

A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE IDEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND
OF 14th CENTURY SAMARITANISM WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO THE WORKS OF ABISHA b. PHINEHAS,
TO ABDULLAH b. SOLOMON AND BEN MANIR.

ROBERT J.F. TROTTER.

C O N T E N T S

FOREWORD.

INTRODUCTION.

PART I:

Page 1.

Belief in God.
His Nature and Attributes; His
Manifestation in the World of
Nature, Man, and History.

PART II:

Page 229.

Belief in Moses.
Son of His House; Birth of Moses;
Pre-Existent Moses; The Drop of
Light; Moses as Saviour; A Logos
Doctrine Connected with Moses? ;
Moses Redivivus.

PART III:

Page 306.

Belief in the Law.
Illumination.

PART IV:

Page 361.

Belief in Mount Gerizim.

PART V:

Page 387.

Eschatology.
The Resurrection; The Day of Vengeance
and Recompense; The Taheb; The Messiahs
of Aaron and Israel; Messianic Era of
A Hundred Years.

PART VI:

Page 520.

Angelology and Demonology.

PART VII:

Page 559.

Conclusion.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Page 581.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Page 586.

FOREWORD

F O R E W O R D

The School of Samaritan Studies, in the University of Leeds' Department of Semitic Languages and Literatures, has been engaged in research in that particular field, and to that end, scholars under the guidance of Dr. John Bowman, former head of the Department, and now Professor of Semitics in the University of Melbourne, Australia, have pursued their labours. The basis for research has been the two volumes of the late Sir A.E.Cowley's invaluable work, The Samaritan Liturgy (Oxford; The Clarendon Press; 1909). Other Mss. were used in conjunction with the text of Cowley.

As it is the province of the present work to present a critical study of the ideological background of 14th cent. Samaritanism with special reference to the works of Abisha b. Phinehas, Abdullah b. Solomon, and Ben Manir, recourse has been made to the good results already achieved by Messrs. Baguley, Boys, Brown, Crown, Green, Lerner, Mowbray and Macdonald, who were faced with the difficulties of translation, and of making comparison, where possible, with the corresponding Jewish Liturgy. By the herculean efforts of this stream of Hebrew research scholars, a good translation of Cowley's two volumes has been arrived at. As the School of Samaritanism was, after all, operating in what was virtually a virgin field, the findings were always tentative in nature. More recently a greater degree of

understanding of the Samaritan liturgical Hebrew and Aramaic has been attained, and some improvements in the translation and interpretation have been effected; this under the guidance of Dr. J. Macdonald, now head of this School. In this dissertation there has been no blind acquiescence in accepting the translations of those scholars already mentioned, but generally the translations arrived at under the expert supervision of Dr. J. Bowman have been accepted.

I first came into the Department under the aegis of Dr. J. Bowman, and as my work was to attempt to analyze the ideological background of the work done in past years, I soon caught the infectious air of expectancy imparted by him. During the pending departure of Dr. J. Bowman to Australia, I was fortunate to have as a guide, philosopher and friend, the Visiting Lecturer to the Department, Professor Theodor H. Gaster, from January to June, 1959. He was the son of a great Samaritan scholar, the late Dr. Moses Gaster.

With the departure of the two aforementioned Hebrew scholars, one for Australia, the other for Rome, the Department eventually came under the headship of Dr. Isserlin, while my studies became the immediate concern of Dr. J. Macdonald.

This work has treated the material available chronologically. Thus the ideological background for each

period of Sam. religious literature has been taken into account. The sources consulted have been Memar Marqah and the Defter from the Roman era, and the Liturgies from the medieval and modern periods. Selections from other medieval literature available in the writings of Dr. M. Gaster have likewise been consulted.

That Samaritanism is an amalgamation of Pentateuchal religion with early Christianity and, in its medieval form, with Islam, is made clear from the publications of Dr. J. Macdonald (see Bibliography). The picture presented in this work seems to give further evidence of that.

In attempting to establish an ideological background to 14th cent. Samaritanism, where plagiarism is so skilfully disguised as to appear almost to be non-existent, every tendency has to be carefully considered and balanced against improbability. What follows in succeeding chapters is what transpired, as the problem was pursued over a period of three intensive years of persistent effort.

Robert J.F. Trotter,

Rainhill.

1961.

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

INTRODUCTION

In order to obtain a correct perspective of the development of The Sam. Nation, and to make an attempt to assess the ideological background, a survey of the historical data of that background would not be out of place. Sam. scholars generally have stressed the insularity of the Sam. and in so doing have tended to minimize the possibility of their responding positively to changing conditions. But such is the psychology of Man, that he does respond to environment, if not positively, then in a negative sense. The Sam. were not unaware of the changes that occurred, not only physically, but also in the moral and spiritual climates. Any new movement of thought could not but be a wind of change, and if the Sam. did not accept new ideas and idioms, they nevertheless made use of the existing verbal coinage. They accepted the form if not the content. Therefore an historical survey, however superficial, is necessary if the Sam. are to be understood. The dominating influences of each century will be assessed, and due consideration and weight given to each succeeding facet.

What may be called the Sam. problem can be said to have had its beginning at the time when Sargon defeated the Northern Kingdom of Israel, (722 B.C.). Sargon¹ transported 27,290 of the inhabitants, and settled them in various named parts of Assyria². In their place he introduced a new

population³. The immigrants appear to have developed a synthesis of their own religion and the religion already present in Samaria. It is to this alien population, rightly or wrongly, that the Hebrew historian traces the mixed and heretical Sam. people. For a Jew biased against Samaria it would not be difficult, in rationalizing, to focus attention on the repopulation of Samaria, and the terminus a quo, where the bitterness and hostility between the two peoples took its rise. On the other hand, the cleavage may go back to the time when the lead in the conquest of Canaan was undertaken by the Joseph tribe. The hostility may therefore have had its roots politically in the jealousy of Judah who did not come into prominence until the time of David. The reign of Solomon saw visible signs of antagonism between North and South, and when he died there was an open division of opinion. Between the divided kingdoms there was deep bitterness, and although on some subsequent occasions there were alliances, these only arose as matters of expediency. One or the other was usually in the ascendant, and an element of some compulsion dictated the situation. But up to now the opposition between North and South was political. There is no trace either of race or religion being regarded as a cause for antagonism. The first overt act of enmity between the Jews and Sam. is recorded in Ezra⁴, and as this incident took

place shortly before Nehemiah's arrival in Jerusalem, the date for the actual beginning of Jewish-Sam. hostility is about 445 B.C. The difference was a political one arising out of envy and fear on the part of the Sam. when they saw the returned exiles increase the population, and fortify the capital and its walls⁵. The antagonism was political, but eventually gave way to a difference on grounds of religion, and later still, for good measure, racial differences came to be emphasized. Differences of race did not arise until after Nehemiah's second visit to Jerusalem in 432 B.C. This is approximately a century after the return of Israel from exile (538 B.C.). "They separated from Israel all the mixed multitude."⁶ But there is no word against the Sam. as such.

The O.T. says nothing about the Sam. having separated themselves as a community from the Jews. Yet that separation did take place. The first certain date showing the Sam. as a separate community is 128 B.C. when John Hyrcanus destroyed the Sam. Temple built on Mount Gerizim. Josephus, who however wrote a cent. after the event, states that it had been in existence for 200 years. This would give a date somewhere in the middle of the 4th cent. B.C.. So from the time of Nehemiah's action to the middle of the 4th cent. B.C. there had been a widening of the breach which led to the building of the Sam. temple. In 110 B.C. John Hyrcanus captured the city of Samaria, and incorporated it in the

Jewish state. In 63 B.C. when Jerusalem fell, and the Jews were subjugated by Pompey, the Sam. regained their freedom under Roman suzerainty, their land now forming part of the Roman province of Syria. Neither of these happenings would tend to improve relations between the Sam. and the Jews.

During this pre-Christian period of history the Sam. had suffered at the hands of Antiochus Epiphanes. He commanded that the Temple on Mount Gerizim was to be dedicated to Zeus Xenios, "Zeus the Protector of strangers." ⁷ II Maccabees⁸ mentions the occasion.

The first cent. of the Common Era saw the Sam. being ruled by the Romans, enjoying as far as they were able the fruits of Pax Romana. During this cent. as with those prior to it, they were aware, not only of the Jews as neighbours, but of other influences that could arise almost overnight. The first cent. saw the inception of a new movement of thought called Christianity. This precipitated a new influx of ideas that fell on receptive ground. The N.T. affords evidence of how the early Christian Church took root in Samaria itself.⁹ Generally the mention of the Sam. in the N.T. is in favourable terms. The Gospels of St. Luke and St. John give them a favourable endorsement. Indeed, some assessors would bring the Johannine Gospel into close affinity with the Sam. outlook. Some scholars see, however slight, a certain identical basis of approach in

the Johannine Gospel, the Sam. ideology, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. But even here there are deviations in method, for whereas the Sam. keep the Law virgo intacta, Father Patrick Skehan ¹⁰ has shown that in the Dead Sea Literature the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy xxxii had once a separate circulation with the text arranged in Hemistichs; which suggests that there are divergencies as well as agreements in the respective techniques. At this stage of investigation it is best to consider the three sources as distinct one from the other without being committed to any particular school of thought, but to be cognizant of the fact that there exist "coincidences of thought." These coincidences are inevitable, as coming virtually from the same ideological milieu, where recourse has been made to a common coinage of thought forms.

Some writers such as Cowley ¹¹ try to stress:-

"The extent of the Samaritan debt to Jewish literature, which will become more evident on a careful study of the texts."

He states ¹² :-

"The similarity of these hymns to PS. CXIX in general is so striking, that it is sufficient to mention the fact."

It would appear that the hymns from the Defter that Cowley has in mind are two anonymous hymns (C.pp.55, 56). An examination shows that it is difficult to prove that plagiarism has occurred here. Indeed one would be hard

put to prove that the Sam. plagiarize either the Jewish Scriptures or the Apocrypha. To quote Cowley¹³ it is only possible to say:-

"Coincidences of thought are of course commoner."

It is difficult to prove that the Sam. used the Jewish Scriptures other than the Torah, and have not made use of the Apocrypha. In a particular field such as philosophy or theology there is a residuum of words and ideas that occur by virtue of the subject itself. As the Sam. were determined to remain aloof from the Jews, holding them to be either schismatics or heretics, they would not run the risk of being accused of plagiarism. It will however be shown later that the Sam. might very well have been influenced by Christian ideas, especially as, over the cent., the Christian Church did make an impact in Samaria.

The expectancy of a Sam. Messiah¹⁴ led to the massacre of not a few Sam. on Mount Gerizim in 35. Schonfield¹⁵ writes:-

"How much the Samaritans at this very time were longing for the Taheb is again made plain to us by Josephus, who gives an account of the appearance soon after Christ of a false Samaritan Messiah. He tells how this man called upon the Samaritans to get together on Mount Gerizim, which is by them looked upon as the most holy of all mountains, and assured them that, when they were come there, he would show them those sacred vessels which were laid under that place."

Pontius Pilate believing it to be a revolt sent soldiers and slaughtered them. The outcome was that the Sam. sent a

mission to Vitellius, Legate of Syria, to accuse Pilate of wilful murder. Pilate faced this and other charges at Rome, with the result that he was exiled to Gaul in 36.

It is possible that Simon Magus was associated with this incident. Dr. Frank Slaughter¹⁶ said that Samaria was governed by Pontius Pilate; and that Simon Magus¹⁷ was looked upon as the Messiah. Green¹⁸ says that Simon Magus set himself forth as the Great Deliverer, the true Christ. Simon said that he had appeared as the Son in Judea, as the Father in Samaria, and as the Holy Ghost among the Nations. Nutt¹⁹ states that Simon Magus was associated with the first entry of Gnostic teaching into the Christian Church. He also quotes Justin Martyr as saying that Simon was a disciple of John the Baptist.

Grant²⁰ referring to the Acts²¹ (viii. 4-25) asks:-

"Could it be that Simon was more closely related to the Samaritan religion than Luke, who regards Samaria as a Christian mission field, wants to admit? Could it be that he was regarded as the Taheb or 'restorer' of the Samaritans?"

It is noticed that when the woman of Samaria²² (John iv.25) spoke to Jesus Christ, she was not then aware that the Messiah had come.

The Christian Church in Samaria must have taken root very early for Jesus Christ²³ insists that it was not the Twelve, but others (Alloi) who had founded the mission in Samaria. Culmann²⁴ asks the question, why did the Hellenists,

when they were expelled from Jerusalem after the martyrdom of Stephen (although the Twelve were able to remain) turn towards Samaria and thus become the first missionaries?

Cullmann says:-

"Because the inhabitants of this country, which had strongly undergone the influence of the paganism of syncretistic Hellenism, were half-Jews, who recognized the five books of Moses, but rejected above all the Temple of Jerusalem in favour of their own place of worship, the sacred Mount Gerizim. According to the Church Fathers there was a "Simonian" religion in Samaria, which appealed to the authority of Simon the Magician. The role of Simon must have been more important than the Book of Acts indicates. According to the pseudo-Clementines, he was the actual founder of a Gnostic sect."

Montgomery²⁵ points out that up to the administration of the first Procurator Coponius (6 - 9) the Sam. had not been forbidden to enter the Temple at Jerusalem. But when the Jewish War (66 - 70) occurred the Sam. and the Jews were not on too friendly terms. However in this war the Sam. also suffered, for in 66 Samaria - Sebaste was burned to the ground. In 67 the Sam. assembled on Mount Gerizim. Vespasian sent his captain Cerealis with 600 horses, and 3,000 infantry to dislodge the rebels. 11,600 Sam. were slain²⁶. Samaria as a city never recovered. On the other hand Vespasian built the modern Shechem called Flavia Neapolis, or Neapolis, now Nablus.

The end of the Jewish War with the consequent destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem must have been a

source of quiet, if not jubilant, satisfaction for the Sam. They were now in a position to affirm that Mount Gerizim was the true Mount, and not Mount Zion. This would give a great boost to their own faith, believing that history was only confirming what they had always held to be true regarding the Eternal Mountain. Both the Mount and the Torah would become acceptable as official tenets in their Creed.

An examination of the history of the 1st cent. brings into focus the question as to whether the Sam. were not the people whom the writer of the Epistle of the Hebrews had in mind. Orthodox reasoning avails itself of two factors in attempting to fix the date of the Epistle. The first assumption is that "allusions to the Levitical system as still existing seem to necessitate a date before A.D.70"²⁷. The Sam. had a Levitical system that persisted long after A.D.70. The second assumption is that "Clement of Rome makes so much use of it that he was even suggested as its author."²⁸ The strength of this second assumption would be minimized if it could be proved that the writer of the Epistle actually quoted Clement, and not vice versa. If these two factors can be nullified then there would exist a potential situation that would be in agreement with the Muratorian Canon²⁹(c.170) which does not include the Epistle in the Canon. The Epistle to the Hebrews was not

mentioned again in the West for two cent. But it was known before that time in Syria. An attempt has been made to show that the line of thought in the Epistle is not completely hostile to the point of view held by the 4th cent. Sam. writers in the Defter. Indeed the letter could have been written by one Gnostically minded or trained, who had been in Rome, so becoming aware of the writings of Clement of Rome, and who wrote to the Christian Church in Samaria. The orthodox Sam. would soon be aware of this letter read in the Christian Churches in Samaria.

The 2nd cent. saw persecution come to the Sam. from a quarter where they least expected it. Hadrian (117 - 138) has been considered to be one of the most enlightened of Roman Emperors. He was one of the most cultivated scholars of his age, a poet and philosopher. He was a very capable and able administrator, and on the whole he showed himself merciful, sympathetic and noble-minded. But the last few receding months of his reign saw him suffering from a painful disease, which tended to blur the political policy that had exemplified humanitarianism at its best. An incident occurred which provoked this even-tempered man into action. In 131 a revolt took place in Judea, under a false Messiah, who called himself Bar-Cochba, probably in allusion to Balaam's prophecy of the star arising out of Jacob. This rebellion was not finally crushed until 135. The rebellion

was crushed with terrific bloodshed. Hadrian renamed Jerusalem Aelia Capitolina, and erected a temple of Jupiter on the site of the Jewish temple. No Jew was allowed to enter the city under pain of death. A Christian Church arose in Aelia with Marcus as its first Bishop. Hadrian also vented his spleen on the Sam. probably concluding that they also were Jews. Hadrian had another temple of Jupiter erected on Mount Gerizim. Confusion appears to exist as to whether Hadrian did or did not erect a Temple to Jupiter on Mount Gerizim. Oesterley³⁰ only mentions Hadrian as building a shrine to Zeus on the site of the ancient Jewish Temple. He does not mention Mount Gerizim. But he states³¹ that Hadrian issued an edict stating that mutilation (either castration or circumcision) was punishable by death. The Sam. like the Jews would resist on religious grounds. Hadrian logically would suppress them by resorting to punitive measures. Green³² only mentions Hadrian rebuilding Jerusalem "calling the city Aelia, after his own name and dedicating it to Jupiter of the Capital by the adjunct Capitolina." Nutt³³ says the Sam. Temple was restored under Hadrian for support received from the Sam. in the Bar-Cochba Revolt. On the other hand Brown³⁴ adds a note to a composition (C.p.39; Brown p.250) saying:-

"This might refer to the acceptance by some Samaritans of the Samaritan Temple under Zeus Olympus in the time of Hadrian."

Tradition has it that the Sam. lost many of their ancient literary treasures through the punitive measures enacted by Hadrian. Hadrian had a new city built called Neapolis (now Nablus), which, in the 2nd cent. became renowned as one of the most flourishing centres of philosophy³⁵.

It is more than likely that it was from Nablus that esoteric ideological systems such as Neo-Platonism and Gnosticism began to influence the country generally. The traditional founder of Gnosticism is Simon Magus, the Sorcerer of Samaria³⁶. Another Sam. was the disciple and successor of Simon Magus named Menander, who taught at Antioch. Eusebius states that from this man Gnostic heresy spread out into two branches, at Antioch and at Alexandria. Cerinthus combined Ebionite theology with Gnostic speculation. Saturninus appears to have followed his master in practising the art of Magic. Basilides is the more interesting in that he attempts to define God in negative terms, a method resorted to later in the 14th cent. by Sam. writers. Valentinus also was a strong Gnostic supporter. However it should be noted that Montgomery³⁷ says:-

"That there is little to show that Samaritanism was ever gnostically minded."

Those opposed to the Sam. and biassed against them would argue that syncretism was always a feature of the Sam. religion from the time when they came to the parting of the ways with Judaism. They could assert that Simon Magus was

held to be a Gnostic, who was born in a Sam. village called Gittah, and that he deposed from leadership one called Dositheus. The Dositheans were held to be a Sam. Sect. Marcion (c.160) the Gnostic refers to God as "The Lord of the World"; an epithet used later in the 4th cent. by Marqah (C.p.19). The expression is also found in Memar Marqah.

An examination of the Defter leads one to conclude that the 4th cent. writers were not uninfluenced by Gnostic terminology. They appear on occasion to use Gnostic premises without necessarily subscribing to Gnostic conclusions.

Bearing in mind that there was a Bishop of Sebaste in the 4th cent., one may safely conclude that the Christian Church in Samaria continued to grow in the 2nd cent.

At the beginning of the 3rd cent. arose a philosophy that was to have an effect on men's minds for cent. to come. Neoplatonism was ostensibly a direct attempt to compete with Christianity. It attracted notice in that it was the last attempt of Greek philosophy to explain the mystery of the world. It was based on the teaching of Plato, mingled with a strong element of mysticism. Whereas Gnosticism was an attempt to reconstruct Christianity, Neoplatonism was out to depose Christianity. The two great progenitors of it were Plotinus and Porphyry. While Neo-Platonic elements

percolated through from Alexandria, Plotinus and Porphyry did not directly affect Samaria.

The great Origen (D.253) in this cent. had taken refuge at Caesaria, a port not far from Nablus. During his lifetime he undertook his Hexapla based on the accepted Hebrew Canon. His work might or might not have been of interest to the Sam.

The 3rd cent. saw the growth of Manichaeism. Mani endeavoured to reconcile Christianity with Zoroastrianism, exploiting fully the antithesis between light and darkness; a theme which always intrigued speculative minds. While the Defter mentions light and darkness, the Sam. do not subscribe to Persian dualism. On this point the Johannine Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls are nearer to each other than they are to the Defter.

The 4th cent. is one of the high-water marks of Samaritanism, for it was in this century that Baba Rabba "established the synagogue on Mount Gerizim, and engaged Amram Darah and Marqah to supply a synagogue liturgy³⁸. The Defter is a product of Sam. activity in this cent. This cent. is important because Christianity in 313 was no longer a persecuted religion, becoming recognized by Constantine. The official acceptance of Christianity would mean that other denominations, on the whole, would be in a more unfavourable position. But there were in the Christian Church sharp cleavages of opinion as to the

person of Jesus Christ in the Godhead. So in 325, at the instigation of the Emperor, the Council of Nicaea was called. Nearly all the Bishops were from the East. Nutt³⁹ states that a Bishop of Sebaste (Samaria) was present at this Council. The official findings of this Council, as exemplified in the Nicene Creed, cannot but have had an effect on the outlook of the Sam. writers regarding the Divinity of the Godhead. It will be shown later that Marqah may have been influenced by some of the terminology used at Nicaea. Time and again the 4th cent. writers affirm that God created without an associate or a second (partner).

Epiphanius (310 - 403), Bishop of Salamis in his chief work "On Heresies", mentions four different sects; The Essenes, the Sebuseans, Gorthenians, and Dositheans. The Dositheans were known to be a Sam. sect.

Montgomery⁴⁰ states that in the 4th cent. Nablus (Neapolis) was one of the greatest cities in Palestine. It may well be that there is a connection between Baba Rabba, the Dositheans mentioned by Epiphanius, and the flourishing town of Nablus. The writings of Amram Darah and Marqah are forever portrayed in the 4th cent. product of the Sam. Defter.

The 5th cent. saw the Christian Church in Africa faced with a challenge from Pelagius who held to a point of view not unlike the Sam. He appeared in Africa in 410, but later went to Palestine. In 415 Pelagius was accused

before a council at Jerusalem for asserting that Man could live without sin. He disparaged the need of Divine Grace. Pelagius is credited with having denied original sin. He also asserted the complete freedom of Man's will. He did not believe in transmitted corruption, and had no place in his teaching for transmitted guilt. He affirmed that every man, like Adam, was perfectly free to choose between good and evil. All Adam did was to set a bad example for Man to follow. This reduced the necessity for Grace to a minimum. Jerome in 385 left Rome, spending the remaining 34 years of his life at Bethlehem. He made his contribution to the Pelagian controversy from there, so that Samaria could very well have come within the orbit of being aware of the Pelagian doctrine. A reading of the Sam. Liturgies suggests that Sam. views on Man and sin are closely akin to the view expressed by Pelagius.

During this cent. Zeno, the Isaurian (474 - 490) kept a very close check on the Sam. He, it was, who forbade the Sam. burning, charring or destroying anything with fire. Montgomery⁴¹ alludes to the fire - purifications of the Sam., referring to them as "The most unique custom the Samaritans possess."

