leviticus 18, named Tafsir surat al-irbot or Sharh utsul az-zawag – of the principles of marriage, and recently 'Abd-al-Mu'in (Il'azar) Sadaqa (born 1927) wrote an interpretation of the names occurring in the Torah – Tafsir al-asma' al-werida fi t-tawra.

The manuscripts of the commentaries are not yet properly identified – that will only come when a full edition has been done of them. However we can cite the following abbreviated list of manuscripts of some form of commentary or other:- Bodley Or. Add. 4° 99; Op. Add. 8° 99; Berlin, Petermann Or. I: 4; Boston, Barton 12; Leipzig, ZDMG 130; B.L. Or. MS 10370/1; Sassoon 380 and 719; Bodley MS 2539, Huntington MS 301, the work of Sadaqah, is the oldest complete commentary on a single book;

<sup>108</sup> See A. Neubauer, 'Un commentaire samaritain inconnu', Journal Asiatique (April 1873),341-68.

<sup>109</sup> On Nafis al-Din see LOT 1:45 and Samaritan liturgy, 425.

of Meshalmah ibn Murjan' (Columbia University Ph.D thesis, 1951). M. Klumel, Mischpâtim, ein samaritanisch-arabischer Commentar zu Ex.21-22,15 von Ibrahim ibn Jakub. Berlin, 1902, and S. Hanover, Das Festgesetz der Samaritaner nach Ibrâhîm ibn Ja'kûb. Edition und Uebersetzung seines Kommentars zu Lev. 23: nebst Einleitung und Anmerkungen. (Berlin: H. Itzkowski, 1904). [Reprint of inaugural dissertation, University of Jena]. These works represent so far the sum total of what has been published from the commentaries.

Bodley Sam MS d. 4; Cambridge Add. 1895 and 1896; JNUL 2° 5; Uppsala University O Nova 517; B.L. Add. MS 19657.

This basic guide to Samaritan literature has concerned itself with manuscript production in the main periods of Samaritan creativity and the subjects which might be expected to be found in manuscripts of various period. One should note that there are numerous other halachic works than those cited here, but the majority of those would be ater works, readily identifiable as stemming from the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. There are also numerous marriage deeds, Ketubbot, of which the best collections are in Washington at the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Museum library and in St Petersburgh, at the Public Library (formerly the Saltykov Tschedrin Library). These have all been published in the study by Pummer. 111 There are also many amulets. some of considerable age, and some as artefacts as well as manuscripts. These have been described recently by both Bowman<sup>112</sup> and Baillet<sup>113</sup> but there is no identifiable consistent thread running through their development. Moreover, there has vet to be a full comparison with the phylacteries from Qumran that would allow us to see these texts in a diachronic perspective and provide a chronological description of value. 114 Numerous calendars are still to be found preserved in western libraries. These need no description here.

<sup>111</sup> Reinhard Pummer, Samaritan marriage contracts and deeds of divorce. Vol. 1 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1993).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>112</sup> John Bowman 'Phylacteries', Texte und untersuchungen zur Geschichte du altchristlichen Literatur, 73 (1959), 523–38.

<sup>113</sup> M. Baillet, 'Samaritains' 774-1047.

The matter was approached by J.T.Milik, 'Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128-4Q157)' Qumrân Grotte 4 DJD VI (Oxford: O.U.P., 1977), 33-92, but in a rather superficial way.