In the 6th cent., Justinian, the Emperor (527 - 565) issued his edict: De Haereticis et Manichaeis et Samaritis (527). He was determined to eradicate the remains of

paganism in the Empire. There was a burning of heathen books. Professors of heathenism were tortured. He assumed the task of regulating forms of belief. In particular he acts against the Jews, who were a disturbing power in the State: He prohibited the reading of the Hebrew Mishna, and imposed severe penalties upon both Jews and Sam. There was a great uprising of the Sam. in 529. The edict of Justinian in 529 was "against the Samaritans, the Manichaeans, Borborites, Montanists, Taskogrudi, Ophites and Pagans in general."⁴² Pursuing a line of thought other than historical, it is suggested later that Marqah (4th cent.) was aware of Ophite nomenclature and ideas. This point of view is further supported by the later edict of 531 concerning , "The Manichaeans, Borborites, Pagans, and the Samaritans, and those who are not unlike the latter, namely Montanists, Taskogrudi and Ophites."⁴³ In 556 the Sam. rose again in Caesaria.

But a cloud was about to rise in the East, which was destined to bring vast changes in Africa, and indeed in Europe. In 570 Mohammad was born, and before the end of the cent. was pondering on his projected mission, and devising his plans.

The fall of Rome before the Goth brought about a world flux in which other competing factors began to take a hand. But the religion which was to gain the pre-eminence was not

Christianity or Judaism, but Islam, which like Judaism and Samaritanism, derived from Semitic stock. Islam was a monotheistic religion, affirming the Oneness of God. The main concept was "The sword is the key of heaven and hell." The Saracen armies presented men with three alternatives, death, slavery or conversion. In their advance on Samaria Nablus was taken, while the Sam. fled from Caesaria and Arsuf. The Muslims achieved victories at Yarmuth (634), Jerusalem (636), while Caesaria fell in 640. In the same year Alexandria was also captured by the Muslims. Africa yielded to Islam in 707, and the African Christian Church came to an end. For nearly eight cent. the Muslim armies were to remain in Spain. Persia was subdued in the 9th cent. and the Persian religion destroyed. It can only be imagined how the Sam. suffered under the Muslims, although their belief in the Oneness of God rather than the Trinity would help to preserve them from extinction. It is safe to conclude that some Sam. defected while others became crypto-Muslims. It is recorded however that in 833 in the reign of Caliph MUTASIM, heretical sects of Islam seized and destroyed Nablus⁴⁴.

The Caliphs reigned from 636 to 1099, a period in which the people of Sam. suffered further oppression. Another "invasion" also occurred in that Arabic began to spread and eventually became the Lingua Franca. It is known how Arabic was able to sweep aside other languages, thus becoming the

chief medium of expression, although the Sam. would feel compelled to hang on desperately to their Liturgy couched in their native tongue. They therefore became a bilingual race.

But their land was to face another upheaval with the coming of the Crusaders. In pitched battles between the Crusaders and Saracens, large areas of land became depopulated, including Samaria. Altogether there were eight crusades from 1095 to 1270. The fall of Acre in 1291 saw the Christian Kingdom of the Franks in Palestine come to an end. There are very few records to tell what was going on in Samaria at that time, viewed from the Sam. point of view. As a small nation they would be insignificant historically, yet because of their smallness they would be the first to suffer both at the hands of the Franks and the Saracens.

The terminus ad quem of this thesis is the 14th cent., and a critical study made of the ideological background of the 14th cent. Samaritanism, as exemplified in the preceding cent. with special reference to the works of Abisha b. Phinehas, Abdullah b. Solomon and Ben Manir, all 14th cent. writers. So that the historical situation of the 13th and 14th cent. will now be given a little more fully.

It is by no means easy to penetrate the historical

situation which embraced 14th cent. Samaritanism. Apart from the broad trend of events, an attempt to ascertain details is fraught with difficulties. Samaria as a nation never appears to have been intimately concerned in the vital destiny of Mankind. If domestic records of the nation were kept then it is more than likely that they have been destroyed. The paucity of written evidence has been the despair of Samaritan scholars. It entails a situation where much has been left to conjecture. For example, the exact part which the Dositheans played in the history of Sam. doctrine is completely shrouded in mystery. One can only be aware of possible trends, and then tentatively suggest, rather than calculate or even estimate, their eventual outcome. In matters Sam., due to a lack of evidence, it is difficult to trace an evolutionary pattern. Speculation is more often the likely process than accurate assessment. Indeed lack of a clear-cut definition can so easily come to be regarded as evidence for mysticism. A subject can acquire the aura of abstruseness, not so much on account of its inherent nature, but by virtue of its presentation. And with a reconditeness of allusion, a difficult problem in itself is made more so by the hazards of translation.

However it is possible, by implication, to envisage what was happening inside Samaria, by gauging events that transpired outside. During the cent. immediately preceding

the 14th, an entirely new and important factor in the affairs of the Levant was the extension of the empire of the Mongols. At this time there were Muslim powers in Syria and Egypt. The Mongols in the 13th cent. were not as yet in any great number Muslims. Indeed their official religion was Shamanism. But by the end of the 14th cent. that branch of the Mongols contiguous with Asia Minor and Northern Syria became Muslims, while another branch that had advanced into China embraced Buddhism. Swiftmess of movement was a characteristic of these people. In 1258 the Mongols took Baghdad. Hulagu, their leader, pursued a policy of ferocity when he captured Baghdad. The last of the Abbasid Caliphs was tortured to death. 800,000 Muslim subjects were put to the sword. Such an impending wave of terror must have been psychologically disturbing to the Sam. In 1260 Hulagu, now Khan of Persia, invaded Syria. He took Aleppo and proceeded to capture Damascus.

Egypt was saved from the Mongol invasion by two factors. The first was Hulagu's sudden decision to return to China, and the second was the resolute leadership of the Mameluke Kotuz, and his great general Baibars, who recaptured Damascus. Hulagu had been converted to Islam, and had established his family as Ilkhans of Persia. It was the disunion of the Muslims in the 13th cent. that saved Christendom. Meanwhile, and this factor is

important, the continued destruction of centres of learning and civilisation like Baghdad had repercussions, for artists and men of letters became scattered into other lands. This intellectual diaspora had occurred long before 1453. The Renaissance was well under way before the Fall of Constantinople. Yet under pressure the Mongol Empire began to break up, and in the 14th cent. Mongol unity was utterly lost. On the other hand Egypt began to become stronger under the rule of the Mameluke Sultans, so that in 1260 Egypt was able to defeat the Mongols and drive them out of Palestine and Syria. During the remainder of the 13th cent. Syria remained under the suzerainty of the Mameluke Sultans of Egypt. After the Mongolian menace had subsided, Egypt prepared to give a great welcome to Kotuz. But Baibars took the opportunity to slay Kotuz, and assumed power. In 1261 Baibars the 5th Mameluke Sultan took Shechem. He transported Christian citizens from there to Damascus. This indicates that in the 13th cent. the Sam. were in close proximity to the Christian Church at Shechem.

Baibars continued his victorious policy for in 1265 he defeated the Franks at Caesaria and Arsuf; 1268 saw him take Antioch. As Syria became the battleground of the Mongols and the Sultans of Egypt, the Latin (Frank) principalities of Syria were fated, and fell as a prize of victory to one or other of the combatants. Baibars was in

possession of all his conquests when he died in 1277. He is held to have been succeeded by his son, and also by his father-in-law Kalaun. In 1281 Kalaun defeated the Mongol invasion at the Battle of Homs (Emesa).⁴⁵

In 1291 Kalaun cleared all Syria of the Crusaders. By 1293 Malik Al Nasir, the younger son of Kalaun was on the throne. But a year later Kitboga, a Mongol Courtier compelled Malik Al Nasir to resign. From 1296 to 1299 Husam Al-Din, formerly governor of Damascus, reigned over Egypt. He made a fresh survey and division of land in Egypt and Syria, which occasioned much discontent. In 1299 Malik Al-Nasir was re-instated as Sultan. He imposed a fresh tax of 33% on rents in both countries mentioned. There were many complaints. This new tax was to help meet a further invasion of the Mongols. In 1299 Susamish, Viceroy of Damascus, prepared to invade Cilicia at the head of a Mameluke army. He was defeated by the Mongols. After this success Ghazan Khan and Hethum took the offensive to seize Syria and Palestine from the Mamelukes. The 7th Ilkhan Ghazan was able to take Damascus. In 1300 the Mongols were compelled to give up Damascus. Egypt now became supreme under Malik Al-Nasir. The Mongols by 1303 were finally defeated, while the last Latin (Frank) stronghold had already fallen.

With the recession of the Mongols, the Ottoman Turks began to become prominent in Asia Minor. In 1303 the Turks

and the Mamelukes united and invaded Armenia three times. But in the main the Turks did not venture into Syria and the Levant. During the 14th cent. Egypt was supreme in this sphere and it was to Egypt that Samaria had to submit. It is recorded that the Sultan renewed the earlier ordinances against Jews and Christians for helping the Mongols. The assumption is that these punitive measures were also in force against the Sam. It is to be noted that these ordinances had earlier been in force. 1309 saw a famine in Samaria. Refugees fled to either the Egyptian or the Mongol headquarters. From 1320 to 1340 Christian Armenia had to put up with a series of blows from Egypt. In 1322 Egypt and the Mongols had reached terms of peace. Due to the extravagance of Malik Al-Nasir, his viziers had to resort to violent extortion. Many new buildings had been erected in Damascus. In 1335 Armenia was conquered by Malik Al-Nasir.

During this period (1326 - 59) Orkan the Turk laid the foundations of the Ottoman Empire which was to last 6½ cent. He specifically encouraged learning and founded schools.

1336 Timur the Tarter born

1341 Malik Al-Nasir dies

1342 Egypt invades Armeno-Cilicia.

The 14th cent. in Europe and Asia saw the Black Death (1348-9 and 1362). The plague of 1665 was known to

emanate from the Levant, and it is conjectured that the Black Death had its genesis in Libya, Egypt and Syria. At the time of Timurlane's supremacy, Asia and Europe had already been devastated by the terrible ravages of the Black Death. Timurlane was finally able to break the power of the great Mongol house.

Yet Egypt did not have it all her own way during the 14th cent., for history records that in 1357 Constantine IV, king of Armenia, drove the Mamelukes from the country and captured Alexandretta.

Also Peter the Great (1359 - 1369) ravaged the coast-line of Syria. He was a man of strong character, and tried to wage war against Egypt and to shake the hold of the Mamelukes of Egypt on the Holy Land. In the Autumn of 1365 he sacked Alexandria, while in 1367 he paid full attention to the coast of Syria.

1375 Leo VI, King of Armenia, fought against the Mamelukes. He was defeated and led captive to Cairo.

In 1386 Timurlane and his armies began to threaten the supremacy of Egypt. The Tartar armies over-ran Persia. Baghdad surrendered. The Mameluke, Barkuk and the Ottoman Turks united to push back the Tartars eastwards. They were able to recover Baghdad. But later Timurlane returned and destroyed the city of Baghdad (1401). He exacted a terrible slaughter. He had already faced a

dangerous alliance of the Egyptian Mamelukes and the Ottoman Sultans. He defeated the Mamelukes at Aleppo. Then he proceeded to capture and burn Damascus. Only a plague of locusts stopped Timurlane from taking Jerusalem. He was able to drive the Christian Knights from Smyrna.

In 1405 Timurlane died.

The conclusion from such a survey is that in the 14th cent. Samaria was under the suzerainty of Egypt. Unfortunately there is little direct evidence with Samaria as the focal point. Even with such an important place as Damascus no data was available for the 14th cent. to any large degree.⁴⁶ Montgomery⁴⁷ writes:- Outside of family annals, "The Samaritan Chronicles contribute nothing to our knowledge of the history between the beginning of the 14th cent. and the 17th cent." Elsewhere he writes⁴⁸: "The real intellectual centres of the sect were in Egypt and at Damascus." "This famous centre of Islamic culture became the centre of Samaritan science (sic) as Egypt had been of the Midrashic literature of the sect."⁴⁹

The Latin bishopric of Sebaste (Samaria) had commenced in 1155. This title which had been kept up by the Roman Church, ceased to be in the 14th cent. The lapse probably occurred at the time when the Crusaders had been ejected from Syria. The Christian Church must have lost prestige in an environment where contending forces were upholders of the

faith of Islam, for the Egyptians, the Turks and the Mongols in increasing numbers became adherents of Islam. By the end of the 14th cent. the western Mongols finally embraced Islam as a religion on a national basis. Hulagu (d.1277) had been converted to Islam, and his successors, the Ilkhans of Persia, followed his example. Timurlane was a well educated and sincere Muslim. The Sam. would, no doubt, be impressed by an atmosphere definitely Islamic. The religious beliefs of the conqueror tend to supersede those of the conquered. Material circumstances inevitably lead to psychological questioning. Doubts arise, if one is in a minority, and one wonders where one has gone wrong and incurred disfavour. The Sam. never lost sight of the worldly situation as one of favour (RAHUTAH) and disfavour (PANUTAH). Their religious leaders must have pondered seriously on this matter, especially in the light of a victorious Islam. While basic concepts are not necessarily changed, a different attitude, due to events, can and does happen. The Babylonian exile brought about a change in Judaism. So, logically, if one had to decide in the light of historical analysis, whether Samaritanism influenced Islam, or vice versa, then the latter is more, if not, most likely and inevitable. The conqueror does not change his mode of life or beliefs in case he may lose the smile of fortune. Nothing succeeds like success. The

Sam. however conservative he might be, must have wondered where he had gone wrong for him to experience continued disfavour. The impact of Christianity, especially brought to his notice by the Crusaders, followed by the more recent successes of Islam could not have passed unnoticed. The Sam. must have wondered in the 14th cent. why Ishmael (Egypt) should prevail, where Isaac (Sam.) had failed. The continued decimation of a nation's population, who by God had been promised, through Abraham, that "I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore"⁵⁰, must have induced much heart-searching. They knew that they were faithfully endeavouring to keep the law in its "content". Where then were they continuing to fall short? Perhaps after all, it was in the "form". It may be that the revival of Hebrew in the 14th cent. was due to a desire to rectify the situation. Many Jewish and Sam. writers were fully at home in Arabic. The Sam. may have thought that a neglect of Hebrew was the cause of disfavour. Yet, on the other hand, the resurgence of the Hebrew language for Liturgical purposes in the 14th cent. could be but another indication of the extreme conservatism that was such a characteristic feature of the Sam.

N O T E S

INTRODUCTION

1. Robinson. Theodore H. A History of Israel. 2 Vols. Oxford. 1948.
 ibid. p.382
2. II Kings, xvii, 6.
3. II Kings, xvii, 24. cf. 30-31.
4. Ezra iv, 6-23
5. Ezra iv, 12
6. Neh. xiii, 1-3
7. Oesterley and Robinson, Vol.11, p.225.
8. II Maccabees vi, 2.
9. Acts viii, 25.
10. Allegro, J.M. The Dead Sea Scrolls. The Jewish Quarterly Review. ibid. p.65
11. ibid. Vol.VII, p.134
12. ibid. p.133
13. ibid. p.133
14. St. John iv, 25.
15. Schonfield, J.H. The Bible Was Right. p.74.
 Slaughter, Frank. The Thorn of Arithmathea.
16. p.52
17. ibid. p.80
 Green, Samuel G. A Handbook of Church History
18. p.45
 Nutt, J.W. The Samaritan Targum.
19. p.55
20. Grant, R.M. Op.cit. p.73
21. Acts viii, 4-25.
22. St. John iv, 25.
23. St. John iv, 38.
24. The Expository Times. Vol.LXXI, No.2.
 Professor O. Culmann, November, 1959.
25. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.85
26. ibid. p.87
27. Whitham, A.R. op.cit. p.38

28. ibid. p.38
29. Clogg, Frank Bertram. An Introduction to the New Testament. p.142
30. Oesterley, W.O.E. op.cit. p.461
31. ibid. p.460
32. Green, Samuel G. op.cit. p.58
33. Nutt, J.W. op.cit. p.21
34. Brown, S. Dissertation, Leeds, 1955. p.268
35. Perowne, Stewart, Hadrian. p.166. London, 1960
36. Acts viii
37. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. Chap.xii
38. Bowman, J. L.U.O.R. Vol.I, p.48.
Art: The Importance of Samaritan Researches.
39. Nutt, J.W. op.cit. p.11
40. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. Chap.viii
41. ibid. pp.319-320
42. ibid. p.118
43. ibid. p.119
44. ibid. p.129
45. Cambridge Medieval History, Vol.IV, p.176.
46. The Jewish Encyclopaedia, Vol. IV, pp.417-418
Art: Damascus.
47. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.139
48. ibid. p.316
49. ditto
50. Gen. xxii, 17.

P A R T I : B E L I E F I N G O D

(A) G O D A N D L I F E

1. Existence of God
2. Life of God
3. Eternity of God

(B) N A T U R E O F G O D

4. Personality of God
5. The Oneness of God
6. Spirituality of God
7. Ethical Attributes of God
8. Transcendence and Immanence
9. The Metaphysical Attributes
10. Divinity of God
11. The Glory of God
12. A Specific Sam. Interpretation of the Oneness of God.

In order to attempt a critical study of the ideological background of 14th century Samaritanism, it is necessary to make some reference to early Semitic religion. Without this background it would be difficult to ascertain in what way the Semitic religion, known as Samaritanism, developed. As with Judaism generally so with Samaritanism, the Pentateuch was their 'blue-print'. Whatever was said therein about God was accepted without evasion, mental reservation or equivocation of any kind. They never wished to add to, or detract from, the inspired word of God, as solely found in the Sam. Pentateuch. From earliest times God for the Sam. was a person; He possessed individuality, and had a name. Initially He was conceived of after the analogy of a man. But the certainty of God's existence and nature led to the eventual reduction in the number of anthropomorphic expressions used to describe Him. Anthropomorphic allusions to God became reduced to a minimum. That vestiges remained right up to the 14th cent. cannot be denied, but expressions such as "the finger of God", and "face to face" (or "mouth to mouth") can be truthfully held to be metaphors. In religion generally the tendency is for the literal to become metaphorical; for that which is material to become that which is incorporeal. In the Pentateuch God is alluded to by a number of names. The word EL occurs frequently within a polytheistic context

(e.g. in Canaanite sources) but when it is used with the article it normally denotes the one and only God; e.g. "And he said 'I am God'" (HA'EL Gen.XLVI. 3). The name ELOHIM used so frequently in the E document is obviously derived from EL and though plural in form¹ it normally denotes the one God; hence it is followed by the third person singular verb. But EL, or ELOHIM is generic, and is not a personal name of God. According to Oesterley and Robinson² EL is connected with a place (e.g. BETHEL) and points to a transitional stage of a spirit developing into a god. EL occurs again in a name for God in EX. vi.3; "And God spoke unto Moses, and said unto him, I am Yahweh: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as God Almighty (EL SHADDAI), but by my name Yahweh I was not known to them." EL SHADDAI is often interpreted as "God Almighty", but this is considered to be inaccurate. The meaning of the name has been lost. The Pentateuch mentions God also as EL ELYON, the Almighty God³ and as EL OLAM, the Ancient God or the Everlasting God. Although such references to God suggest an early animistic stage there was no hesitation whatever on the part of the Sam. to utilize such names. But the name most used by the Sam. is that name by which God became personally known to Moses, Yahweh. The tetragrammaton Y - H - W - H, came to hold a special place in the minds of the Sam. Such veneration was not exclusive to them however,

for the name has a deep significance for most religious sects originating in the Old Testament. Awe and Reverence would not permit the followers of Yahweh to utter His name.

It must, however, always be remembered that the Pentateuch⁴ was not initially a Sam. heirloom. The Pentateuch is as much the book of orthodox Judaism as it is of the Sam., and other Judaistic sects. When the breach occurred between Israel and Samaria both gave full allegiance to the Pentateuch and the teaching therein. The Sam. Pentateuch varies in a number of places from that of normative Judaism but in the main both hold tenaciously to the same fundamental doctrine of God. The deviations will be noted later, in so far as they have bearing on matters discussed below.

The time eventually arose when the Sam. began, in their liturgies, to possess compositions, hymns, poems and prayers in which the contents expressed exclusively the Sam. outlook. The earliest collection of such evidence for examination is called the Defter (The Diphthera or "Book") in "The Samaritan Liturgy", by Sir A.E.Cowley⁵, Vol.I, pages 1-92. While the Defter is considered to be of 4th cent. vintage, doubts are still held as to its precise date. The contents of the Defter have been added to from time to time, but the bulk of the work would appear to be of the same era. The Defter is

composed mainly of compositions from the pens of Marqah and Amram Darah, and upon their foundation was built up the Sam. edifice found in "The Samaritan Liturgy."⁶ After the Sam. Pentateuch, the Defter stands in high estimation among the Sam. Therein is found the genesis of much that they came to hold dear with regard to their beliefs. An analysis of the Sam. Defter reveals that the Sam. never compromises about the nature of God. The fundamental axiom of the Sam. Liturgy is that "There is only one God," or that "There is no God but God." In this fundamental proposition two aspects of faith about God are crystallized, the existence of God and His Oneness.

1. THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

The Sam. never question the existence of God. They accept Ex.iii.14 at its face value; "And God said unto Moses, 'I am that I am': and He said "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I am hath sent me unto you." The ontological aspect of this statement seems to be more clearly indicated in the LXX rather than the M.T.; EGO EIMI HO ON.⁷ But God was never considered to be a metaphysical problem for the Semitic mind. The God of Abraham is not necessarily the same as the God of Aristotle. Existence for the Sam. carried with it two essential postulates; the existence of God as the Primal Cause or Creator, and the existence of the material world created by Him ex nihilo. As the world was

creatio ex nihilo, there had to be something or someone in the beginning. That is why for the Sam. as well as the Jew, the fulcrum of all existence rests on Gen.i.1; "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." It may be said of all philosophical systems that they all commence with a pre-supposition that cannot be proved or demonstrated. The Jew and the Sam. accept Gen.i.1. as axiomatic; God exists. The writer of Acts puts it another way. "For in Him we live, and move, and have our being"⁸, or existence. The Sam. mind reasons; we live and exist, so the Creator lives and exists. The Sam. mind never entered into the problem of what existence means. The two names most used for God also stress the existence of God, EHYEH ASHER EHYEH⁹ and YAHWEH¹⁰. EHYEH is the First person singular of the Imperfect Qal of HAYAH (to be), and the tetragrammaton Y - H - W - H is probably the imperfect of the word HAWAH (Aramaic for Hebrew HAYAH) (to exist or to be). God revealed Himself to Moses as "I am that I am" and as "Yahweh". So, in the first instance knowledge of the existence of God came as direct revelation as "I am that I am", and "Yahweh". This revelation, in the minds of the Sam. placed Moses in a unique position. Henri Bergson¹¹ insists that life is never grasped by reason, but only through intuition. He asserts that reason may review what has happened in the past, or postulate what may

happen in the future, but that it is intuition rather than reason that helps the living present of experience to be realized. Moses must have been a person of great intuitive insight. This is further demonstrated by the incident of the Burning Bush.¹² The question of the knowledge of God and of His existence, has led to many divergences of opinion. To the question is the knowledge of God intuitive or inferential? the most accurate answer would appear to be that knowledge of God is intuitive, and knowledge about God inferred. This distinction is necessary because the Sam. as well as other sects hold God to be a person. Knowledge of a person is, at least, two-fold in character. One can have a personal knowledge of a person such as, for example, the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did, knowing the person of God directly. This knowledge is intimate and personal. On the other hand knowledge can be about a person, such as knowing facts about him. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob - and Moses - knew God directly, having convictions of His existence, but they also knew about God, being able to identify His attributes, partly, if not in full. Personality is no less real although it cannot be demonstrated logically. It does not lend itself to a complete analysis, and cannot be reduced to logically and mathematically demonstrable categories. Personality is elusive, indeed almost spiritual. As God is held to be

pure spirit, the slide-rule is of very little help. As God is pure spirit He can only be known spiritually. He is a transcendent and infinitive Spirit. God transcends human categories. As such He is ever beyond the full grasp and significance of the human mind. Sir William Hamilton¹³ would maintain that a God understood by the human mind would be no God at all. Everyone would not go all the way with Hamilton, but it is a chastening thought to those who seek. God was not known as Yahweh to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.¹⁴ Reason enables us to have knowledge about God. But reason can never, by the very nature of the case, tell us all about God. Reason and revelation, faith and fact, are obverse facets of the same problem. The main hypothesis, that God exists, is come by intuitively. But knowledge about God, come by inferentially, helps to complement intuition.

The Sam. were able to accept the existence of God without ever feeling compelled to demonstrate His existence. The Pentateuch affirms the existence of God, therefore they never doubted but that He did exist. They never ventured forth on a wave of speculation as Anselm¹⁵ did stating, "God is a being than which no greater can be conceived", (Aliquid Quo Nihil Majus Cogitari Potest). The thesis worked out by Anselm stressed the necessity for the real existence of God. Existence is necessarily part of the essence of God. It is a quality that goes to make up perfection. Existence is not

like any other quality, such as bigness, redness or softness: it is "co-extensive" with these. The value of the Ontological Argument, if any, is that it is the expression of the conviction, rightly or wrongly, that the ideal must be the real. The Sam., however, were never at pains to demonstrate the existence of God. Of the so-called Theistic Proofs¹⁶ the Ontological Argument would be the least acceptable to them, providing of course that they understood it. The existence of God was never, for them, an hypothesis. The Cosmological Argument would be acceptable to them. God created the heavens and the earth. God¹⁷ was a Prima Causa. The world was caused by His will,¹⁸ wisdom¹⁹ and power.²⁰ The first chapter of Genesis - and also the second - could be evaluated as a poetical treatise on the Cosmological Argument. He was the Creator, the Mover and the Doer. To demonstrate the complete dependence of the Universe on God, there was a creatio ex nihilo. Without God there would be no creation. As they also believed that God "willed"²¹ the Universe, they believed in Teleology. They were not always sure what the purpose was, except of course that as Israel was the Elect and Chosen of God, the tendency was for the eventual benefit of the "keepers" of the Law to be realized. But perfection and purity were to be goals to be aimed for.

In the Defter the existence of God is never brought into question. The world exists, therefore ipso facto, God exists.

The world and God are never confused. There was no identical existence; no suggestion of Pantheism. Amram Darah (C.p.27) says:- "Thou art present in every place, but nothing that exists is like thee." In such a statement Amram Darah avoids the implication of Pantheism. So he can safely say also (C.p.28):-

"Wherever man turns his face, there he finds Thee."

An absolute expression of Sam. Ideological view of this is found in one of Eleazar b. Phinehas' prayers in the Defter (C.p.35); he writes:-

"And Thou art Yahweh who existed before the creation; And after the day of vengeance Thou art without end",

where he stresses the existence of God by introducing the concept of eternity.

An excursion through the Defter in search of God but confirms the one fundamental concept of the Sam. Faith, that the God of the Defter is but the God of the Pentateuch, and that both books assume the existence of God even without the necessity to demonstrate that existence.

In the 14th cent. revival of Sam. among the writers identified with the renaissance were Ben Manir, Abisha b. Phinehas and Abdullah b. Solomon. The evidence would suggest²² that Ben Manir belonged to the early 14th cent. Abisha b. Phinehas died in 1376, whose son Phinehas later came under the guardianship of Abdullah b. Solomon. It is

through the eyes of these Sam. that an attempt is to be made to ascertain, where possible, what was the ideological background which enabled these writers to confirm and sustain, or even to develop the theology of their Faith. Like the Sam. at all times, the existence of God was a sine qua non. For the Sam. it was sufficient to state that God existed, and existed sui generis. Aaron b. Manir not only alludes to God and describes His attributes in positive superlatives, but with confidence resorts to a mode of thought that has been used by such writers as Proclus, Moses Maimonides and Spinoza. But in making use of negative formulae in alluding to God he never committed himself to the concept of there being, at any time, "a non-existent God." Basilides, an Alexandrian Gnostic teacher, (C.117-138) went to the furthest limit in the matter of negatives. He wrote:- "So the non-existent God made a non-existent cosmos out of the non-existent." ²³ For Basilides, in the beginning there was "nothing"; "No matter, no substance, no non-substance, nothing single, nothing complex, nothing not understood, nothing not sensed, no man, no angel, no God." "The non-existent God wished (without intelligence, without sense, without will, without choice, without passion, without desire) to make a cosmos." However much Ben Manir resorts to negatives God for him is never non-existent. The negatives expressed above, Basilides regarded as an explanation of two

verses, one in Genesis²⁴ ("Let there be light"); the other from the Gospel of St. John²⁵ ("It was the true light"). Ben Manir does not go as far as Basilides in the via negativa. He would agree that the world was made ex nihilo, but would not accept the concept of God's non-existence; unless non-existence means "out of time", or "before time." The concept of time is necessary to the data of "existence" and "matter." A Hebrew philosopher, who lived a century or so before Ben Manir, and who made a deep impact on scholars of many nations was Moses Maimonides (1135 - 1204). In his "Guide to the Perplexed"²⁶ (Moreh Nebuchim) Maimonides also used negative formulae in referring to the attributes of God and of His existence. It is just possible that Ben Manir was influenced by Maimonides, for it has been established that Maimonides, in his travels, came to Damascus. Indeed, at a later date his work used to be read in the Jewish Synagogues there. Maimonides gave careful consideration to the tetragrammaton, and referred to it as the Shem Ha-Meforash, the nomen proprium. He states that the tetragrammaton may have conveyed the meaning of "absolute existence."²⁷ Maimonides²⁸ also wrote:- "For there is nothing else in existence but God and His works, the latter including all existing things beside Him; we can only obtain a knowledge of Him through His works; His works give evidence of His existence." The Sam. rely more on revelation

than reason in acclaiming God's existence.

Ben Manir (C.p.644) points out:-

"That which exists in the centre teaches
that His works are perfect."

The inspiration of this thought may have been derived from Maimonides who writes²⁹, At "the centre of all is the Absolute Being." Is Ben Manir alluding to this discussion of Maimonides on the Spheres? With regard to space the usual Sam. terms are "above" and "below".³⁰ It is most unusual for a Sam. writer specifically to place God in "the centre" of things.

Abisha b. Phinehas perpetuates the Defter thought in a hymn of praise (C.p.248) when he writes of God:-

"Abiding in every place, yet no place
can contain Him."

This is a typical Sam. attitude towards the existence of God. In His existence He is to be found everywhere, yet no place can contain or hold Him. This is a species of logic that one would associate with Prof. A.J.Ayer of Oxford, and not with Abisha of the 14th cent. Howbeit, the Prof. as an accredited Logical Positivist would discountenance the sentence as not conforming to the "Principle of Verification"³¹. It is a kind of affirmation about the existence, and indeed essence of God that one would associate with the Pantheistic Philosophy of BARUCH DE SPINOZA (1632 - 1677). Spinoza was influenced by Moses Maimonides and by Descartes (1596-1650). His researches led him to the conclusion that God existed and

was co-extensive with the Universe. He was led to this inevitable conclusion in his attempt to unify the two ultimates of thought and matter. Descartes, for his part, laid stress on thought as being necessary to existence. His basic concept of existence was Cogito Ergo Sum (I think, therefore I am.) Descartes relied on the Ontological Proof of God's existence. He says: "When the mind reviews the different ideas that are in it, it discovers what is by far the chief among them - that of a Being, omniscient, all-powerful, and absolutely perfect, and it observes that in this idea there is contained not only possible and contingent existence, as in the ideas of all other things which it clearly perceives, but existence absolutely necessary and eternal."³² In spite of what is seemingly a Pantheistic statement Abisha, with the Pentateuch as his "blue-print", makes a clear distinction between God and the Universe He created.

He makes the point that (C.p.699):-

"A creator is not like one at rest,
but is as something that seeks."

Spinoza would hold that a God who seeks is a God who is imperfect. On the other hand, a God who seeks is a God who has a purpose, and this concept is likewise acceptable to the Jew and Christian. Abisha then is not averse to maintaining a Teleological Argument for the existence of God, except that the Sam. like the Jew, accepted God's

existence as axiomatic, and required no demonstration apart from the created universe - the phenomenological argument, typically Sam. In another hymn (C.p.250) entitled "Words of Forgiveness", Abisha writes:-

"When the Lord sought that the creation of the world should take place."

The operative word here is "sought." It can be assumed that "to seek after" something, psychologically indicates a need that requires fulfilment; that something is lacking. It proves that the subject possesses a psychology; that is, that it is not inanimate. Also that a restoration of "harmony" in one's personality is wished for. It also indicates the presence of a will.³³ Abisha's thought about God having "sought" is consistent with the concept of God as a personality. Abisha by using Darash, does not place himself in the difficult position of Basilides, who, when trying to explain how and why the world came into existence wrote:- "The non-existent God -----"wished" (SIC) to make a cosmos."³⁴ The word "wished" is put in inverted commas because, for Basilides, God did not possess personality. If, for him, God has possessed personality He would exist, and wishing would be a normal concomitant of His psychological make-up.

Abdullah b. Solomon in a SHEBUA (C.p.178) writes of God that there is none beside him "from before the

beginning." This means that God existed in His Oneness before the beginning of the time sequence. Such a concept although appearing naive on the surface, is really of deep significance. Time is an ordinate that is only understood when brought into the context of matter. To the extent therefore that there was no material world "in the beginning", so also time did not exist, and vice versa. This point was elucidated by Maimonides in Moreh Nebuchim. Abdullah also states (C.p.178):-

"There was no beginning to His existence"

Also:-

"He is to be found in all things"

and:-

"He possesses all places."

But Abdullah avoids the charge of Pantheism for he writes:-

"And yet he that looketh shall not find Him"

Does it follow that Pantheism is obviated because of man's inability to find the all-pervasive God?

2. LIFE OF GOD.

The Sam. therefore identify themselves fully with the Consensus Gentium that God exists; that He possesses personality and has a name. The next step is to demonstrate that the Sam. accepted a Living God, and to discover whether life for God is in any way different from that possessed by human beings. The Sam. make use of two words to denote life

and living. There is Hayyim which is used as a synonym for God as "the Living" (C.p.3). The second word is Kayim and is used both of God and angels.³⁵ In the Defter (C.p.59) Marqah writes:-

"He (Moses) passed before the eyes of the Living one."

Here the word would appear to refer to angels, although, in the main it is chiefly used as a synonym for God. Marqah (C.p.61) also uses the word in the singular for he writes:-

"And for them the Living One (Kahimah Achad) descended from heaven to earth."

One (Achad) is eventually omitted with Kahimah standing alone as "The Living". (cf.C.p.74); Thus said the Living (One).

The tendency appears to be in the Defter to use Kahimah as referring to God specifically. Marqah writes (C.p.50),

"Life of eternal life is the great scripture, which is among us; the living (Hayyah) testify that there is no thing like it."

On a later page (C.p.61) is read,

"For it is the scripture of the Living (Kahimah) King, written with the finger of the Living (Kayim) God."

The Pentateuch prefers the expression in full, The Living God.³⁶ As however, in the Defter, Kayim is used of human beings as well as of angels, and God, it must be concluded that the latter possesses a quality which both

Marqah and Amram Darah associate with human beings before death intervenes. When Philo uses the word Kayim it seems to be equal to 'Estōs (being or existing). It is but a plain expression for "being alive." It does not include the principle of eternity or of everlasting life. In the Defter, The Prayer of Joshua (C.p.4) which is concerned solely with God, we have the statement:-

"As the days of the heaven above the earth,
we praise the Lord who endureth for ever." (Kayim
Leholam).

In this sense Kayim Leholam equals "everlasting life." In the Defter Marqah is the only one who refers to everlasting life. In one instance (C.p.25) he uses Hayye Holam Delah, and in another instance (C.p.27) Kayim Ho Had Leholam. It would appear therefore that Dr. Solomon Brown in his Thesis on the Defter³⁷ translates too freely Ah Maren Kayimah as "Oh Eternal Lord."

That the words Kayimah (the Existent or Living One) and Kamay (The First) can lead to confusion is evidenced in two Mss.:- K.Ms. F.162³⁸ and the Jaffa Ms.³⁹ Brown⁴⁰ has translated the Jaffa Ms., where necessary in his thesis. The translation is:-

"And Thou art He who was first who
wast before creation."

The J. Ms. has Kamah

The K. Ms. has Kayimah

Gesenius⁴¹ in the third hymn has an interesting observation on Kayim. It is:-

Deus aeterne
qui vivis in aeternum;

Kayim vivum notat et aeternum, a rad.Kayam. I.Q. Hebr.Kum quae praesertim in Aphel etiam vivendi notionem habet, unde in codice sacro explicandum est Kol Hayekum Gen.VII 4 and 23; Deut. XI.6, i.e. quicquid vivit.

Simon Magus calls himself 'Estōs "the Standing One," and the Greek participle seems to be equatable with the Aramaic Kayimah. If this conclusion is accurate then Kayim does not mean "eternal" but "living."

The Sam. Theology of God can be put in a nut-shell by quoting the first part of Article One of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. It is⁴² :-

UNUS EST VIVUS ET VERUS DEUS, AETERNUS,
INCORPOREUS, IMPARTIBILIS, IMPASSIBILIS;
IMMENSÆ POTENTIAE, SAPIENTIAE AC BONITATIS;
CREATOR ET CONSERVATOR OMNIUM, TUM VISIBILIIUM,
TUM INVISIBILIIUM.

As God is held by the Jews and the Sam. to be the source of all life, it may appear strange that the prefix. "Living" should be necessary in describing Him. Scripture lays stress on the "Living God," especially as against Idolatry and unbelief.⁴³ The correct word to designate the "Living" God is Vivus and not Vivens. God is life and its source. When the word "Living" is used in describing God the Sam. has also in mind the mortality of Man. If the

argument about the Sam. not believing in the Resurrection in the early cent. can be sustained, then the "Living God" has a particular significance when contrasted with Man. This point, however, will be taken up later in a chapter on Sam. eschatology. In the Pentateuch where the Living God is mentioned⁴⁴ the life of Man is also considered:-

"For who is there among all flesh that hath heard the voice of the living God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as we have, and lived?"

3. ETERNITY OF GOD

There is never any doubt in the mind of the Sam. about the Eternity of God. It indicates a Being, who, in no way, conforms to the ordinates of time and space. The Pentateuch refers to "The Lord, the Everlasting God"⁴⁵. He is a God living from generation to generation - the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob:⁴⁶ He is the Eternal God.⁴⁷ Speaking of God's eternity the Defter (C.p.84) reads:-

"Thou art everlasting unto all eternity;
Before the creation,
And after the Day of Vengeance."

This is the characteristic formula which the Sam. uses when referring to God's eternity.

In the Defter also (C.p.75), AB-GELUGAH (12th cent.) refers to God as:-

"The only One from old, without a second."

In other words God was the only One who had continued to be or exist from the distant past.

But generally the Samaritans prefer to refer to God as the "Eternal One" rather than the "Old One" or "the Ancient One." The Book of Daniel⁴⁸ makes reference to "The Ancient (Hathik) of Days." This thought is never prominent in the Sam. Liturgy, for the Sam. are averse to describing God in terms which associate Him with the time sequence; He is eternal, beyond time. Dr. T.H.Gaster in lecture once drew attention to this matter by referring to Montgomery.⁴⁹

Montgomery translates as:-

"He never grows old for He has no want", translating Mishcanim as 'want' (poverties), and Yithhathik as 'ancient' or 'grown old' from the verb Hathak. Gaster pointed out that Ben Manir never speaks of God growing old; that God is beyond space and time. He also said that the expression "the Ancient" did however appear in a 14th cent. Midrash. Gaster said the correct translation is:-

"He cannot go from place to place,
for He has no dwellings",
or "That God is not transferable for
He is not locatable."

Where the Sam. does mention a unit of time (i.e. Day) in connection with God it really implies the beginning of time and presumably its end, but not of God. Eleazar b. Phinehas (14th cent.) (C.p.35) sums up the Eternity of God by saying:-

"And Thou art Yahweh, who existed before the creation; and after the Day of Vengeance; Thou art without end."

Indeed in this matter the "Day of Vengeance" is often used as a signpost in time, or the end of time, with the actual meaning of the day in the background.

In a KIME (C.p.97) Aaron b. Manir alludes to the Eternity of God by referring to Him as the God of Abraham etc., right down to Caleb, Joshua and the Seventy Elders. Men arise, and later pass away from the scene of life, but God lives from age to age. Jesus Christ⁵⁰ also mentions "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" when affirming that "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living", indicating thereby, inter alia, that God is eternal.

Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.498) writes:-

"He lives! He is infinite, having no days or hours",

and again "It is known that He has no finality, and no end, which can be visualized."

Without, at this stage, discussing the infinity of God, by God being "infinite" and having "no finality", Abisha is really stating that God, being outside of the co-ordinates of time and space, is eternal.

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.432) makes use of a tautological expression when stating:-

"This unchanging Sovereign who is eternal always" ,

and may be his way of saying that God lives "for ever and ever."

At no time is the eternity of God in doubt in the minds of the Sam., but that aspect of God is stated in different ways, as if to exclude any possibility of doubt. This paragraph on the Eternity of God cannot better be concluded than by a return, for a moment, to the 4th cent. Defter. The only writer in that book to mention Everlasting Life is Marqah. He mentions it five times (C.pp.20, 25, 25, 25, 26). On each occasion it refers only to God. God for Marqah has "Everlasting Life" or "Life for ever." The other contributors like Amram Darah, however, make reference to the Eternity of God with such references as Eternal (One) (C.pp.27, 46, 28, 12, 19, 25, 39, 40); Enduring King (C.p.72); Enduring God (C.p.84); Eternal King (C.p.44); Eternal God (C.pp.16,84); Eternal in the Beginning and End (C.p.83); and the Eternal Lord (C.p.12). The designation of God as "Everlasting Life" will be raised again in the chapter on Eschatology.

4. PERSONALITY OF GOD.

It does not come within the province of this dissertation to consider the problem of the personality of God in extenso. Personality normally includes such facets as self-consciousness, will, cognition, communicability, and conation. The Latin word "persona", and the Greek

word Hupostasis have led to quite lengthy disquisitions with the matter still unsolved. It is thought that Seneca, in his letters, was giving an equivalent to Hupostasis when he wrote "substantia" to express "real concrete existence." The difficulties inherent in the problem of personality are brought to the fore in translation, and in finding suitable synonyms or equivalents. For example in the Epistle to the Hebrews⁵¹ Charakter Tēs Hupostaseōs is translated in the Authorized Version (1611) as "the express image of His person," while the Revised Version (1881) has fallen back on the word "substance", and renders it "the very image of His substance" (R.V. Margin:- "The impress of His substance.") The American R.S.V. has, "The very image of His nature." To Boethius at the beginning of the sixth cent. is attributed the distinction of ascribing to "persona" the definition, which became the standard definition of the writers and philosophers of the Middle Ages, for he wrote:- "Persona est naturae rationabilis individua substantia." In the Pentateuch God would appear to indicate self-consciousness as an ultimate element in personality when He says:- "I am that I am"⁵² and "I am".⁵³ It is usual, however, for personality to be exemplified in and through a union of corporeal and mental faculties. Personality continues so long as there is a continuity of being biologically. With God personality operates in another dimension or sphere. He

is incorporeal; He is infinite, and spiritual. The medium in which God's personality is evident is that of the spirit. While He is the Creator of the natural universe, He Himself is non-material. He, the Creator, is distinct from His creation. Man, through the ages has come nearer to God's personality, character and nature through revelation and reason, and by the gradual elimination of anthropomorphic allusions. God originally was conceived in the "image" and "likeness" of Man, but those human traits, so ascribed, were minimized and finally excluded. Although God was incorporeal, and spiritual as a personality, He continued to influence Mankind. As He was the source of life, and personality can only be realized through life, He was in the true sense the personal God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Indeed where His personality differs from Man, lies in the fact that He possesses Everlasting Life. For the Jewish Patriarchs God was always a personal God. He never became an abstract principle. For the Jewish People He never became the Absolute beloved of the Philosophers. The God of Abraham was different from the God of Aristotle. God was an intimate personal factor in the lives of the Patriarchs. He spoke to Moses "face to face"⁵⁴. Scripture draws the line of demarcation in the very beginning with regard to the personality of God when it

states⁵⁵:- "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth; the Creator and the created; the Self and the non-self; the Universe within, and the universe without; Being and non-being; Spiritual and material.' Even with Man, on a much lower plane, Man is a microcosmos while the world is the macrocosmos. Personality occurs where there is consciousness and self-consciousness. From the foundation of consciousness has arisen the concept of personal obligation. From self-consciousness is derived Morality, or the consciousness of merit or guilt in actions and thoughts. Given the premises of God's personality and existence the conclusion objectified in the Torah inevitably follows. Originally both suneidesis and conscientia meant simply consciousness. Later they came to have especially the meaning of moral consciousness. One's attitude to God, and one's attitude to one's neighbours come within the boundaries of personality. Personality is always concerned with the universe, but most often with the "universes of reference" of which the chief is the "Moral universe."⁵⁶ Personality operates in the medium of a Moral universe; a universe of value judgements.

It is not without interest that, about the time Amram Darah and Marqah lived (i.e.4th cent.) a controversy arose at Antioch in Syria. At least Arius and his supporters had studied under Lucian at Antioch, although the

battle-ground was later elsewhere in Egypt. The piece de resistance was the word "substance." Arius strove with Athanasius in 325 at Nicaea over the question as to whether Jesus Christ was of "One substance" (Homoousios) with God, or of "Like substance" (Homoiousios). It could be that such a marked difference of opinion in the Christian Church had repercussions over a wide field, and that Amram Darah attempted to clear the air in Samaria by affirming that God was "without substance" (C.p.27) and that He was "He whom nothing resembles" (C.p.27). It is well known that the environment of opinions and ideas is just as likely to make a deep impression on a person as does the physical. A fairly safe assumption is that the Sam. at the same time that the Christian Church was involved in the controversy regarding "the substance" of Jesus Christ in His relationship to God, indicated their position in this matter. If Amram Darah was so actuated by controversy on this point, then there is a little evidence here to be considered, when an accurate dating of the Defter is attempted.

Amram Darah writes (C.p.28):-

"When Thy wisdom saw fit to create, Thy power brought together all things at Thy word."

Such a statement is indicative of a true personality. At whose creative fiat all things were made, is a statement which postulates the existence of Will, Wisdom, Power and

Utterance. These are the normal aspects of personality.

The outstanding Sam. writer of the 10th cent., who made a significant contribution to the Defter (C.p.78) was Tabiah b. Durathah. Tabiah is fully aware that God's personality is ever beyond the full comprehension of Man for he writes:-

"And because none of us can estimate or explain that which hath no explanation or interpretation in the Faith, verily the explanation of the truth of His divinity and the limit in His humility; for there is no speech capable of estimating the Proclaimer, and there is no created thing to reach, or to explore (define) the Creator." His remarks theologically reveal the magnitude of trying to compass and comprehend God. His words are a brave attempt, but their very vagueness implies, not so much defeat as the impossibility of the project. Tabiah states (C.p.78):-

"None of us can speak (of Thee)
according as Thou art."

He is aware that God is the "Perfect of the Perfect", without attempting in any way to give a definition to perfection.

Generally, however, in a theological sense, Tabiah b. Durathah, maintains the Sam. status quo ante. A diversionary note is introduced when Tabiah appears to assess God in what would appear to be a Gnostic vocabulary (C.p.79, lines 12-24).

Ben Manir in his hymn (C.p.676) refers to the Will of God by stating, "His will is good", which is more than a truistic statement, for it reminds us that the essence of virtue lies in the Will. Kant states:- "A good will is good not because of what it performs or effects, not by its aptness for the attainment of some proposed end, but simply by virtue of the volition."⁵⁷

In the Kantian system of philosophy autonomy or freedom of the will is a necessary corollary of personality. It is hard to conceive of personality divorced from will. In relation to God the autonomy of the will is held to be self-evident. The Sam. never stops to consider precisely what constitutes the will. He takes the will, power, and wisdom of God for granted. The Sam. never resorts to philosophical distinctions or subtlety. For example, he never stops to differentiate between God's willing and God's doing. He would not be prepared to diagnose "an effort of will." As God is spiritual, the Sam. has no need to ponder on the relationship of "bodily acts" to that of "acts of will." No problems of psycho-kinesis beset his mind. As God is incorporeal, an analysis of His will is never made more difficult by other aspects of personality, such as are common to man. But God's will does not lend itself so easily to analysis. Having spoken of God's will as good, it is difficult for Ben Manir to go much further, for a good will must always be positive. "And God saw

everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good."⁵⁸ God's will is held to operate, not only on the earth, but also in the heavens. It is able to give expression to itself through power, guided always by wisdom. The scheme of repentance, redemption and salvation is dependent upon the erring will of man being consonant with the good and steadfast will of God. So for the Sam., as with Jew and Christian and Muslim, it is the will of God which remains consistent, being exemplified first in Creation, then in redemption and election. The Covenants are an earnest of God's good will and intention.

5. THE ONENESS OF GOD

An analysis of the Sam. Defter reveals that the Sam. never compromises about the Oneness as distinct from the unity of God. The fundamental axiom of the Sam. Liturgy is that "there is only one God" (C.p.p.3, et passim). This view is expressed throughout all the hymns and prayers of the Defter, and the concept maintains continuity through all the succeeding centuries without modification. Never for one moment is the Oneness of God doubted. There is always a tendency in theology for plurality to arise, if not polytheism. A development of thought about the nature of God, expressed as attributes and epithets, does tend to lead to plurality. Indeed a plurality in the Godhead can arise

in two ways. There can occur a plurality that is "inward". It is possible for certain attributes of God to be given such emphasis over a period of time, that an apotheosis tends to occur. For example, the "spirit" of God, or the "wisdom" of God tends to become personalized.⁵⁹ The Sam. always maintains that God is one in essence; that He is not a plurality. Plurality can occur in an "outward" sense when other persons are brought into close affinity with God. This form of plurality is non-existent with those religions associated with Judaism. It has been argued that there are attributes of God, only in so far as they are observed by Man. The attributes and epithets of God are Man's way of expressing what he has apprehended about God. By a process that can basically be called "Kantian", Man analyses God into "categories." Man's psychological make up commits him to this diagnosis. Apprehension occurs in that God appears to Man as a series of capacities or faculties. In a sense there are no personae in God; no separate aspects. It is not strictly logical to differentiate, and to refer to God as Creator, Sustainer, Saviour and Preserver, etc. Creation and Sustenance are intermingled in the qualities, or rather the qualitative-ness of God. As God is initially a qualitative synthesis, an analysis of God misses the mark. That the Sam. has over one hundred and fifty attributes and epithets relative

to God, is a gesture to the psychological make up of Man, rather than a logical and true estimate of God. The Sam., like other religious bodies, in looking at God, sees at best but a "spectrum" of attributes. But a "spectrum" is something different from the "light" so analyzed. The Sam. adamantly rejects polytheism. There is no second with God. He has no partner. God does not belong to a class. As the Sam. puts it God is incalculable. God cannot be measured or numbered. The Sam. adduces the Creation as evidence of His Oneness when asserting in the Liturgy (C.p.4):-

"The Universe doth testify that Yahweh,
He is God."

Also "Yahweh is One, He alone" (C.p.3).

The "Prayer of Moses" (C.p.48) is just as insistent in affirming that:-

"In the heavens above, and upon the earth
beneath, there is none beside Him."

So important to the Sam. in the 4th cent. is "that God is only One" that emphasis reaches the superlative when the Deifter states (C.p.84):-

"A thousand, thousand times, proclaiming
and saying, There is only One God."

It is not without interest and indeed some significance that in the 4th cent. the Christian Church was involved in a controversy which arose at Antioch in Syria about the relationship of the person of Jesus Christ to God. At

least Arius and his supporters had studied under Lucian at Antioch, although the battle-ground later was elsewhere in Egypt. Arius strove with Athanasius in 325 at Nicaea, over the question as to whether Jesus Christ was of "One substance" (Homousios). The Christian Church had roots in Samaria, and the 4th cent. Sam. writers could quite easily have been aware of the point at issue, and hence the Sam. insistence over and over again that God is one and one alone.

Ab-Hisdah (Abul-Hasan) of Tyre in the XIth cent. continues to maintain the status quo ante in relation to the Oneness of God. In his composition (C.p.79) Ab-Hisdah says of God:-

"He hath no equal, and there is none like Him";

"One alone without a second, without helper and without governor",

in the sense of a vice-regent.

Ab-Gelugah (C.pp.75-78) of the 12th cent. refers to God as:-

"The only One from old, without second."

It could be stated that the Sam. have an obsession in this matter of stressing the Oneness of God even more so than the Jews. True, the Hebrew does mention the Oneness of God in the Shemah Israel⁶⁰ but he never reiterates the statement ad nauseam. He assumes that the fact is so

obvious as not to need further demonstration. It could well be therefore, that the Sam. continued over the cent. to resort to propaganda in emphasising the Oneness of God as a reaction to an Alien environment - to them - in which the Trinitarian Doctrine of the Christian Church was the pre-disposing feature.

Aaron b. Manir (C.p.644) attempts to give a definition of God which immediately brings to mind Moses Maimonides (1135 - 1204) who in Moreh Nebuchim expresses sentiments about God which are similar. Ben Manir writes:-

"I am That I am, the One - without number!
The First, the Before - nothing has been made by a number! The First - nothing has been established from a number. We find it according to what He is - One - not entering into any reckoning. He has no place, so that they might seize upon a number."

Maimonides writes that the Tetragrammaton may originally have conveyed the meaning of "absolute existence."⁶¹ To strengthen his case he quotes from Zechariah⁶² and translates:-

"In that day will the Lord, be One,
and His Name One."

But what does Ben Manir really imply by:-

"The One - without number! " ?

Does he mean to infer that it excludes any kind of doctrine appertaining to a Trinity (i.e. Christian), or for that matter to any kind of hypostasis? He certainly excludes

any Jewish tendency such as Holy Spirit⁶³ or Wisdom⁶⁴ or Glory as an apotheosis. Could it be that he had read some ancient Pythagorean treatise, and was not enamoured of its implicates? Ben Manir has here the concept of an All-pervading Deity - without a number. Where does the answer possibly occur? Owing to a fairly close approximation of thought the answer may probably be found in Maimonides. In considering the twenty-five propositions which are employed in the proof for the existence of God, and demonstrating, inter alia, that He is One - propositions which Aristotle and his school, the Peripatetics accepted - Maimonides⁶⁵ quotes proposition XVI in extenso :-

"Incorporeal bodies can only be numbered when they are forces situated in a body; the several forces must then be counted together with substances or objects in which they exist. Hence purely spiritual beings, which are neither corporeal nor forces situated in corporeal objects, cannot be counted, except when considered as causes and effects."

Maimonides had already proved that God was incorporeal; a truth accepted by the Muslim theology, which he had examined,⁶⁶ and by the Philosophers, especially Aristotle⁶⁷ whom he admired, and whose philosophy, in the main, he accepted. Indeed his main thesis was to reconcile Aristotelian philosophy with the Scriptures, especially the Pentateuch. Maimonides in his work points out that as God

is incorporeal He is without number. "Without incorporeality there is no Unity."⁶⁸ God is not subject to the accident of relation.⁶⁹ God is One - not of a number - in that He is Unique. He is One, because, as he proves, and as the Muslims argue - whose arguments he examines⁷⁰ - there is no room for Dualism. God is incorporeal because a corporeal object consists of substance and form, or two attributes in number.⁷¹ God also does not consist of atoms; therefore He is without number.⁷² He cannot be compared with His creatures. He has no dimensions; therefore no number. "The relation of time is not applicable to God, because motion cannot be predicated of Him."⁷³ The hypothesis that there exist two Gods is inadmissible, because absolutely incorporeal beings cannot be counted. So Ben Manir (C.p.644) may be following Maimonides when he says of God:-

"The First, the Before - nothing has been made by a number."

For, as God is prior to time, and is incorporeal He is not reckonable, so that nothing was made by a number. God is not a number, and there was a creatio ex nihilo. Ben Manir therefore agrees with Maimonides (and Aristotle) that "number" implies corporate existence, and as God is incorporate He is

"exalted above every number" (C.p.644).

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.296) gives a picture of God

as he conceives Him to be:-

"Thou art One in Thy Divinity,
Thou art alone in Thy Oneness
Thou art apart,
Thou art First in Thy beginning,
Thou art eternal."

For him also God is:-

"The First of all Firsts", (C.p.296)

but not in the sense of Primus inter pares, but before all that ever came to be in time and place.

6. SPIRITUALITY OF GOD

Reference to Roget's Thesaurus⁷⁴ shows that spirituality is equated with immateriality and incorporeality. It appertains to that which is non-material. It is best conceived of and explained in terms that are negative in relation to matter. Whereas it is difficult to describe that which is spiritual, it is not so hard to conceive of something lacking the qualities of matter. Hence the use of adjectives such as supernatural, supranatural, transcendent and transcendental, or that which is beyond the categories of Nature or the created world. In the Defter the Sam. writers allude to the spirituality of God by keeping anthropomorphical expressions to a minimum. The spirituality of God is also substantiated by stressing the transcendence of God. As transcendence refers rather to "location" than specifically to a subject's spiritual nature, it will be taken up and considered later. God is conceived

of and held to be both spiritual and infinite; also that, in contradistinction to the very essence of His nature, He created the world ex nihilo. In the Defter Amram Darah says (C.p.27):-

"Thou art present in every place, but
nothing that exists is like Thee."

Such a statement expresses personality that exists everywhere, His existence is not in loco. Amram Darah, by such a statement avoids the implications of Pantheism. The same writer also says (C.p.30):-

"Who cannot be seen."

The spirituality of God is also in evidence in this statement in the Defter (C.p.84):-

"Thou art everlasting unto all
eternity, Before the creation,

And after the Day of Vengeance."

Before the creation, and after the Day of Vengeance signifies the belief of the Sam. that the material world is to be destroyed, but as God is non-material or spiritual He will live for ever.

The 10th cent. writer, Tabiah b.Durathah, is fully aware that God is ever beyond the fullest comprehension of Man, due, in no small measure, to the spirituality of God. We repeat a citation from his hymn (C.p.78):-

"And because none among us can estimate or explain
that which hath no explanation or interpretation in the

Faith, verily the explanation of the truth of His spiritual divinity, and the limit in His meditation, and the treasure of His humility, for there is no speech capable of estimating the Speaker, and there is no created thing to reach, or to explore (define) the Creator."

A noticeable feature in the 14th cent. is that some writers instead of resorting to positive superlative expressions about God resort to the via negativa. They have been led, by the very nature of God (i.e. His spirituality) to leave far behind any anthropomorphic tendencies, and to attempt a definition of God that is "wholly other." Ben Manir (C.p.644) mentions:-

1. "The One - without a number."
2. "Nothing has been made without a number."
3. "Nothing has been established from a number."
4. "One - not entering into any reckoning."
5. "He has no place."
6. "The Lord! No name is his measure as in the case of a number."

Writers before the time of Ben Manir had attempted to explain the nature of God, and of His existence by negatives, but not so obviously among the Sam. It could be that Ben Manir was influenced by Maimonides who writes⁷⁵:-

"Know that the negative attributes of God are the true attributes",

And "We cannot describe the Creator by any means except by negative attributes."

Also, "The negative attributes, however, are those which are necessary to direct the mind to the truths which we must believe concerning God; for, on the one hand, they do not imply any plurality."

Also⁷⁶ :-

"We thus learn that there is no other being like unto God, and we say that He is One, i.e. there are not more gods than one."

Maimonides arrives at this conclusion after examining carefully the principle of the via negativa in relation to the attributes and epithets of God, His nature, and His existence.

Ben Manir emphasizes the spirituality of God by stating (C.p.644):-

"He has no place."

As God is incorporeal He cannot be localized. Maimonides too considers the meaning of place (MAKOM) in relation to God. He says⁷⁷ :-

"And wherever MAKOM is applied to God, it expresses the same idea, namely, the distinguished position of His existence to which nothing is equal or comparable."

Ben Manir therefore agrees with Maimonides (and Aristotle) that "number" implies corporate existence, and as God is spiritual He is "exalted above every number" (C.p.644).

An examination of Ben Manir's hymn (C.p.644) shows that while he stresses the spirituality of God in the first stanza (ALEPH), in the second stanza (BETH) he proceeds to the creation of the world by God - from the spiritual

(or incorporeal) - to the material.

In a song, concerning Miracles (C.p.181) Ben Manir gives a further demonstration of referring to the attributes in superlatives; then, in order not to omit any reference to God resorts again to the Via Negativa. This plan of always commencing a composition by referring to the attributes of God was current in the 4th cent. But not the method of oscillating from positive to negative. The via negativa⁷⁸ would appear to be of 14th cent. vintage in Sam. writings. Stressing the incorporeality of God Ben Manir says, "God sees without eyes"; "hears without ears"; "does not wax old"; "He has no dwelling places"; "He has no dwelling in earth or in heaven." But he, like other Sam. writers, never commits himself to the concept of there being at any-time "a non-existent God." In other words he does not pursue the via negativa to the extremes of negativity as does Basilides. Basilides, an Alexandrian Gnostic teacher, (C.117-138) went to the furthest point in the matter of negatives. The Gnostics generally held God to be infinite and spiritual, whereas matter was finite, therefore evil. Basilides writes⁷⁹ :-

"So the non-existent God made a non-existent cosmos out of the non-existent."

For Basilides in the beginning there was "nothing."

"No matter, no substance, no non-substance, nothing simple, nothing complex, nothing not understood, nothing not sensed, no man, no angel, no god."

Abisha b. Phinehas, when he speaks of God no longer refers to Him in anthropomorphic terminology. Indeed he conceives of God in terms of spirit. This spiritualizing tendency finds a safe anchorage in "The Name." This trait, of course, is not peculiar to Abisha. The "Name" is as meaningful, and yet as abstract as the "Logos." Abisha also likes to refer to God metaphorically, as for example:-

"He who has power over all is God the Shepherd."

Here again, Abisha is not alone in this respect of confining his thoughts to metaphors. However he does clinch the matter when he writes (C.p.498):-

"All things spiritual are of spirit, and among them are revelations." 80

He stresses in typically 14th cent. manner the spirituality of God by writing (C.p.498):-

"He lives! He is infinite, having no days or hours."

Also:- "It is known that he has no finality and no end which can be visualized."

By referring to God as "The Lord of Divinity", Abisha is only reiterating the supremacy of God "ruling every spirit" (C.p.736), and is not introducing any new concept. As a God who is over "the seen and the unseen", He is over the material and the spiritual.

The third 14th cent. writer Abdullah b. Solomon also has recourse to the via negativa. This method in describing or attempting to describe God, in virtue of His spiritual

nature is consistent with the best philosophic thought, and would be acceptable to rationalists such as Maimonides. One objector would be Gersonides⁸¹ (c.1288-1334), who argued against such a procedure. He said that God is not the Unknowable Absolute of the Neo-Platonists. He is "Highest Thought", and as such, positive attributes can be ascribed to God. Reference to Abdullah's hymn (C.p.213) shows how completely he exploits the via negativa.

1. "There is none other besides Him from before the beginning."
2. "There was no beginning to His existence."
3. "He is One alone, and there is no strange God with Him, no partner, no friend, no second, no structure, no form, no image, no substance, no body, no intimate. He knoweth without heart, seeth without eye, heareth without ear, calleth without mouth."

The modus operandi in negative terms serves to illustrate that Abisha b. Phinehas and Abdullah b. Solomon exploit more fully the Sam. 4th cent. belief in the spirituality of God, and with complete fluency and assurance pass from positive attributes to an expression of attributes in negative terms. Account must be taken of the transition from anthropomorphic terms originally to a position in which now negatives are used. This evolution of thought, and expression may be a criterion of Sam. thought indicating that reality is really spiritual. It is almost like an artist, who accentuates the positive by introducing shadow, thereby making apparent the third dimension of

depth. So the use of negative expressions is but a positive affirmation in the spirituality of God. God truly is a spirit.

7. ETHICAL ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

It is the stressing of the ethical side of God's nature that is such a distinguishing and characteristic feature of Semitic religion. This is vividly displayed in the Ten Commandments given to Moses by God. Many gods and goddesses of Ancient Greece and Rome were considered to be immoral, and morality was not usually held to be a distinguishing feature in a god. In early Israel, on the other hand, if the priests were mainly concerned with ritual demand and sacrifice, the prophets "were chiefly concerned with the preaching of the moral law; and in placing morality on a higher level than ritual they undoubtedly continued and developed the original teaching of Moses himself."⁸² "The great and enduring contribution which the Hebrew prophets made to the religious evolution of the race was that they set forth with unsurpassed force their conviction that JAHWEH was a righteous and holy God."⁸³ The Hebrew race became aware of these ethical attributes of God through the realm of experience. "Such attributes as justice, mercy, holiness, belong to the religious rather than the philosophical conception of God, for they are based

on religious experience rather than upon reasoning, and represent the conviction that the ground of our being possesses in Himself our highest values."⁸⁴

Kant⁸⁵ rejected the three traditional arguments for the existence of God - The Ontological, the Cosmological and the Teleological - in favour of a new argument of his own, the Moral Argument. For him moral duty to God was the most obvious and inescapable of facts. This was the position tenaciously upheld by the Hebrew Prophets. The attributes to which religious experience bears witness are those of personality, goodness and love. As derivations of these are mercy, holiness and justice. These all come within the religious experience of men, and are not philosophical postulates. God is held to be personal in the sense of being responsive to Man in the way that human beings respond and re-act to each other. The whole religious system of redemption is grounded in love, for love evokes sympathy. Men seek the grace and favour of God because of His moral goodness. One of the main features of the teaching of the Prophets was that Yahweh was the Lord of Universal Morality. The Prophets averred that moral judgement was universal in its nature and scope. Even Israel was not immune from the judgement of God and His vengeance would fall upon all.⁸⁶ It was in 760 B.C. that Amos suddenly appeared at Bethel in the Northern Kingdom, proclaiming "that because God is

essentially righteous, He is and must be the only God."⁸⁷
The idea of an ethical monotheism was not entirely new - the Pentateuch upholds the concept - but it was given a fresh emphasis and impetus by Amos. For the Jew and the Sam. God was one who in His holiness and righteousness forgave the sins of those who repented. Hence among many other days, the great day of Atonement, when the people made restitution for their moral lapses. Amos' concept of God as spiritual, righteous and therefore one only, is the criterion for an understanding of Jewish History. Long before Amos, Abraham had asked the question, "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?"⁸⁸

The outstanding ethical attributes of God are His holiness and His mercy. The song of Moses⁸⁹ has the words:-

"Who is like Thee, O Lord, among the gods?"
"Who is like Thee, majestic in holiness?"

Indeed the moral attributes of God were made manifest to Moses in a special theophany on Mount Sinai. These characteristics⁹⁰ constitute the holiness of God, and are designated as the "Thirteen Attributes." These are related to God's dealings and actions with men, and do not bear any relation to God's essence. The two pillars upon which the moral law of Holiness is upheld are Justice and Righteousness. "Justice is the negative aspect of Holiness; Righteousness, its positive aspect."⁹¹ From

the Holiness of God is derived the concept of a thing being holy. This idea of a thing being holy arises when it is sacred or dedicated fully and without reservation to God and His service. Nana b. Marqah (C.p.16) has the matter clearly focussed when he writes:-

"Woe to those who declare praises to any other but to Him, for this city of the creation is a beautiful city, and every creature therein is holy, like a friend of the Holiest of the Holy; He is God, who created it."

Holiness generally is based on the Holiness of God.

"Ye shall be holy, for I, Y - H - W - H, your god am holy."⁹²

The concept of Holiness is held consistently by the Sam. throughout the cent. without any specific attempt to be exegetical. Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.445) does make mention of holiness in the material world. For him - and others - the Sabbath is a "holy day", and the Sabbath "confers its holiness." He also adds that "holiness passes over to holiness." Indeed anything appertaining to God, and service to God becomes holy. This point is consonant with that held in the 4th cent. The Defter (C.p.44) refers to "a holy Torah" and a "holy congregation." There are also references to a "holy sabbath day" and "holy festivals" (C.p.83). But if holiness can be ascribed to God, and to objects dedicated to His service, and separated from ordinary secular usage, so human beings can be holy⁹³ and the Sam. accept this truth, for the Defter says (C.p.11):-

"Hallowed and glorious One, who set us,
Thy Holy ones, apart, and revealed Thyself
unto us, Thy Chosen Ones, and gave us the
holy Sabbath for rest."

A predominant emphasis that is most obvious right through the Sam. Liturgy is the Mercy of God. Indeed God is designated as "the Merciful One" (C.p.18 Et.Passim). This composition of Marqah (C.p.18) is typical not only of the Defter but of all Sam. writings in the ages that succeed it. He writes:-

1. "By Thy Mercy we live."
2. "Our power would be weak and slight,
were it not that Thou art merciful."
3. "For Thou art merciful and compassionate."
4. "Merciful One is Thy Name, to which there
is no temporal limit;
Thy mercies testify that there is no
end to Thy works.
Merciful One is Thy Name, and all
testify that Thou art so."

Whereas the Pentateuch refers to God as a "Merciful God", the Sam. prefer to refer to Him simply as the "Merciful (One)."

Mercy is usually associated in the context of Justice and Judgement, and the affinity of these two aspects of God's nature would not be denied by the Sam. But what is a pronounced feature of Sam. thinking is to associate Mercy with Creation. The two ideas are never far from each other. Amram Darah (C.p.30) sees a close connection with these two ideas. And Ab-gelugah (c.12th cent.) still associates the

two when he writes (C.p.75):-

"I am, that I am, O my Maker, my Creator, my Former, my Fashioner, save me, from all judgement and hasten my deliverance, and from thy mercy turn not my supplication away empty, for Thou art merciful and gracious, and Thy name is zealous God."

The Creator originally must have been kindly disposed towards His projected works, otherwise there would have been no logical reason for creation at all.

To the Sam. then God is conceived of possessing those ethical attributes which the Jews and Christians also recognize. That God is a God of Holiness, Merciful and Gracious, Just in His dealings with Man, abounding in loving kindness as distinct from Mercy, and of essential Goodness. The aspect of Vengeance will be raised at a later stage.

8. TRANSCENDENCE AND IMMANENCE

The transcendence of God as a concept arises by His being prior to His created works, and those works created ex nihilo. God in the Semitic mind is conceived of as being distinct from His creation. God is pure spirit free from the limitations associated with matter. The doctrine of divine incorporeality is one of the oldest in the Hebrew scriptures. The tendency to a reduction of anthropomorphic expressions in describing God especially among the Sam. is a recognition of the spirituality of God, and ipso facto

of His transcendence. An interesting process illustrating this tendency is observed when referring to God as the "Voice." Yet in the 14th cent. it is not only usual to refer to God in negative terms due to His spirituality, but to make reference to Him as the "Voice." In other words, He is "wholly - other." In all ages the Sam. have insisted on both the transcendence and immanence of God. They pursue this matter almost ad nauseam. For them these two aspects of God are complementary. By so doing they avoid the pitfalls of Deism on the one hand, and Pantheism on the other.

Amram Darah (C.p.27) writes:-

"For Thou art present in every place,
but nothing that exists is like Thee."

Here the writer is able to avoid the charge of Pantheism, while associating two nearly related concepts, that of immanence and omnipresence. Amram Darah (C.p.29) brings immanence and transcendence together in stating:-

"Happy he who nears himself to Thee,
O Far One who art near;
Woe to him who is far from Thee,
O Near One who art far."

The 10th cent. writer Tabiah b. Durathah (C.p.78) maintains the continuity of this concept when he states:-

"O Thou who art near to hearts."

4th cent. theology in Samaritanism lays equal stress on the transcendence and immanence of God. Even if it

could be sustained that the Sam. theologians breathed the atmosphere of an incipient Gnosticism they never yield in the matter of God's immanence. God was distinct from and above His universe, but never in the fullest Deistic sense. God also was at hand. He never left the world to its own resources in spite of the nearness of matter. To the Gnostic mind matter was finite and evil, but God infinite and spiritual. The Sam. believed God to be infinite and spiritual, yet as He had created the material world ex nihilo, and Man was made in the image and likeness of God⁹⁴, matter did not contain a potentiality for evil, that the Neo-Platonists, and Gnostics imagined it to possess. Indeed God saw that everything that he had made was very good.⁹⁵ To the Sam. matter was not evil, therefore he had no need to interpose a mediator or demiurge between the Supreme God and the material world. The Sam. would never capitulate to the concept of God mentioned by Thomas Carlyle⁹⁶ when he wrote of:-

"An absentee God, sitting idle, ever since the first Sabbath, at the outside of His universe, and seeing it go."

So Amram Darah is able to affirm current Sam. belief when writing (C.p.28),

"Wherever man turns his face, there He finds Thee."

or again (C.p.30):-

"Nearest of the near ones Who is not to be seen."

Ab-Hisdah (Abul-Hasan) in the 11th cent. continues to use an expression which had currency in the 4th when he writes (C.p.72):-

"Look down from Thy Holy Habitation."

This statement could imply both immanence and transcendence, for it depends on what Ab-Hisdah had in mind when he mentioned "Holy Habitation." It is usual to think of "Holy Habitation" as being far away in the heavens. The Sam., however, referred to Mount Gerizim as the Holy Habitation of God, and in that sense would indicate not the transcendence of God but His immanence. It is possible however that Holy Habitation means to suggest both the transcendence of God and His immanence, for the holy Mount is the habitation of God only as He is encountered by worshipful, believing man.

Ben Manir never ceases to accept the tenets of God's transcendence and immanence. For him they are axiomatic. He therefore says with confidence (C.p.644),

"He has no place."

He means by this that as God is incorporeal He cannot be localized; He is above and beyond. Moses Maimonides⁹⁷ gives careful consideration to the meaning of place (MAKOM) in connection with God. He says:-

"And wherever MAKOM is applied to God, it expresses the same idea, namely the distinguished position of His existence, to which nothing is equal or comparable."

Having no localization God is, by the same token, transcendent. It is not unlikely that, as Ben Manir touches upon some many topics and ideas already handled by his predecessor in time, Maimonides, that he may well have been aware of Maimonides' writings. Not only had Maimonides visited Damascus, but his works were afterwards read in the synagogues there. That there are affinities of thought between Ben Manir and Maimonides cannot really be denied. Indeed further research on this subject might well lead to a profitable conclusion. The outstanding philosopher who did eventually absorb the teaching of Maimonides was Spinoza (1632-1677). Spinoza's philosophy is a development of that of Descartes (1596-1650), but it was the reasoning of Maimonides that led Spinoza to perfect his system of Pantheism. He forsook the concept of transcendence for that of a re-emphasis of the immanence of God. But Ben Manir, Abisha b. Phinehas and Abdullah b. Solomon never lose sight of both. They look towards God through both lenses simultaneously, and see God both as transcendent and immanent.

Abisha b. Phinehas in his MALIFUT (C.p.489) writes:-

"By His great and holy Name He will look down upon us from his dwelling."

Here again the thought might be immanent or transcendent. It might also well be that this is but further evidence of the attempt to avoid anthropomorphism. It is interesting

to be aware of what Spinoza⁹⁸ inferred, that to leave out anthropomorphic descriptions of God leads to Pantheism. For Abisha God does "look down upon us" in the transcendental sense, and thereby safeguards his point of view as being strictly Samaritan. When Abisha in a hymn of praise (C.p.248) writes of God

"Abiding in every place, yet no place can contain Him",

he is really bringing into juxtaposition two concepts already expressed by other Sam. writers already alluded to. Amram Darah had already stated (C.p.27):-

"For Thou art present in every place",

and Ben Manir (C.p.644) had written,

"He has no place."

"Abiding in every place, Yet no place can contain Him",

is a species of thought that philosophers like Prof. A.J. Ayer of Oxford could not accept. The Prof. as an accredited Logical Positivist would discountenance the statement, as not conforming to the "Principle of Verification."⁹⁹

The 14th cent. Sam. writers are true Theists for they proclaim as did their ancestors that God is both immanent and transcendent. They are never Deists or Pantheists. They were not actuated by intellectual motives, but attempting to keep close to a picture of God as exemplified in the Pentateuch. Their theistic conceptions are the

outcome of a purely religious instinct based on the Pentateuch. Their concern with God is a living concern. The spiritual worshipper looks for a God who is very near. Religion requires a living communion with God. Indeed the immanence of God is to be seen in the Covenants which God had with the Israelites. God comes within the orbit of human endeavour, especially through the contractual document of the covenant. Yet faith demands that God should be above and beyond this world of discord and sin. Or in a phrase especially attributed to Marqah (C.p.26 et passim):-

"And He is above and below, and all is within His dominion."

9. THE METAPHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES

The metaphysical attributes are those which Man has ascribed to God by virtue of His being the true and living God most high, the Creator of all that is. They are attributes which Man would expect God to have, yet not be fully aware of philosophical difficulties which arise when ascribing to God Omnipotence, Omnipresence and Omniscience. God is expected to be All-powerful. Anything less would not evoke reverence for God. Theistic religion calls for a God, who can control the forces of nature, and have a purpose which secures salvation for souls. He must be One who can overcome all obstacles, difficulties and opposition. God is omnipotent since he can achieve a result by investing

His will with power. Amram Darah (C.p.27) stresses the Omnipotence of God when he writes:-

"When Thy wisdom saw fit to create, Thy power brought together all things at Thy word. Thou art the first, the designer, the creator who established all things; Thou art He, by whom and from whom are all things and to whom all things are subject."

In the Defter the omnipotence of God is nearly always indicated by what that power does rather than having a specific word or phrase for omnipotence. For example Amram Darah (C.p.28) writes:-

"Thy power brought all to pass without any previous origin."

Here the word is gebhurah, and normally means strength, power or might. But Marqah (C.p.17) when writing:-

"Above and below, Thy power is great and supreme",

resorts to the word hail. This is the word which appears to gain the ascendancy, and to be more acceptable to the Sam. writers of later cent. Marqah states (C.p.18):-

"Thy power is over all powers and all powers are derived from Thy power; Our power would be weak and slight were it not that Thou art merciful."

In each mention of power hail is used, but the source of all power is from that of God's. Marqah continues to use hail when he writes (C.p.25):-

"In Thy great power we put our trust",
and "Great in power."

Cowley¹⁰⁰ indicates that hailah is a variant for elah because the Sam. scribes confuse the gutterals heth and aleph, thus signifying God. The word however appears to be synonym for God in its own right, without allusion or reference to any other word.

It could be suggested that the most appropriate word for omnipotence is that of shaddai as in el shaddai, God Mighty, but it is not certain that shaddai means Mighty. This designation is not common in Sam. liturgies. Indeed no hymn commences with the words el shaddai. On the other hand there are fifty-seven hymns all beginning with hailah, or the adjective hayyol/hayyola. The word is even translated as God, after Cowley¹⁰¹.

Aaron b. Manir, in the 14th cent. continues to use hailah when he writes (C.p.324):-

"Great is the Power",

when referring to God as Creator. He writes that the Omnipotent One cannot but prevail; He has neither beginning nor end; The Power will be exalted.

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.373) speaking of God says:-

"Thy power and Thy mind abide in every work";

also that "In Thee is the power to do."

Generally speaking the Sam. conceive of God as being omnipotent in being able to accomplish things such as creation, and the overthrow of enemies, but they never ask why, if God is omnipotent He should permit evil and sin to

persist in the world, which He originally beheld as "very good." The Talmud¹⁰² also refers to God as "The Might" (Ha-Gebhurah) meaning thereby that He is omnipotent and powerful; and the only limit to His power is His will.

In the Defter, in the Service for the Sabbath Morning, and the Service for the Sabbath Afternoon, the prayer, "I stand before Thee" (C.p.3) is recited. Mention is made of,

"The chosen place, Mount Gerizim, Bethel, towards Luz, the Mount of Thine inheritance and of Thy presence."

By so doing allusion is thereby made by the Sam. to the omnipresence of God. It recalls the occasion when Jacob awoke from his sleep, and said¹⁰³:-

"Surely the Lord is in this place and I did not know it."

And,¹⁰⁴ "He called the name of that place Bethel, but the name of the city was Luz at the first."

This was the dawning on the mind of the Israelites that Yahweh was not a localized Baal, but was to be found everywhere. The O.T. affords ample evidence of the ubiquity of God.¹⁰⁵

"If I ascend up to heaven, Thou art there!
If I make my bed in Sheol, Thou art there!
If I take the wings of the morning and dwell
in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there
Thy hand shall lead me, and Thy right hand
shall hold me."

A spiritual conception of God carries with it a belief in the omnipresence of God. At first sight it might be

difficult, or appear to be difficult to differentiate between immanence and omnipresence. But a distinction can be maintained. Marqah (C.p.26) writes:-

"And He is above and below, and all is within His dominion."

Of God's immanence Marqah says (C.p.18):-

"For Thou art to be found in every day."

Amram Darah (C.p.27) writes:-

"For Thou art present in every place, but nothing that exists is like Thee,"

which adds a differentiating factor, to the effect that God's omnipresence does not involve any necessary participation of God within the realms of His omnipresence.

The Durran (C.p.42) states that,

"He is to be found in every place, and all kings are in His dominion",

where omnipresence and omnipotence, in true Sam. manner, are regarded as correlatives.

The Defter also includes two hymns from later cent. where mention is made of the omnipresence of God. Ab-Hisdah (Abul-Hasan) of Tyre (XIth cent.; C.p.70) writes:-

"Eternal art Thou in Thy Divinity, my Lord, and art to be found in every place",

where infinity and omnipresence, and almost certainly immanence, are correlatives. In its simplest form omnipresence is set out by Phinehas the H.P. (1308-1363; C.p.34) when he writes:-

"For Thou art the omnipresent, who art to be found in all places."

Dr. Isidore Epstein¹⁰⁶ states:-

"Judaism further emphasizes God's omnipresence, and the Talmud has coined a special term to describe this divine attribute. God is SHECHINAH (The Indwelling), immanent and omnipresent, not necessarily in the sense that God is co-extensive with creation, but that His providence extends over all creation. 'The SHECHINAH is everywhere' (T.BABA BATHRA, 25A); 'There is no place without SHECHINAH' (MIDRASH EXODUS RABBAH, ii, 9)."

The Defter mentions the Divine Presence (Shechinah) three times and each occasion is a reference back to C.p.3 where Shechinah is mentioned twice, and is localized on Mount Gerizim.

Ben Manir (C.p.184) also localizes the Shechinah when he speaks of,

"The days of favour upon Mount Gerizim, which is the habitation of the Divine Presence (Shechinah) of the Lord."

It therefore seems that the Sam. writers interpret the Shechinah in a different way from the Talmudists. God's Divine Presence is to be found only on Mount Gerizim, (though not probably the physical mountain - see section on Mount Gerizim). Phinehas the H.P. (1308-1363) also speaks of the Divine Presence (Shechinah) on Mount Gerizim, when he writes (C.p.272):-

"Whose Divine Presence is on Mount Gerizim."

In the Zohar the last and tenth Sephrah is called

Malchuth (Kingdom). It is also named Shechinah. The word as used in the Zohar,¹⁰⁷

"Signifies the special manifestation of God in the lives of individuals or communities as well as in hallowed spots and places."

As the harmony in creation has given place to discord, the Shechinah is said to be in absentia. The Sam. scribes would agree here for they believe that the Shechinah is absent, hence the era of disfavour (Panutah). When the Messianic era favour (Rahutah) returns, then the Shechinah will be found present on Mount Gerizim. In Kabbalistic teaching, because of sin, the Shechinah is now only found, here and there, in isolated individuals or communities, or in special localities. With the Sam. theologians the Shechinah is never indwelling in a person. The Legends of the Jews¹⁰⁸ states that Isaac was punished for his lack of paternal love for:-

"The SHECHINAH deserted him, and did not return to him until the day of his death."

In this instance the Shechinah is equated with the Holy Spirit. The Sam. believe that eventually the Shechinah will be located on Mount Gerizim. This, in spite of the Sam. belief that God is to be found in every place. Both the Jew and the Sam. believe that the presence of the Shechinah will be associated with the restoration of the Temple. To the Jew the place is Jerusalem; to the Sam. Mount Gerizim. "The Second Temple was said to lack the Ark, the Fire, the

SHECHINAH, the Spirit, the Urim and Thummim."¹⁰⁹

The word will call for discussion later when the Glory of God is considered, and also in the study of the true nature of the Holy Mount.

As God is the origin or "the source of all beginning" (C.p.79) the Sam. assumes that God is also the source of all knowledge. Incidentally the Simonians spoke of God as "the root of all."¹¹⁰ God is omniscient, the possibility of His omniscience resting on the central relation of God to His universe. He is the active Source or Ground of all being, or as Amram Darah (C.p.27) puts it:-

"Thou art He, by whom and from whom are all things, and to whom all things are subject."

For the Samaritans since God is the active creator, and source, and power of all things, omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence are inevitably inter-related attributes of God. There are, however, occasions when the wisdom or knowledge of God comes as a recurring thought in the Sam. mind. The Defter (C.p.12) affirms:-

"Thou art God who knoweth all that is hidden and revealed, and there is no God but Thee."

Marqah re-affirms this viewpoint when he says (C.p.19):-

"He seeth and knoweth what is hidden in every heart; He seeth the good of the seen world; He that hath knowledge of the unseen world."

Later he writes (C.p.22):-

"Thou hast brought about all that Thou wishest from the providence of Thine intelligencē."

He also writes (C.p.25):-

"Pardoner, Comforter, who hath knowledge of all",

and again (C.p.26):-

"For He hath knowledge of all things."

It is against this ideological background of the 4th cent.

in particular that the 14th cent. Sam. writers operate.

Eleazar b. Phinehas (1363-1387) is able to reflect the thoughts of the 14th cent. when he writes (C.p.35):-

"Glory is Thine, O Thou who knowest all things hidden, Thy works revealed all things good and glorious. For Thou art omnipresent, Highest of the High."

And also (C.p.36):-

"His wisdom brought to pass all things, brought to pass with goodness; Wisdom, with fullness of knowledge, by the right of the Eternal One of old."

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.213) in this hymn gave a full assessment of the attributes and epithets of God. He makes specific reference to omnipotence, omnipresence and omniscience. These metaphysical attributes are really a kind of addendum used by theologians, who having mentioned the attributes of God via eminentiae, and via negationis, want to complete the picture. A God who was thought to be deficient in any way, could not command respect and reverence. So God for Abdullah is omnipotent. He is "The conqueror of

all battles", and "Performer of all kinds of wonders."
He is omnipresent; "He is to be found in all things";
"He possesses all places." "He is present for those who
seek Him." He is omniscient; "Wisest of the wise";
"Knower of hidden things"; "Knower of all hidden and
revealed things." These are distinct echoes of Marqah,
and indicate the way in which the status quo of the 4th cent.
ideological background is maintained right up to and
including the 14th cent. Sam. writers. Abdullah does not
seek to exploit the terms of omnipotence, omniscience and
omnipresence in a metaphysical sense, but to indicate that
God as the creator of the universe, as the Primal Cause, and
as the Sustainer of the world is fully adequate. He is the
Summum Bonum.

10. DIVINITY OF GOD.

The concept of divinity is associated with that kind of
Being who is usually held to be infinite and spiritual, of
one who is "wholly-other." The divinity of Yahweh arises
in virtue of His being the "Supreme Being, The Prima Causa,
the Ens Entium, the Ain Soph, the Omnipotent, Omniscient and
Omnipresent. For as St. Paul said in quoting the Greek poet
EPIMENIDES¹¹¹ :-

"In Him we live and move and have our being."

With reference to God the Sam. use the word Elahuta,

and in the various theses under examination the word has been translated as Godhead. But as the study of Samaritanism is still a comparatively unexplored field, a number of translations have been purely tentative in nature. Scholarship, however, is now veering away from the translation of Elahuta as Godhead, and postulating in its place the safer word divinity (i.e. Divineship). This word has more to do with the essence of the word involved. Godhead suggests rightly or wrongly a plurality or pleroma. Godhead is a word more akin to Christian Theology with its concept of the Trinity, or more akin to the pleroma of Gnosticism. But the expression Godhead does not go very well with the concept of Oneness as distinct from Unity. Cowley in his invaluable Glossary¹¹² translates Elahuta as Godhead, but Divinity seems a better choice. The 4th cent. Sam. writers would not entertain a word which would lend itself to mis-interpretation either by their own people or others. It is safe to assume that the presence of the Christian Church in Samaria would cause the Sam. Theologians like Amram Darah and Marqah to choose their words carefully, and to use words that were not ambiguous. They would not entertain the idea of Godhead in a Christian sense. God for them was a spiritual Oneness. A good example occurs (C.p.288) where it says:-

"We all pray with sincerity of heart, to Him who is One in Divinity, and endureth to all eternity."

To say "One in the Godhead" for the Sam. would be a misnomer. Again, "Whose Divinity was first" (pre-eminent) (C.p.288) gives a different exegesis from that of "Whose Godhead was first." The whole of the paragraph (C.p.288) stresses the Oneness of The Lord. That Divinity in the mind of the Sam. belongs to One is mentioned in the Durran (C.p.38):-

"The Divinity belongs to One, to the Great One alone."

Marqah (C.p.16) refers to

"The power of Thy Divinity" (Elahuta).

In another hymn (C.p.23) Marqah is specific for he writes:-

"In His great Divinity there is no other associate, His great Divinity fills the world."

and continues,

"Woe to him that testified not, there is no God but One."

Indeed Marqah associates Divinity with Oneness (cf.C.pp.24, 25, 26).

Ab-Hisdah (Abul-Hasan) of Tyre (XIth cent. C.p.71) writes:-

"Eternal art Thou in Thy Divinity, My Lord."

Here again Divinity is associated with Oneness.

Can it be however that, rather than the teaching of the Christian Trinity, Marqah has Gnostic teaching in mind, for although Gnosticism had already reached its zenith, and

was on the wane, yet its terminology would remain in part if not in full?

Marqah writes (C.p.19):-

"And let us declare unto Him, that the fullness is His, by reason of His greatness! "

(C.p.21)

"For Thou art the fullness and more so."

The "Godhead" in the Gnostic system of Valentinus (140 A.D.) consisted of thirty aeons that formed the "fullness" or the Pleroma. The Gospel of St. John¹¹³ has an interesting comment on this point when it says:-

"And from His fullness have we all received grace upon grace."

An examination of 'The Gospel of Truth', a Valentinian meditation on the Christian Gospel, by KENDRICK GROBEL¹¹⁴ shows an affinity of thought with these two hymns of Marqah (C.pp.19 and 21). Several of the attributes and epithets of God from which the thirty aeons bare their names in the developed Gnostic systems occur in the "Gospel of Truth", "but they occur as attributes and epithets of God, not as independent mythological persons."¹¹⁵ In the "Gospel of Truth" God's Oneness is maintained in spite of references to the "Pleroma." The Greek word Pleroma occurs eleven times in the "Gospel of Truth", and could be equated with Heaven. However it also could retain its original Gnostic meaning. It is also noticed how close in thought is the

"Gospel of Truth" with the Epistle to the Hebrews. If it can be sustained that Marqah knew of the "Gospel of Truth" and Amram Darah of the "Epistle to the Hebrews" then the ideological background was not only to be confined to the Pentateuch. Orthodox scholarship maintains that there is almost a total dependence of Sam. writers in the 4th cent. on the Pentateuch, while writers in succeeding centuries rely on the Pentateuch and the Defter. It is perhaps more correct to infer that while there is an attempt to adhere strictly to the Pentateuch (and the Defter) the Sam. were cognizant of thought in other religions. There has been an attempt to show how Amram Darah approximates in thought to the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹¹⁶ Another excursion, tracing a possible affinity of thought with the "Gospel of Truth" and Marqah would not be without some value. Indeed it may lead to a hypothesis where the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews wrote not only to the Sam., but that the writer himself may have emanated from or have been influenced by the Gnostic school at Alexandria. Valentinus was born in Egypt (c.100-110). He received a thorough Hellenistic education at Alexandria. He later lived and worked at Rome (136-165). He was familiar with the writings of Plato. He was haunted by the problem of evil and that of Salvation. There is evidence that he was a man of deepest religious and ethical aspirations.

If Marqah was aware of Gnostic teaching in any writings that he may have come across, it only enabled him to be more emphatic about the Divinity of God.

Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.108) refers to God as the "Lord of Lords", an ascription which had once been applied to Cyrus, King of Persia¹¹⁷ but also as "Lord of the Divinity." The danger here is that in translation Divinity may be construed as a partitive genitive, which is not possible in the original Aramaic, as Divinity is in the absolute. It may be that Abisha with the construction "Lord of Lords" before him rather clumsily resorts to parallelism, and so construes "Lord of the Divinity." But generally speaking the 14th cent. writers do not hesitate to accept the Oneness and the Spirituality of Divinity, bearing in mind such Defter references as:-

"The power of Thy Divinity" (C.p.16)

"His Divinity" (C.p.25)

"For He is alone in His Divinity" (C.p.26)

"Whose Divinity is One" (C.p.76).

11. THE GLORY OF GOD

An examination of the concept of the glory of God, in the Defter, does not carry with it any other meaning than that it actually indicates. The word glory never becomes hypostasized, for it never carries with it any over-tone which could imply personalization of any kind. In the ranks

of 4th cent. Sam. there is no Philo, nor writer of the Johannine Gospel. This glory of God is not seen, therefore it never acts as an intermediary between God and Man. The adjectival pronoun "Thy" is used often with glory, there being no occasion when glory is used in ipso either subjectively or objectively. It is a feature in the Deifter that, whereas the Sam. tend to avoid anthropomorphism in describing or alluding to God, such symbols as glory, power, word and wisdom are not used in loco parentis. This, perhaps, was inevitable in a century where Christians were indulging in controversy about the substance or essence of God; where homousios and homoiousios came to be bandied about in the streets and market place. The Sam. in like token even avoided any allusion to the Holy Spirit of God. The Oneness of God is for them a concept that will not permit any attributes or epithets of God, becoming, in any way, detached from His being, person, or essence. God, for them, has no relationships outside of Himself, or within. What God does, He does in toto. With God there is no delegation of office, or of authority, either to any particular aspect of His nature, or to another. The attributes of God, like His glory, are co-extensive, or co-terminus with His nature and being. The liaison between God and Man is effected and achieved by Moses. In the 4th cent. the manward side of Moses' nature, attributes and

activities is never in dispute. On Mount Sinai God Himself gave the Law to Moses. God spoke to Moses "face to face", while the Law was written with "the finger of God."¹¹⁸ As the Sam. in the 4th cent. were living in an environment where subtle distinctions about God's nature or essence were being made the Sam. would not deviate in the matter of God's Oneness.

An examination of the Defter shows that the word kabod is used only once, and that by Phinehas the H.P. (1308-1363; C.p.82) when he says:-

"The glory of Yahweh is to be seen therein, therefore Yahweh has said in His book, Ye shall surely observe my Sabbaths for it is a sign between Me and You."

The other words translated as glory in the Defter are related to rabo; galag; and yekirah. Moore¹¹⁹ states that Onkelos in his Targum translates Ex.xxiv.10 as:-

"And they saw the glory (yekara) of the God of Israel."

Moore points out that:-

"Yekara is the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew kabod, which it regularly translates,"

the principle being that God Himself cannot be seen by mortal eyes. Moore¹²⁰ making reference to Moses Maimonides says:-

"Assuming that Onkelos was actuated by similar ideas in his endeavour to render the anthropomorphic expressions in the Pentateuch innocuous by paraphrase, he held that the Glory, The Word the Presence, in the Targum mean created (physical) things, distinct from God; the Glory and the Presence being of the nature of light."

What conclusion then can one arrive at when aware of the fact that kabod is not prominent with 4th cent. Sam. writers in the Defter? It could be that they were fully aware of the implication which the word kabod now carried, so that Amram Darah and Marqah were anxious to avoid its use.

Tabia b. Durathah (10th cent. C.p.78) is specific when he writes:-

"And we bow and prostrate before Thy glory
(rabinekah) which cannot be seen."

Can it be that he is indulging in polemics here? It is to be found in a context which the present writer considers to be couched in Gnostic terminology. The XIth cent. writer Ab-Hisdah (C.p.72) when writing:-

"Great is Thy glory, My Lord"

uses rabothekah thus avoiding kabod.

In the 14th cent. Sam. liturgy for the Passover, Dr. Lerner¹²¹ translates a hymn where Phinehas the H.P. refers to

"The glory (kabod) of the Lord"

(C.p.236), but in another hymn by the same writer (C.p.223) he translates shechinah as "The glory." It is true that "the glory" of the Lord can be represented by shechinah, although the latter word can, appropriately enough, be translated to represent "The Divine Presence." Glory can be conceived of as a property of the Divine Presence. Indeed

in the N.T. the Greek word doxa really alludes to the Shechinah - Glory. In this connection John i.14 reflects a truly Jewish background if it is correct to say that the verb eskēnōsen is used because of its likeness to the noun Shechinah. In this verse there is an allusion to the Word (the Memra of the Targums), the Shechinah, and the Shechinah-Glory. "It is remarkable that the Memra (Logos or Word) of the Targums almost entirely disappears in the Midrashic literature, and the Talmud, its place being taken by Shechinah."¹²²

It might therefore be a safe expedient, in the light of Sam. tradition, as distinct from Jewish, to translate Shechinah as Divine Presence rather than Glory, although strictly speaking it is not possible to have one without the other. Lerner translates from a hymn by Ben Manir (C.p.184) as

"The habitation of the glory (Shechinah)
of the Lord",

where, perhaps on technical grounds the "Abiding Divine Presence", might be a more logical rendering.

Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.498) makes reference to Kabod when he writes:-

"So Moses has the Tabernacle, wearing
breastplate and ephod; Who perceives the
two cherubs. The Glory (Kabod) of the
Lord comes and fills, 'All that He made,
and behold it was very good'".

Although Moses, the Tabernacle, breastplate and ephod are

mentioned with the two cherubs in Exodus¹²³ it is suggested, after careful scrutiny, that Abisha's thoughts were guided by Maimonides¹²⁴ where he specifically mentions Isaiah. Mention is made there¹²⁵ that:-

"The whole earth is full of His glory (kabod)."
As the Sam. did not recognise the Prophets of Israel, Abisha could hardly quote from Isaiah¹²⁶ directly, so he paraphrases "The whole earth is full", by reference back to the Pentateuch¹²⁷.

On another occasion Abisha in a Malifut (C.p.489) writes:-

"The Holy Kebala preserves us by His glory (kabod)", which is a mysterious statement, in that glory (kabod), a property associated with God is mentioned about Kebala, a name of one of four Sam. angels. God, however, is implied here, not only because kabod is a property of God, but because the Sam. do refer to

"The God of Kebala" (cf.C.p.652).

The mystery is further deepened, when Abisha, in a Kime (C.p.430) writes:-

"And Kebala made the heaven of heavens for His holiness."

Abisha b. Phinehas writes (C.p.366) that he had a dream which he saw himself standing before Mount Gerizim. The angels of God were upon it. Yahweh also was on it. He then states (C.p.367) that

"The Glory was standing upon the throne."

This is a remarkable transition of thought from that of the 4th cent. Glory is now able to be used without a possessive pronoun, and has an action ascribed to it. This factor of detachment would suggest personalization like Wisdom in Proverbs¹²⁸, yet it is known that Abisha does not depart from the Oneness of God. Abdullah b. Solomon is more careful in his choice of words, for he writes (C.p.373):-

"Thou standest upon the throne of Thy greatness"

and "Thou shalt give of Thy glory unto us."

There are occasions when the 14th cent. Sam. writers leave strict prose, and resort to poetical symbolism, so that a measure of licence has to be accorded to them.

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.424) in describing the meeting of God and Moses on Mount Sinai, stated that

"The Glory manifested itself."

The Kabbalah writers of the Middle Ages held that certain people could, after careful preparation and meditation, and in purity of heart see "The Glory." Even Moses only spoke to God face to face (or mouth to mouth). He never saw God face to face. When Abdullah remarks,

"The Glory manifested itself",

is there a tendency here for him to personalize the Kabod? No Sam. writer ever loses sight of the Oneness of God, yet here the Kabod does tend to obtrude itself as an hypostasis.

Normally Sam. writers leave no doubt, for so often glory is associated with a personal pronoun, such as "His glory." When "Glory" stands alone in ipso then the doubt arises as to whether "glory" does not tend to exist, if not in its own right, at least as a distinct aspect of God's personality and nature. To be aware of the vision of the Kabod is to be aware of the Divine Light, which signifies the presence of God.

Abdullah in his hymn on the birth of Moses (C.pp.746-753) states that when Pharaoh's daughter came down to the river, and opened the ark, she and those with her saw the "Light of the world", and beheld his "Glory" (Kabod). An analysis of this hymn compared with the first eight chapters of the Johannine Gospel, leads one to postulate that Abdullah is making a comparison with Moses and Jesus Christ. Abdullah could very well have John¹²⁹ in mind when writing about Moses and his birth. If this is so then Kabod is the equivalent of the Greek word Doxa. The use of the word Kabod by Abdullah indicates how close he goes in ascribing the aspect of "divinity" to Moses.

This comparison of Moses with Jesus Christ is also in evidence in the Epistle to the Hebrews¹³⁰ where it says:-

"Yet Jesus has been counted worthy of as much more glory than Moses as the builder of a house has more honour than the house."

The Epistle¹³¹ does not isolate this glory from God in that,

"He (i.e. The Son) reflects the glory of God and bears the very stamp of His nature, upholding the universe by His word of power."

Whereas the 4th cent. Sam. writers in the Defter did not use the word Kabod, the word in the 14th cent. is used quite freely by Ben Manir, Abisha b. Phinehas, and Abdullah b. Solomon. It is accepted now in the way which both Jews and Christians accept it; that is to say, it is never entirely divorced from God. If there was no God, there would be no Kabod. By the above writers Kabod is never conceived of as sui generis.

Sa'dallah b. Zedaqah al-Kethari, another 14th cent. Sam. writer, whose thoughts appear to be patterned, in his hymn (C.p.381) on the Epistle to the Hebrews¹³² states that after the angels had ascended and descended,

"The great glory came down upon the top of the mountain",

but he has God in mind for he states,

"Then He called to Moses, the apostle 'O son of My house'",

which is further evidence that the Greek word Doxa can be translated by the Hebrew word Kabod, although in the 1st cent., as for example in the Epistle to the Romans¹³³, Doxa is equal to Shechinah-glory.

12. A SPECIFIC SAMARITAN INTERPRETATION
OF THE ONENESS OF GOD.

At all times the Sam. never deviated from the doctrine of the Oneness of God. To refer to the Unity of God is to miss the vital meaning of the essence of God's nature. The theme right throughout Sam. belief is that "There is only one God." (C.p.3). It is a kind of Sam. seal or "Amen" at the end of nearly all prayers and hymns. A number of reasons would account for this attitude so dogmatic in its exposition. The Sam. are held to be the oldest Jewish sect in existence.¹³⁴ They never deviated from accepting the Oneness of God, one reason probably being that they would never allow the Jews any opportunity of condemning them as unorthodox and heretics.

While God is not referred to as Father in the Pentateuch there are to be found in it ideas which could have been developed with an imagination. For example Deut.¹³⁵ says:-

"And the Lord saw it, and abhorred them,
Because of the provocation of His sons
and His daughters. And he said, I will
hide my face from them",

indicating thereby the cause of Penutah or Disfavour. The Sam. accepted and developed the concept of Favour and Disfavour, but not that of Father.

In the Defter, when one would expect the mention of Father, Marqah slips into a different train of thought when he writes (C.p.19):-

"We have erred and we have sinned; it is time for us to return; It is no shame for a child to return to his teacher."

If the Sam. were determined to show the Jews that it was they (the Sam.) who were orthodox - although the Jews thought of God in terms of Father¹³⁶ - they were further prompted to maintain the Oneness of God in the light of controversy in the Christian Church over the precise relationship of Jesus Christ to God. The Council of Nicaea was called to offset the heresy of Arius who had seized on the title "Son of God" as applied to Jesus Christ, and asked "How can a son be as old as his father?"¹³⁷ The Creed of Nicaea¹³⁸ enunciated that God was the "Father Almighty", and Jesus Christ the "Son of God." The remainder of this century, which incidentally coincided with the Sam. writers Marqah, Amram Darah and Nana b. Marqah, was given up to bitter controversy and division in the Christian Church. A natural re-action on the part of the Sam., if for no other reason, would be to avoid such theological pitfalls and disputes, probably believing that such absence of bitterness in their sect, on such matters, was a sign that they were correct. By avoiding the concept of the Fatherhood of God, they steered clear of fruitless controversy. There may have been another reason. By stressing the fact that God was Father, the implication would be that the Sam. at least were His children. But the Sam. or should it be said, Marqah,

stressing God as possessing Everlasting Life (C.pp.20,25, 26), to bring out this significant fact, alludes to Man as "Transient dust." Marqah never equivocates about this distinction, so much so, that any argument for the resurrection of the body, or of everlasting life for Man, can be sustained by very little support from the Defter in a direct sense. There are no overt statements on this matter, which will arise later for discussion in the chapter on Eschatology. To the 4th cent. Sam. God is eternal, but Man is not to be considered in the same light. He, God, is unique and "without an associate."

The rise of Islam was another reason why the Sam. held to a belief in the Oneness of God. This does not necessarily mean that the Muslims influenced the Sam. on this point. It might be that the reverse is nearer the truth since Marqah, Nana and Amram antedate the emergence of Islam by about three centuries. Nevertheless as the Arabs became conquerors over a vast area including Samaria, and as the Arabs held strictly to the concept of one God, a suppressed nation would take into consideration the theological concepts of its overlord and master. The Muslim Quran does not allude specifically to God as Father. The Koran¹³⁹ says:-

"There is no God but God",
and¹⁴⁰ "There is no God but He."

The success of the Muslims in the field of arms would cause the Sam. to feel that at least they were right in

upholding the Oneness of God, for the one true God was the ultimate victor in battle.

This is not to suggest that the Sam. would not have clung to the concept of the Oneness of God regardless of outside influence or pressure. But such external factors must have helped them in maintaining the integrity of God as One in divinity, and that it was incorrect to conceive of Him as Father.

The Sam. also do not refer to the Holy Spirit of God. This is an indication that they pursued their own line of thought on this point of doctrine and were not influenced by the Jewish, Christian and Islamic religions. The avoidance of the use of the expression was no doubt due to their intention to uphold the Oneness of God, for in their creed they affirm (C.p.3):-

"Yahweh is our God, Yahweh is One,
He alone."

The Holy Spirit of God however is mentioned in the O.T.. Psalm Li¹⁴¹ says:-

"And take not Thy Holy Spirit from me",
while the prophet Isaiah¹⁴² writes:-

"But they rebelled and grieved His Holy Spirit"
and¹⁴³:-

"Where is He who put in the midst of them
His Holy Spirit?"

The Holy Spirit in the Christian Theology is a member of the Godhead, and in mentioning the Trinity (Tri-unity)

allusion is made to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. References to the Holy Spirit (or Holy Ghost) are found passim in the N.T. Those who see a close affinity with the Gospel of St. John and the Sam. are faced with the problem of the Gospel mentioning the Father and the Holy Spirit, neither of whom is found in the Defter.

However the expression holy spirit is found in M.M. but not in a way suggestive of Divinity. When it is used in M.M. there is no hint that it partakes of God's nature or essence. "In the earlier books (of the O.T.) the Spirit is certainly depicted as a Divine energy, but in the later there seems to be something like an approximation to the doctrine of the Spirit as a Personal Being (Isa. XLViii,16; LXii,9,10; Zech.iv,6). Perhaps, in general, the Spirit in the Old Testament is a Divine Agent rather than a distinct Personality. God is regarded as at work by His Spirit. One strong confirmation of the truth that the doctrine of the Spirit is a Bible doctrine is the fact that for all practical purposes the period of the Apocrypha from Malachi to Matthew contributed nothing to it."¹⁴⁴

M.M. could be reflecting the tradition of the period from Malachi to Matthew in being reticent about the mention of the holy spirit. The writer of M.M.¹⁴⁵ states:-

"By the power of the Good One, assembled by three glorious ministers, hedged in by three great fences - cloud, fire, and holy spirit - one leading, one illumining, and one protecting."

He also writes ¹⁴⁶ :-

"The body of Adam was created by God,
and perfected with holy spirit, and
made a living soul."

There is nothing in these casual allusions to the holy spirit to suggest that a genesis of a doctrine of the Holy Spirit is evident in M.M. If it had been conceived as such, later Sam. writers would have developed it, so that by the 14th cent. such a doctrine would have been fully established. It is not so. The Sam. would reject, in toto, Article V ¹⁴⁷ of the Church of England, which states:-

De Spiritu Sancto.
Spiritus Sanctus, a Patre et Filio procedens,
ejusdem est cum Patre et Filio essentiae,
majestatis, et gloriae, verus ac aeternus Deus.

This Article reflects the teaching in the Johannine Gospel, but not that of the Sam.

As an example of the Gospel of St. John there is the following verse ¹⁴⁸:-

"But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit,
whom the Father will send is my name, he
will teach you all things, and bring to
your remembrance all that I said unto you."

The Quran ¹⁴⁹ states that Jesus was strengthened "with the Holy Spirit", but G.Sale adds a footnote:-

"We must not imagine Mohammed here means the Holy Ghost in the Christian acceptation. The commentators say this spirit was the angel Gabriel, who sanctified Jesus and constantly attended on him."

Similarly Tisdall ¹⁵⁰ affirms that the angel Gabriel is

called the Holy Spirit by the Muslims.

In the Apocrypha, the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon¹⁵¹ identifies the Holy Spirit with Wisdom.

The Dead Sea Scrolls make mention of the Holy Spirit of God. T.H.Gaster¹⁵² draws attention to "the Zadokite Document." In the section i. 1 - ii.12 it states:-

"It was a time when a certain scoffer
arose to distil upon Israel the waters
deceptive, and to lead them astray in a
trackless waste ."

T.H.Gaster points out that this may be a general polemic against the Sam. However in the Zadokite Document (ii.2-13) is stated regarding Israel:-

"And to these has He ever revealed
His Holy Spirit, at the hands of
His annointed, and has ever disclosed
the Truth."

In the Gnostic Gospel of Truth probably written by Valentinus, and which may have been known to the Sam. "God is always called The Father,"¹⁵³ while the Holy Spirit is not over prominent. Grobel¹⁵⁴ states that it is doubted if "The Holy Spirit has even a degree of independence."
"It is a function of God."

In the Epistle to the Hebrews which could quite conceivably have been written to the Sam., mention is made of the Holy Spirit¹⁵⁵, and where God is mentioned as Father, it is never in a proprietary sense such as "our" father or "your" father. In the Greek Mss. Jesus is referred to as "a son" and not "the son."¹⁵⁶ Mention is also made of,

"Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee",¹⁵⁷ but this also refers to Jesus. The other references¹⁵⁸ are:-

"God dealeth with you as with sons"
and¹⁵⁹ :-

"Shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits."

The Defter makes mention of the "God of spirits", itself deriving it from Leviticus.¹⁶⁰

So that in the Epistle to the Hebrews while mention is made of the Holy Spirit, the concept of God as the Father of Man - apart from Jesus - is not stressed.

The 14th cent. writers as a whole, including Ben Manir, Abisha b. Phinehas and Abdullah b. Solomon, do not mention God as Father, or refer to the Holy Spirit. Abdullah does say of Israel (C.p.337):-

"The spirit of God protecteth thee."

Abraham Al-Qabasi (16th cent.; C.p.668) makes mention of the Holy Spirit; also Solomon b. Tabiah (19th cent. C.p.363). The words of Solomon b. Tabiah (C.p.363) refer back to Mount Sinai and are worth quoting:-

"Even the Law which hath been revealed, which hath been received on tablets, and which was given by the Holy Spirit, with His glory, and with His strength to the faithful one, the prophet of the world and the hereafter."

That writers later than the 14th cent. introduce the Holy Spirit into their work, shows that they are susceptible to outside influences other than that of Sam. tradition.

Abraham Al-Qabasi has shown that he is prepared to read back into a specific situation and occasion, and introduce the Holy Spirit at Mount Sinai. No Sam. writer prior to the 14th cent. had done this.

The doctrine of the oneness, the uniqueness, and the spirituality of God is the supreme concept and theme of Sam. faith. This doctrine is based "upon the formula of the Shemah; Hear, O Israel, Y H W H thy God is one Y H W H"¹⁶¹ which eventually came to be,¹⁶²

"Generally expressed in the terms of Islam,
'There is no God but God'"

The great doctrine of the Quran is the oneness of God; "to restore which point Mohammad pretended was the chief end of his mission."¹⁶³ The determination of the Sam. to uphold God's oneness was further accentuated by Christian distinctions within the Godhead, and one may assume by Gnostic ideas of emanation. After the Council of Nicaea (325) the eastern branch of the Christian Church was engaged in perpetual arguments, and disputes continued to persist among the Arians, Sabelians, Nestorians and Eutychians. In such an atmosphere the Sam. insistence on the oneness of God, rather than the unity of God, would take on the appearance of a polemic against the Christian Church. The Sam. concept of the oneness of God would stand out in clear relief against a background of the Gnostic teaching on emanation. God for the Sam. was one without plurality.

Later, in their attempt to sustain the concept of God's oneness, they would be supported, if not influenced "by the hard Deism of Islam."¹⁶⁴

To emphasize this oneness rather than the unity of God, the Sam. do not mention the Holy Spirit of God as did the Jews.¹⁶⁵ "The doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, which was first developed in Judaism, and later made the cornerstone of religion by Jesus, is ignored, and even contradicted by the Sam. faith."¹⁶⁶ However the rigid monotheism of Sam. ideology is enhanced by a large vocabulary of attributes and epithets describing the uniqueness of God. It was because of their confidence in the oneness of God that they developed and expanded the number of attributes and epithets relative to God. The Christians had stressed the unity of God, and then proceeded, as for example in the Nicene Creed (325), to enlarge upon the Trinity (Tri-unity). It is also noticed how, in the 4th cent., the Sam. avoid reference to Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Sam. clung tenaciously to the Shemah of Deuteronomy; the one Lord.¹⁶⁷

PART I

BELIEF IN GOD

NOTES

N O T E S

1. Gen. i.1
2. Oesterley W.O.E. and Robinson: Hebrew Religion.
London. 1930.
ibid. p. 53
3. Gen. xiv.18-20; Num. xxiv. 16.
4. Oesterley and Robinson. op. cit. Chap. v.
5. Cowley. Sir A.E. "The Samaritan Liturgy" Two vols.
Oxford 1909.
6. ibid. Vol. ii. pp. xx-xxi.
 1. THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.
7. Ex. iii. 14.
8. The Acts of the Apostles. xvii. 28.
9. Ex. iii. 14.
10. Ex. vi. 3.
11. Joad. C.E.M. Guide to Philosophy. London. 1943.
ibid. pp. 540 - 556.
12. Ex. iii.
13. cf. Tennant. F.R. Philosophical Theology. Vol. 1. p.251
14. Ex. vi. 3.
15. St. Anselm. Cur Deus Homo. London.
16. Waterhouse. Eric.S. The Philosophical Approach to Religion. London. 1933.
ibid. p. 65. f.
17. Gen. i. 1.

18. Memar Margah. Book. vi. Par. 1; Brown S. Dissertation, Leeds, 1955.
19. ibid. p. 73 (C.p. 27)
20. ibid. p. 73 (C.p. 27)
21. M.M. Book vi. Par. 1.
22. Cowley. Vol.II. op.cit. pp. xxviii - xxix.
23. Grant. R.M. Gnosticism and Early Christianity. London. 1959.
ibid. p. 143.
24. Gen. i. 3.
25. St. John i. 9.
26. Friedlander. M. The Guide to the Perplexed.
27. ibid. p. 90
28. ibid. p. 45
29. Friedlander. M. op.cit. p. 158
30. cf. Defter; Passim.
31. Ayer. A.J. Language, Truth, and Logic. London. 1946.
ibid. p. 5 ff.
32. Joad. C.E.M. op. cit. p. 117
33. cf. M.M. Book i, Par. 2. "By His Mighty Will."
34. Grant. R.M. op. cit. p. 143

2. LIFE OF GOD

35. Cowley. A.E. op. cit. Vol. II. p. Lxviii.
36. Deut. v. 26.

37. Brown, S. op.cit. p. 134. (C.p.12)
38. ibid. p. xL
39. ibid. p. xLi.
40. ibid. p. 226 (Not found in Cowley)
cf. Brown's note 50 (p.232).
41. Gesenius. G. Carmina Samaritana. Leiden. 1924.
42. Griffith Thomas, W.H. The Principles of Theology.
London. 1930.
ibid. p. 3
43. cf. Josh. iii. 10; Heb. iii. 12.
44. Deut. v. 26.

3. ETERNITY OF GOD

45. Gen. xxi. 33
46. Ex. iii. 15.
47. Deut. xxxiii. 27
48. Dan. vii. 9, 13, 22
49. Montgomery. J.A. The Samaritans. Philadelphia 1907.
ibid. p. 211
50. Matt. xxii, 23; Mark xii, 27.

4. PERSONALITY OF GOD

51. Heb. i, 3
52. Ex. iii, 14.
53. Ex. iii, 14.
54. Ex. xxxiii, 11.

55. Gen. i, 1.
Mackensie. J.S. A Manual of Ethics. London. 1950.
56. ibid. p. 388
57. ibid. p. 10
58. Gen. i, 31.

5. THE ONENESS OF GOD

59. cf. Proverbs. viii. 22-30.
60. Deut. vi, 4.
61. Friedlander. M. op.cit. p. 90
62. Zech. xiv, 9.
63. Friedlander. M. op.cit. p. 39.
(Holy Spirit six times on p. 242).
64. cf. Proverbs. viii. 20-30.
65. Friedlander. M. op.cit. pp.146-147
66. ibid. p. 108 - 144.
67. ibid. p. 145 - 192.
68. ibid. p. 50
69. ibid. p. 72
70. ibid. pp. 138 f.
71. ibid. p. 141
72. ibid. p. 142
73. ibid. p. 151

6. SPIRITUALITY OF GOD

74. Browning. D.C. Thesaurus (of Peter Roget).
London. 1955.
ibid. p. 99
75. Friedlander. M. op.cit. pp. 81-82
76. ibid. p. 83
77. ibid. p. 21
78. Tennant. F.R. op.cit. Vol.I, p.313.
79. Grant. R.M. op.cit. p.143
80. cf. I Cor. ii, 10-15.
81. Epstein. Isidore. Judaism.
ibid. p. 216

7. ETHICAL ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

82. Ottley. R.L. The Hebrew Prophets. London. 1937.
ibid. p. 11
83. Galloway. George. The Philosophy of Religion
Edinburgh. 1948.
ibid. p. 505
84. Waterhouse. Eric. S. The Philosophical Approach to Religion. London. 1933.
ibid. p. 85
85. ibid. p. 78
86. cf. Amos i, 3-15; iii, 1-3.
87. Ottley. R.L. op.cit. p. 23
88. Gen. xviii, 25.
89. Ex. xv, 11.
90. Ex. xxxiv, 6-7.

- 91. Epstein, Isidore, op.cit. p.26
- 92. Lev. xix, 2.
- 93. Lev. xix, 2.

8. TRANSCENDENCE AND IMMANENCE.

- 94. cf. Gen. i, 26.
- 95. Gen. i, 31.
- 96. Carlyle. Thomas, Sartor Resartus. London. 1888.
Book ii, Chap. VII. p. 112.
- 97. Friedlander. M. op.cit. p.21
- 98. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Art: Spinoza; Vol.21.p.235
- 99. Ayer. A.J. Language, Truth, and Logic. London 1946.
ibid. p.5 f

9 . THE METAPHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES.

- 100. Cowley. A.E. op.cit. p. LVI.
- 101. Brown. S. Dissertation, Leeds. 1955
ibid. p.255
- 102. Epstein, Isidore, op.cit. p.136
- 103. Gen. xxviii, 16.
- 104. Gen. xxviii, 19.
- 105. Psalm Cxxxix, 8-10.
- 106. Epstein, Isidore, op.cit. p.137
- 107. ibid. p.237
- 108. Ginzberg. Louis, The Legends of the Jews. 7 Vols.
ibid. Vol. V, p.289
- 109. Encyclopaedia Britannica; 14th Edition;
ibid. Vol.XI, p.685

110. Montgomery. J.A. The Samaritans. Philadelphia, 1907.
ibid. p.215

10. DIVINITY OF GOD

111. Acts. xvii, 28.
112. Cowley. A.E. op.cit. p. L.
113. St. John i, 16.
114. Grobel. Kendrick. The Gospel of Truth. London 1960
115. ibid. pp. 21 - 22.
116. Trotter. R.J.F. L.U.O.S. October 1961.
Monograph Series No. 1.
Did the Samaritans of the Fourth Century know the
Epistle to the Hebrews?
117. cf. Rev. xix, 16.

11. THE GLORY OF GOD

118. cf. Strachan. R.H. op.cit. p.149 (Note).
119. Moore. G.F. Judaism. Vol. I. p.420
120. ibid. Vol.I, p.437 (cf. Friedlander.M. op.cit.
p.31.)
121. Lerner. I. Dissertation, Leeds, 1956.
122. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol.XX, p.482
123. Ex. xxv - xxvii.
124. Friedlander. M. op.cit. p.258
125. Isa. vi, 3.
126. Isa. vi.
127. Gen. i, 31.
128. Proverbs, viii.

- 129. St. John i, 14.
- 130. Heb. iii, 3.
- 131. Heb. i, 3.
- 132. Heb. i - iii.
- 133. Rom. ix, 4.

12. A SPECIFIC SAMARITAN INTERPRETATION OF
THE ONENESS OF GOD.

- 134. Gaster. Moses. The Samaritans. London 1925.
ibid. p. 1
- 135. Deut. xxxii, 19-20.
- 136. Ps. LXViii, 5; Ps. Ciii, 13.
Whitham. A.R. The History of the Christian Church.
London 1924.
- 137. ibid. p.185
- 138. ibid. p.199
Sale. George, The Koran. London
- 139. ibid. p.32
- 140. ibid. p.33
- 141. Ps. Li, 11
- 142. Isa. LXiii, 10.
- 143. Isa. LXiii, 11.
- 144. Griffith Thomas, W.H. op.cit. p.91
- 145. M.M. Book i, Par. 10.
- 146. M.M. Book ii, Par. 10.
- 147. Griffith Thomas. W.H. op.cit. p.90
- 148. St. John. xiv, 26.

149. Sale. George. op.cit. p.10
150. Tisdall. Dr. The Sources of the Koran.
(S.P.C.K. 1905). op.cit. p.154
- 151 . The Apocrypha. S.P.C.K. London.
Wisdom ix, 17.
152. Gaster. T.H. The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect.
London. 1957.
ibid. pp.70 f
153. Grobel. Kendrick. op.cit. p.21
154. ibid. p. 23
155. Heb. ii, 4; iii, 7; vi, 4; x, 15.
156. Heb. i, 2. cf. St. Matt. xxvii, 54 (R.S.V.)
157. Heb. i, 5; cf. Ps. ii, 7.
158. Heb. xii, 7.
159. Heb. xii, 9.
160. Lev. xvi, 22; xxvii, 16.
161. Deut. vi, 4; Montgomery. op.cit. p.208
162. Montgomery. J.A. op.cit. p.208
163. Sale. George. op.cit. p.49
164. Montgomery. J. A. op.cit. p.210
165. Ginzberg. Louis. Vol. VII, p.220.
166. Montgomery. J.A. op.cit. p.212
167. Deut. vi, 4.

(C) MANIFESTATION OF GOD
IN THE WORLD

(NATURE, MAN, HISTORY)

1. I N N A T U R E.

1. IN NATURE

In extreme simplicity the Book of Genesis opens with the words¹ :-

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

The writer of St. John's Gospel² paraphrases this by stating:-

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

The two poems³ make the position of God and the Creation perfectly simple. God was the Creator, and He brought into being His creative works. From the created universe, by deduction, one can draw certain inferences regarding the personality and character of God. By human analogy one concludes that God possesses Will, Power, Wisdom, Ability and Purpose. On this matter of the creation the Jews rarely philosophized. They hardly stopped to ask whether matter itself was a mere illusion of the mind, or whether the universe was just a fortuitous concourse of atoms and molecules. They accepted as a forthright statement of fact and faith (or faith and fact) that in the beginning God created or made this universe, like Paley's watchmaker made his watch. By according the dignity of creation to God, they thereby, perhaps unknowingly, accorded a dignity to His creation. For example, while Hammurabi's Code laid the emphasis on the sanctity of property, the Mosaic Code has a preference for insisting upon the sanctity of human life and

personality. The God of Israel is designated a "living God" whose creative energy is always at work in His universe. His power was exemplified when creation was made manifest. The problem of creation, whether the world actually came into existence ex nihilo, or out of some pre-existent matter is principally a philosophical one, and was not originally of concern to the primitive Israelite mind. For the Jew the world was not a matter of mere chance. It was inevitable however that in later centuries the Jewish mind should speculate upon God and His created universe. But neither Jew nor Sam. ever considered, as the Gnostics did, that matter was evil. They both affirmed that as God was responsible for the creation of material things, then they were good. "And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good."⁴ Goodness is never defined, but is accepted as a quality appertaining to those things which have a close connection with God. The Jew therefore eventually was able to believe in "the resurrection of the body", while the viewpoint of Neo-platonists and Gnostics veered towards that of a soma-sema doctrine (The body a tomb or a prison).

Amram Darah (C.p.27) states adequately the Sam. belief in creation when he states:-

"When Thy wisdom saw fit to create, Thy power brought together all things at Thy word."

The Aramaic text actually says, "With Thy Word", while "wisdom", "all things", and "word" are familiar expressions theologically, and beloved of Valentinian Gnostics. That God is the absolute maker of things, Amram Darah affirms for he continues (C.p.28):-

"Thou art He, by whom and from whom are all things, and to whom all things are subject."

He also writes (C.p.31):-

"Thy works which are exalted; Which Thou broughtest forth from nothing in six days."

That the works were brought forth "from nothing" is based on the scripture⁵ that the earth was "without form and void." The same expression tohu wa-bohu is used of God by Marqah (C.p.62). The true meaning would therefore appear to be "without form and immaterial." It was Aristotle, who was the first philosopher to deal with the notion of the attributes of substance. He regarded the so-called elements of his predecessor, Empedocles (Circa 490 - 430 B.C.) - earth, air, fire, and water - as the Matter of all chemical compounds, the Form being their specific law of composition.⁶ The Jewish and Sam. belief in creatio ex nihilo, was fundamental in their attitude towards God.

In his second composition (C.p.79) Ab-Hisdah refers to God as "the origin of all beginning." The Aramaic word iqqar stands for "root" and it has been so translated by Brown⁷. By asserting God to be the "root" of all beginning

and not "origin", Ab-Hisdah could place himself in grave theological and philosophical difficulties, for if God is the "root", then all things would stem from Him, and from His nature. What he does mean is that God is responsible for all creation, "for He hath no equal, and there is none like Him; One alone without a second, without helper, and without governor,"(C.p.79). The Gnostics also allude to God as the "One Root".⁸

Marqah also like Amram Darah looks upon God as "Maker of the world" (C.p.16), and as the "Creator of the children of men" (C.p.16). He affirms (C.p.18) that:-

"By Thy Goodness did the world come into existence, and by Thy power was it ordered."

The Prayer of the Angels (C.p.9) refers to God's goodness in creation stating:-

"Thou didst create all that was required therein, to reveal Thy goodness."

On the other hand the Gnostics demurred from associating goodness with the material world. Matter for them was evil. Marqah writes (C.p.24):-

"The beginning of all things art Thou, and the end of all."

Such a statement recalls the marked difference of opinion that has arisen between Dr. Ryle, of Cambridge, and Dr. F. Hoyle of Oxford. Hoyle has maintained in the "Steady State Theory" that in effect there is a conservation of matter and that this world had no beginning and has no end. Ryle

in his "Evolutionary Theory" of the universe postulates that there was a beginning; that there is an evolution of galaxies, and that there will be an end of the universe. He affirms that the world came into being at a definite moment in time.

Amram Darah (C.p.27) also introduces the element of time, for he writes:-

"New creations didst Thou make outside time:
That Thou shouldst make known that Thou art
first, before time was."

Cosmology still continues to intrigue the minds of men.

Ab-Gelugah (12th cent.) says of God (C.p.75):-

"I am that I am, O My Maker, my Creator,
My Former, My Fashioner, save me from
judgement."

These ideas recall to mind HAKIM OMAR KHAYYIM (c.1071-1123) who has, as a basic theme in his Rubaiyat⁹, that Man is a clay vessel fashioned by God.¹⁰ Some of his quatrains speak of the clay being formed and fashioned by God, and of Man's soul being imprisoned therein. The writings of this Persian poet, at the time that Ab-Gelugah lived, were receiving wider recognition, and it may be that Ab-Gelugah was not unaware of this impact. If that was so he, like other Sam. writers, never seeks to disparage the body in order to exalt the soul. Such vapourings had existed for many centuries, and the Sam. were aware of them, but they never succumb to considering the body as evil. All that

God had made was good. Indeed Amram the High Priest (1255-1269) states (C.p.31) that ab origine the works of God were made perfect.

"There was no defect in any of them,"

for they were made by,

"The Lord of creation."

Ben Manir (C.p.644) after stressing the spiritual or incorporeal side of God's nature in the first stanza, proceeds in the second to deal with material creation as a contrast, stating:-

"By His perfect works His majesty is made known."

Of the creation also he adds:-

"No hand has calculated - the foundation is not upon anything - not based on any source - no instrument - no hands - no measure and no rule."

In so doing he subscribes to the cosmology of Samaritanism that was a creatio ex nihilo.

Abisha b. Phinehas in a hymn called "Words of Forgiveness" (C.p.250 ff.) writes of God the Creator:-

"He made its elements - dry earth, moist water, flaming fire and the wind that blows."

It was the Greek philosopher Empedocles (c.495 - 435 B.C.) who was the first to teach that all material substances were compounds from the so-called four elements, fire, air, earth and water. Aristotle later discussed them when propounding his theory of forms. Moses Maimonides in examining the philosophy of Aristotle brought the four

elements in prominence. It may well be that the Sam. writers first became aware of the four elements through coming into contact with the works of Maimonides, which by the time of the 14th cent. were well known and widely read. It may not be wise to exclude such works as the Moreh Nebuchim¹¹ from the ideological background as affecting the 14th cent. writers.

The four elements are not mentioned in the Defter. The 14th cent. writers to mention the four elements are Sa-dallah al-Kethari (C.p.769); Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.250; 510); Eleazar b. Phinehas (C.p.437); and Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.238; 775). These writers either allude generally to the "four elements", or as does Abisha (C.p.510) specifically by name, "fire, and air (ruach) and earth (dust) and water." But whereas for Empedocles they were residual elements from which creation occurred, Abisha states (C.p.250 ff.):-

"He made the elements."

There is a mention of "elements" (stoicheia) in the N.T. but in two different ways. There is reference to elements of the natural universe with the meaning approximating to that of Abisha¹², and as a rudiment or principle of any intellectual or religious system.¹³

However knowledge of the "four elements" was quite widespread. For example, the great Sufi poet of Persia,

JALAL ADDIN (1207 - 1273) makes mention of them in the Masnavi¹⁴ :-

"The four elements are as birds tied together by the feet."

and specifies them¹⁵ :-

"Yea, even air, water, earth and fire."

In a KIME (C.p.430) Abisha as a safe criterion says:-

"Let the Creator be praised who thus created and established everything by His command."

yet, later he writes:-

"And Kebala made the heaven of heavens for His holiness."

Now Kebala is one of the four angels named by the Sam. and on the surface it would almost appear to be heresy to suggest that an angel created the world, or to be precise "the heaven of heavens."

However God is referred to as an angel¹⁶ :-

"The God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac walked, the God who has led me all my life long to this day, the angel who has redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads."

The Defter also alludes to this text (C.p.83) by stating:-

"The angel who hath delivered me from all evil."

It is noticed that the Sam. Pentateuch¹⁷ in order to avoid any attempt at anthropomorphism has been amended to:-

"And the angels of God said, Let us make man in our own image."

By avoiding one pitfall the Sam. inadvertently fall into another, that of ascribing the creation of man to angels.

In the Gnostic system of Cerinthus¹⁸ the creation of the world was effected by angels - powers distinct from the Supreme God - one of whom was the God of the Jews and giver of the Law. Cerinthus, according to tradition, was an opponent of St. John at Ephesus. Simon Magus and Menander also attributed the creation of the world to angels. Saturninus¹⁹ said:-

"The world was created by seven angels
(including the God of the Jews)"

Generally speaking Gnostic systems, conceiving matter as evil, interposed a link between the spiritual and infinite Supreme God, and the finite and material world. Such was the impact of Gnostic thought that the Mandaeans refer to Ptahil as the Demiurge who creates the earth "which lies in the black water."²⁰

Abdullah b. Solomon referring to God (C.p.238) writes:-

"He is the Creator who made all things with a finger, with His great might, that is not contained in the four."

That God created "with a finger", is of course a mere figure of speech. But what does "contained in the four" allude to? Is the reference to the "four elements?" Or else could it be an allusion either to the Sephiroth mentioned in the Book of Creation²¹ (Sefer Yetzirah) or to the doctrine of the four graduated worlds through which the Infinite made Himself manifest in the finite? This doctrine of the four graduated worlds occurs in the teaching

of Jacob ha-Nazir²² (12th cent.) as found in his Book, "The Treatise on Emanation." The stress on God creating

"with a finger, with His great might"

might point to Abdullah not being prepared to accept the teaching of Jacob ha-Nazir in toto. Abdullah stresses creation. There is no suggestion of evolution here, nor emanation. That the Sam. did have a doctrine of four worlds is evidenced in The Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions²³ by Moses Gaster. He points out that the community of the Sam. believe that every man lives in four worlds.

1. The womb of his mother.
2. This world.
3. The world between this and the next.
4. The last world.

Although the Hilluk is 16 - 17th cent. and probably by Ibrahim b. Jacob it contains early verbatim material from earlier works such as the Tabah (10th cent.), the Kafi (C.1030), the Hilaf and other works of MUNADJA b. ZADAKA (11th - 13th cent.); therefore a period prior to Abdullah, and perhaps not unknown to him.

Abdullah (C.p.324) speaking of all sorts of species created, remarks:-

"There were no pre-existing examples."

By this statement Abdullah may be refuting the underlying thesis of the Book of Creation²⁴ (Sefer Yetzirah) which

exemplifies Plato's Theory of Ideas. This theory states the relationship between Universals and Particulars; that there exists in heaven patterns of the things created on earth. The Babylonians also postulated an ideal counterpart on earth, so that Plato was not really the first to stress the affinity between the Noumenal and Phenominal. This theory is alluded to in the scriptural doctrine of the heavenly pattern shown to Moses on the Mount.²⁵ Traces of this doctrine can even be found in Talmudic literature. The Theory of Ideas became the starting point of Philo's philosophy.

Abdullah is aware of the two worlds for he writes (C.p.373):-

"The Lord of the great hand (power), the Creator of things in the invisible and visible worlds."

Ben Manir upholds also the Sam. position re. creation for he writes (C.p.385):-

"He created the creatures, causing them to rise up from non-existence."

Although the 14th cent. writers have clothed their thoughts in a new idiom they still maintain their belief in God as Creator, as indicated in the first hymn quoted by GUIL GESENIUS²⁶. It states:-

CREASTI SINE DEFATIGATIONE OPERA TUA EXCELSA,
ADDUXISTI EA E NIHILO INTRA SEX DIES; CREASTI
EA PERFECTA, NON EST IN UNICO EORUM DEFECTUS.

2. THE LOGOS

It is safe to affirm that the Sam. have a Logos doctrine, but it is never pushed to extreme limits. The spiritualization of the conception of God, together with the attempt to avoid anthropomorphic expressions, leads inevitably to periphrasis or circumlocution. One expression which gained acceptance was "the Word." This expression had already been in full use long before it found its way into theology. The Greek philosophers used it, but there is no direct evidence to show that the Hebrew and Christian theologians and translators borrowed from Greek philosophy. It is true that Heraclitus six centuries before Christ spoke of a Logos or principle of reason at work in the Universe. The Stoics in an attempt to bridge the gulf between the unseen (Platonic) world and the seen world of Man spoke of the eternal reason pervading the whole universe. They spoke of the Logos Endiathetos (reason in its inner potentiality) and the Logos Prophorikos (projected into the visible world). It seemed to Philo of Alexandria, who was an orthodox Jew as well as a Greek philosopher that the Logos offered a means of transition from Judaism to Greek thought. He came to regard the Logos as the means of divine activity. He looked upon it as the agent of God in creation. It became a kind of mediator between God and the created world. Basically it represented reason combined with divine energy

and activity. The Logos tended in time to possess an independent existence. Philo identified it with the "word" of God in the O.T. There are many references in the O.T. to God's "word." The created world is said in Genesis²⁷ to have come into existence with the Divine Fiat, "Let there be." The Targumim extended the idea of God's "word" and mention the Memra (word) as bringing the flood upon the earth, and the making of the covenant with Abraham. The "word" was thus the agency through which God acted upon the world of men. The writer of the Gospel of St. John²⁸ not only personifies the Logos, as Philo had done; he "personalizes" it. Philo²⁹ referred to the Logos as "the second God", and sometimes as the "son of God." "This conception of the Logos was totally alien to Judaism. The God of the Bible is a living God, not the impersonal being of Greek metaphysics."³⁰

Amram Darah (C.p.27) puts the Sam. point of view very clearly when he writes:-

"When Thy wisdom saw fit to create; Thy power brought together all things at Thy word."

One wonders whether Amram is resorting to polemics here for he makes a careful distinction between "wisdom" and "word", while "power" provides the motive force. On the other hand it could be stated that "wisdom" was the Logos Endiathetos, and the "word" Logos Prophorikos.

It seems likely that the Sam. had a Logos doctrine, if

the evidence from Marqah's hymn (C.p.21) is considered. This hymn (already referred to) has strands which could properly be called Gnostic. Reference is made to the "seen and the unseen world." It is recalled that the Stoics introduced the Logos to bridge the unseen (Platonic) world and the seen material world. This attitude was retained by those who followed, such as Philo. Marqah in this hymn refers to the Pleroma a principle found in the system of Valentinus. In the Ogdoad, a section of the Pleroma, come forth or emanates the aeons, one of which is the "word." In their scheme of redemption or salvation (an idea derived from the Christians) the Gnostics indicate that the spiritual ones return. Marqah writes (C.p.21):-

"Loftier than the world art Thou,
and all is beneath Thy hand,

Above and below art Thou, and
Thy dominion is over all,

From Thee cometh the world, and
to Thy hand it returns,

Redeemed by Thy Glory, with a word
from Thee.

Thy redemptions are many, necessary
for all who are in need,

Thy brightness flameth forth, with
a word from Thee."

The meaning of the word 'Millah' approximates to that found in the N.T. especially in the Gospel of St. John; that of the spoken word rather than the spoken word expressive of

thought. "Logos in the sense of "reason" does not occur anywhere in the N.T."³¹

Marqah also writes (C.p.22):-

"Thou sustaineth life, with a word from Thee."

This might well be a thought prompted by Marqah's knowledge of the Valentinian system, for from the aeons, "Life" and "Word" come the ten aeons, called the Decad.

Marqah however (C.p.72) changes the word from Millah to Memar, when he states:-

"He beareth the creation with His word."

This brings Marqah closer to the Targums which used the word Memra. Yet strangely enough in the same hymn (C.p.73) when Marqah writes:-

"Heaven and earth He raised up with His word,"

he reverts to the word "Millah."

In the 12th cent. Ab-Gelugah used "Memar" when he wrote (C.p.76):-

"I am that I am, who called all creatures,
and they came at His word."

It is when the 14th cent. is reached that definitive evidence is available regarding a Sam. doctrine of the Logos. Abdullah b. Solomon in the Sam. Feast of Hag Ha-Succoth has a hymn on the Birth of Moses (C.pp.746-753). A reading of this hymn leads to the conclusion that there is a very close connection between this hymn and the first eight chapters of the Gospel of St. John. An analytical comparison between

the hymn, and the Gospel, shows that Abdullah is ascribing to Moses that which the Gospel ascribes to Jesus Christ. As the Prologue is also made use of, the implication is that Abdullah looked upon Moses as being a kind of Logos. This matter will be dealt with more fully later in the section on Moses. Abdullah writes that Moses came to reveal the truth,

"according to the word of the Lord."

The word used here is Memra.

Where scripture speaks of a direct communication occurring from God to Man, the Targums substituted the Memra or the "word of God." "It is said that this phrase 'the word of the Lord' occurs 150 times in a single Targum of the Pentateuch."³² Philo identified the Logos with the Memra in the O.T. Dr. Isidore Epstein³³ however condemns Philo for conceiving of the Logos as "the second God." He adds that "Philo's conception of the Logos was totally alien to Judaism." An examination of Logos in the Prologue shows that the word owes more to Memra than to the Nous of Philosophy. It is not so much "reason" (ratio) as the uttered word of God. It could be argued that as it is the "word" that God communicates with Man, so the writer of the Prologue is indebted more to the Hebrew conception of the Memra than to the Philonic conception of the Logos. There is no mention of Logos in St. John's Gospel, except in the

Prologue. In the Hymn on the Birth of Moses (C.pp.746-753) the "word" is used a number of times. For example:-

1. "He spoke the word."
2. "According to the word of the Lord."
3. "The word of living truth" (twice).
4. "His word" (i.e. of Moses).
5. "The word was renewed."
6. "His word went forth."
7. "The word of the Lord."

Such repetition of the "word" would suggest that Abdullah in the 14th cent. upholds a Logos doctrine. If he had the Gospel of St. John (including the Prologue) before him, and the evidence appears to be strong, then he by comparing Moses with Jesus Christ, is conceivably thinking of Moses as the Logos.

The Valentinian Gnostics held the Gospel of St. John in high esteem. It would also appear likely that Abdullah b. Solomon read, or was aware of, the Gospel. If this argument can be sustained, then this Gospel also forms part of the ideological background of 14th cent. Samaritanism.

In attempting to assess the strength of the Logos doctrine in the Sam. religion the influence of Islam must not be overlooked. Islam in those days was a virile religion, as it also is to-day in Africa, and the Sam. must have taken cognizance of a religion professed by a supreme power. Islam had its mystical side known as Sufism.

Gesenius³⁴ says of Hymn No.11 that it breathes either Gnosis

or a certain Sufism. He goes on to say that from this hymn much of this secret teaching was not strange to the Sam., and that there were those among them, who had been initiated into the mysteries as "Perfect" (Teleious), and "Spiritual" (Pneumatikous) or having knowledge (Gnostikous). In the 13th cent. in the Sufi writings appeared a doctrine of the "idea of Muhammad." This is nothing more or less than the Logos doctrine developed by Ibn 'Arabi (1165-1240). Guillaume³⁵ writing about the Logos doctrine of Ibn 'Arabi says:-

"The idea or reality of Muhammad, he says, is the creative, animating, and rational principle of the universe, the first intellect; he is the reality of realities whose manifestation is in the perfect man. Every prophet is a Logos whose individual Logoi are united in the idea of Muhammad. The perfect man is he in whom all the attributes of the macrocosm are reflected. The reality of Muhammad is the creative principle of the universe, and the perfect man is its cause."

Ibn 'Arabi³⁶ refers to Muhammad as the seal of the prophets; an attribute which the Sam. ascribe to Moses. Montgomery³⁷ points out that the Sam. have a doctrine concerning the pre-existence of Moses. He does not state whether, in using this theologumenon, they were influenced by the Christians or Muslims. He does however say,³⁸ when alluding to Moses as a "drop of light", that:-

"This doctrine is nothing else than a replica of the Islamic legend of "the Light of Mohammed'."

It can safely be assumed that the prevailing Jewish,

Christian and Islamic opinions about the Logos, however diverse they may have been in interpretation, would impress the Sam. and lead them, perhaps not knowingly, to give a re-interpretation, and fresh emphasis, to the already high status they conceived Moses to hold. Human intercessors, like Moses, tend over the cent., by virtue of their function and office, to be thought of more in a godward sense than a human. Such intercessors are in time, through the medium of legend, if not factually, endowed with divinity. Having been so invested, at the same time that the concept of God has become completely spiritualized, a Logos doctrine becomes imminent. The writer of the Johannine Gospel in speaking of the Logos, was certainly thinking of the Creation story in Genesis i. The Sam. of the 14th cent. would also commit themselves to saying; "In the beginning was the Logos"; for them, Moses.

In spite of the attractiveness of attempting to unfold and uphold a Logos doctrine in Sam. literature, the opinion of Bowman³⁹ has to be kept in mind. He writes:-

"Turning now to John (i.e. the Gospel) we note the emphasis on the Word, but must admit that there is no developed Logos doctrine in Samaritan Theology."

3. REVELATION

The Pentateuch affords testamentary evidence that God revealed Himself to the Patriarchs of Israel, and in

particular to His chosen servant Moses. Moses was the first to recognize in Yahweh the national God in whom his people might be united and redeemed. Moses was instructed to go to Pharoah and say, "The Lord, the God of the Hebrews, has met with us."⁴⁰ God had already appeared to Moses and told him that "I am Yahweh"⁴¹ and "by my name Yahweh I was not known to them"⁴² (i.e. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob). But He had already revealed Himself to them as "EL SHADDAI"⁴³. God had also revealed Himself to Moses as "I am that I am"; "This is my name for ever."⁴⁴ The Sam. like the Jews never doubt that God revealed Himself historically to the Patriarchs, and this revelation is a necessary sine qua non of Sam. belief.

What has to be ascertained is whether in handling this historical material the Sam. writers tend to accentuate certain aspects of revelation in keeping with their peculiar viewpoint.

4. THE NAME

In the Defter there are over one-hundred-and-fifty ascriptions which are attributes and epithets of God, and might be regarded as names. So varied and exhaustive is the list that one might conclude that the Sam. are anxious not to exclude any name that might be applicable to God. They did not want the charge of Agnostō Theō⁴⁵ laid at their

door. But there are also references to "the Name." The most familiar expression in the Defter is (C.p.27):-

"For Thy Name is The Merciful,"

or (C.p.18):-

"Merciful One is Thy Name."

But there is a tendency to make reference only to "the Name." e.g., (C.p.20):-

"Thy Name, O God, beareth all that is above and below",

(C.p.25):-

"For although Thy Name is remembered, yet none can describe Thee."

Marqah (C.p.50) in writing:-

"Let mouths be purified when they come to make mention of the Name from whence came forth the world",

by removing adjectives, and adjectival clauses, and leaving only the Name began a fashion that was to be followed in later cent. The reason for this might be found in the consonants for "The Name" and "Moses" being the same, though in different order. In the Defter, Eleazar b. Phinehas (1363-1387) writes (C.p.32):-

"Glorious is the prophet, garbed, with the name of Thy divinity."

As the 14th cent. writers thought in terms of a pre-existent Moses, the simple epithet "The Name" would tend to gain currency in the minds of men, while Moses also would tend to achieve higher status by the very fact that

the consonants of his name could form "The Name."

As the Sam., Jew and Christian made much of "the Name", it may however be that "the Name", by not being a particular name of personal significance, but more general in its abstractness, comes closer to that concept of God, which is, of its essential nature, discrete. It might be regarded as further evidence in the anti-anthropomorphic trend in religion. By its abstractness "the Name" could imply much without being committal. It is neither positive nor negative as a descriptive attribute, but neutral, in that it says little but implies much.

Dr. W.J. Martin⁴⁶ writes:-

"It might have been possible, of course, to have denied the implications by drawing attention to the full sense of the Hebrew word for 'name.' The field of meaning of this word covers not only that of 'name', that is a verbal deputy, a label for a thing, but also denotes the attributes of the thing named. It may stand for reputation, character, honour, name and fame. Hence the reference would not be so much to nomenclature as to the nature of the reality for which the name stood. To bring out the full meaning in English one would then have to use some such phrase as 'glorious name.'"

Ben Manir (C.p.644) in attempting to give a definition of God and of His attributes and epithets can, on occasion

be rather vague in his allusions. Indeed some of his hymns contain obscure allusions, and references bordering on the mystical. Dr. J. Macdonald⁴⁷ has indicated how difficult these hymns are to translate. The difficulty is still there when an exegesis is attempted. For example Ben Manir writes (C.p.644):-

"The Lord! No name is His measure
as in the case of a number!
His name is great, for its lot
cannot be interpreted in a book."

It is of interest to discover that the writings of Ben Manir attain a clearer perspective if consideration is given to 'The Guide to the Perplexed' (Moreh Nebuchim) by Moses Maimonides (1135-1204). Indeed by bearing Maimonides in mind it is possible to attempt an exegesis of some of the obscurer passages in Ben Manir. Did Ben Manir have 'The Guide to the Perplexed' in mind when he wrote:-

"For its lot cannot be interpreted in a book." ?
That Ben Manir knew the work of Maimonides, a hypothesis suggested here, is also sustained by a visiting professor to Leeds U., Dr. T.H.Gaster, who in conversation alluded to the possibility. Maimonides⁴⁸ had written:-

"Know that the negative attributes of
God are the true attributes",
and that incorporeal bodies cannot be numbered.⁴⁹ Maimonides gives full consideration to the tetragrammaton, calling it "The nomen proprium", and the "shem ha-meforash." He states

that the name (Y - H - W - H) may have conveyed the meaning of "Absolute existence."⁵⁰

So that Ben Manir (C.p.644) when stating that "No name is His measure", has in mind that God is spiritual and absolute. "The Lord" is His name, yet in a sense the negative "No name" is a correct criterion or measure. Ben Manir would therefore agree with Maimonides (and Aristotle) that "number" implies corporate existence.

To read Maimonides in conjunction with Ben Manir helps to elucidate some of the vague allusions in the hymns of Ben Manir, and to bring in light where before darkness prevailed. His compositions appear to be deliberately obscure, and it would seem that he intended his mysterious allusions only for the enlightened of his Faith. One has to be a Sam. "Gnostic", and to be illumined with light - MANIR means "Enlightening" - to understand. Although he is not a Gnostic, he tends to follow the Gnostic pattern of mystical intuition, including at times, cabbalistic concepts. Jewish mysticism (Kabbalah) came to full fruition in the 12th - 13th cent. in Europe, and made a deep impact over a wide area.

It was against this kind of general background that Ben Manir operated. However orthodox a person may be, he cannot but be aware of his environment. Indeed quite often a person can only be understood by a knowledge of his

ideological background. Heredity and Environment are two factors which are complementary and both help to condition the living organism. Acquired characteristics are as prominent a feature of an individual as are the hereditary ones.

Abisha b. Phinehas in a MALIFUT (C.p.489) shows how important "the Name" is in his thinking. He is being consistently orthodox when he refers to "the Mighty Name"; "By His Name He will bless us", and "by His great and Holy Name He will look down upon us from His dwelling." In the first of the three hymns of Abisha in the Atonement Hymnal (C.p.494) he makes a peculiar reference to:-

"The Great Name of the Name."

Here the tendency would seem to be giving to "the Name" the same significance as to proper names such as Yahweh and I am that I am. This supports the observation made by Martin.⁵¹

Abdullah b. Solomon in his hymn entitled "The Piece of Lane" (C.p.641) refers to "the exalted Name" of God.

That the three 14th cent. writers use "the Name" in preference to "Yahweh", may be to avoid repetition and monotony. It may well be, however, that it is further evidence to show how revered "the Name" was; that not only was it voiced but once a year in the Holy of Holies, but that there was a careful observation in writing it.

5. THE VOICE

This is another anti-anthropomorphic expression where the stress is on the physiological rather than the anatomical. God revealed Himself to men and in doing so spoke to them. He used His voice, and spoke words (or word), and through the medium of the voice He revealed His name to Moses as Yahweh. The "voice of the Lord"⁵² came to be as meaningful to the Israelites as did the "word of the Lord."⁵³ The "word", the "voice" and the "name" in time gained prestige so that, instead of being in the construct state, they were placed in the absolute state from the point of view of syntax. This change of status may not have been deliberate. Nevertheless it does indicate a psychological change that cannot be completely disregarded. Yet the Defter does not allude to the "Voice" in the absolute state in spite of there being a precedent in the M.T.⁵⁴ The cent. succeeding the 4th saw the Sam. using the absolute state more often so that the "name", the "voice" and the "word" came to exist in their own right. Both the "voice" and the "name" became an ellipsis for God.

In this matter however no conscious evolution is to be observed. The situation is clearly focussed in a hymn of Ben Manir (C.p.650). He writes:-

"For they heard the voice of the Lord and the voice of Moses, As though it were a man speaking with his companion but without using tongue and mouth."

The use here, once again, of the via negativa recalls to mind the Gnostic Basilides⁵⁵ who said of God:-

"God is impersonal: He can only be defined in negative terms; He is "the God who is not'."

An interesting note is afforded by Dr. F.R.Tennant⁵⁶ :-

"The via negativa is the abstractive method of reaching the concept of God. It negatives all positive characterisations supplied by human analogies, and has aptly been described as the deification of the word 'not'. Everything that can be affirmed of the finite, must be denied of the Infinite One. Basilides, the Gnostic, is said to have taught that we must not even call God ineffable, since that is to make an assertion about Him. Inherited by some early Christian Fathers from Philo, this method led them as philosophers, to describe an Absolute, indeterminate as is pure being; while, as theologians, they of course spoke of God as if He were a personal Spirit."

An analysis of this hymn (C.p.650) shows that Ben Manir uses "The Voice of the Lord", nine times, and "The Voice" twelve times. Is it safe to affirm that he is, in this hymn, caught between two opinions, between Scylla and Charybdis?

It seems therefore, on balance, that he has a penchant

to refer to "The Voice." It could be that he is influenced by ancient tradition dealt with by Maimonides,⁵⁷ when he makes reference to the Bath-kol. Therefore it is noteworthy to observe the process, which may be considered as metaphysical or "paraphysical", whereby crude anthropomorphism is rejected, as illustrated by "The Voice in the wind" (C.p.650).

Ben Manir (C.p.650) refers to:-

"The Voice from the six corners" (six directions). Prof. T.H.Gaster said, in conversation, that he had never been able to discover the exact meaning of "the six directions" (i.e. six corners). The six days of creation appear to be excluded, although God spoke at the beginning of every fresh day of creation, and His voice was heard. The six corners do not appear to be the six points of the compass - four yes, but six, no! Marqah (C.p.21) makes reference to "four corners" when he writes:-

"The whole world rejoices in the hearing
of Thy praise, All the four corners (quarters)
of the world tremble at Thy might."

It may be that there is an allusion to North, South, East and West. The Hebrews expressed the East, West, North and South by words which signified, before, behind, left, and right according to the position of a man with his face turned towards the East. To compass the universe he only had to think of above and below. It so happens that "above

and below" is a cliche beloved of Marqah. He uses it more than any other writer in the Deftar (cf. C.pp. 16,18,10,21, 22, 25, 26). Many Sam. writers from Marqah onwards made considerable use of the expression. "The six directions" (or corners) would then be used to embrace the whole universe in that it accounts for length, breadth, and depth. "The Voice from the six corners" was, in effect, a voice that could not be located, which is in accord with Ben Manir's remark in another hymn (C.p.644):-

"He has no place."

In an Eqr'u (C.p.678) speaking of God he writes:-

"Thou hearest from the six corners."

A reference to "the six sides" is to be found in the Masnavi⁵⁸ where it is stated:-

"Enlighten the world's six sides with its six parts" (i.e. referring to the Masnavi);

also⁵⁹ :-

"Love has naught to do with five senses or six sides."

Referring to God, the Masnavi⁶⁰ states:-

"I am not contained in earth or sky, or even in the highest heaven."

It is likely that Ben Manir was not unaware of the writings of Jalal Addin (Born at Balkh in 1207) for he uses a number of expressions and ideas found in the Masnavi. This however does not prove anything. Yet such was the

mysticism of the Sufists, that they would not demur from much of what Ben Manir wrote. In the Carmina Samaritana, Gesenius says of Hymn No. eleven that it is of the nature of philosophy and breathes either Gnosis or a certain Sufism. This hymn may not be Ben Manir's, but it is Sam. and points in the direction from which he may have derived some inspiration. At least it would not be impossible to show that Sufism or its tenets could quite conceivably form part of the ideological background of 14th cent. Samaritanism.

Abdullah b. Solomon (or Mattanah ha-mizri; C.p.401) writes:-

"It was a voice proclaiming from every side, its words being gathered together from Everlasting Life."

Everlasting Life is a periphrasis for God, and is first mentioned by Marqah in the Defter. The remarkable feature is that of all the 4th cent. writers he is the only one in the Defter to use the expression (C.pp.20, 25, 26). It is used as a contrast in describing His kind of life as compared with that of mortals. For example (C.p.26):-

"Everlasting Life is His, and all other life He maketh perish,"

or in a sentence where the periphrasis is clear (C.p.51):-

"Let us praise the scriptures, gleaned from Everlasting Life."

The words of Abdullah suggest that "the voice" is on

the way almost to becoming a distinct hypostasis, gathering its words from Everlasting Life, a periphrasis for God. This might be a warrantable conclusion drawn from the words as written by Abdullah, but he, like all Sam. writers, never for one moment deviates from the concept of the Oneness of God. That the voice is from God is borne out when Abdullah says (C.p.413):-

"Behold said the Voice, my angel shall go before thee to make thee great, and to reveal the secrets unto thee."

Where the 4th cent. Sam. writers did not allude to God as the "Voice", the 14th cent. Sam. writers now accept it as quite a legitimate synonym for God.

6. LIGHT

It has always been understood by believers in God that as He in the beginning of things said, "Let there be light",⁶¹ there must be a very close connection between God and light. Light also is a word that can have a dual meaning. It can be physical light - without which there can be no life on the earth - and also connote intelligence. There is also a close affinity of light with life. There is no surprise to find that God is referred to as light in the Defter. Indeed in a hymn (C.p.20) which could, in part, receive a Gnostic interpretation Marqah writes:-

"O light, whose brightness is the
fulness of the world,
O light, all lights are derived from
Thy Goodness."

Surely this could be regarded as a retort to the Gnostic system of Valentinus,⁶² who posited that thirty aeons constituted the "Fulness" or Pleroma. He points out that all lights, whatever that may imply, are derived from, or emanate from God. He is the source of all light. He, God, designated as the light (C.p.52) hands over the sacred book, referred to as "the everlasting truth." The writer, probably Marqah, infers that the scriptures come forth or emanate from God. An unknown writer (C.p.56) states that

"The prophet (i.e. Moses) was crowned
with light, which was the fulness of
receiving thee."

Here again the theme is emanation, with the scriptures coming forth from God to Moses. If the idea of emanation is sustained because of the keyword "fulness" then the words referred to above (C.p.52) become more meaningful. The complete text is:-

"We know that thou art everlasting truth
(i.e. The sacred book) which the Light
(i.e. God) handed over; it teacheth us
His wisdom."

In the Pleroma of Valentinus Sophia (Wisdom) was the lowest aeon; Truth also was another aeon. Everlasting Truth is emphasized as being much more than the ordinary aeon "truth" in the Pleroma.

Marqah completes the picture when he states (C.p.61):-

"The great and lofty light stretched forth
a torch of light to the prophet garbed with
a ray of light, when he came down bearing
the tablets, written by the finger of God,
by the right hand of God, a consuming fire",

using the words Nehirah, Esh, and Urah.

There is no direct reference to God as Light in the Pentateuch, so that it would seem likely that Marqah was influenced by other sources. In the Gnostic system of Valentinus the Pleroma was full of light, whereas outside of it was darkness.

In the primitive religious system of the Mandaeans God was referred to as the King of Light. These people are reputed to have had associations with John the Baptist, "who was not the light but came to bear witness to the light."⁶³ They believed that the absolute source of all was light, and that the earth lies solid in the black water.⁶⁴ The Mandaeans believed in an original world of light. Light dwells in the Supreme Deity. The soul liberated from the body is borne upwards to the world of light, and of the Great Life. The origin of the Mandaean doctrine of light is to be sought in the Northern part of Palestine.

In the second prayer of Eleazar b. Phinehas (1363-1387; C.p.36) a new epithet of God is introduced, referring to Him as "The God of Light", who brought all things to pass with His "Wisdom, with the fulness of knowledge", a typical

Gnostic echo. He writes in extenso:-

"Ascribe ye greatness to His divinity,
whose word is above and below,
Who is like Him among the might,
The God of Light who spreadeth forth darkness."

Which recalls to mind the opening verse of I John⁶⁵ where
"the word" is mentioned along with the statement that "God
is light, and in him is no darkness at all."⁶⁶(i.5).

Ben Manir (C.p.385) writes that God had

"endued him (i.e. Moses) with His light"

and:-

"He brought the law to illuminate our hearts",
which is really a paraphrase of what Marqah had stated
originally (cf. above; C.p.61).

Ben Manir (C.p.650) states that when Moses came down
from Mount Sinai,

"The Image was clothed with light."

As the 14th cent. writers associate Moses with light, this
matter will be dealt with more fully in the chapter on Moses.
Scripture records⁶⁷ that after Moses had been with God "the
skin of his face shone", and the people were afraid of
coming too near Moses. Manir's statement is much more
subtle, and borders on the metaphysical. Ben Manir writes
(C.p.630):-

" - And the Image (Zelem) was clothed
with light,
And the form of the tabernacle was in
his heart."

That "image" and "form" should be closely associated is interesting in the light of the evidence that Maimonides⁶⁸ refers to them in the same context, when he states:-

"The term Zelem, on the other hand, signifies the specific form, viz., that which constitutes the essence of a thing, whereby the thing is what it is: the reality of a thing in so far as it is that particular thing. In man the 'form' is that constituent which gives him human perception."

If Manir had read Maimonides the problem is solved, for the latter considers, at length, in his book, the "form" and the "substance", as they are fully expounded by Aristotle. In the LXX⁶⁹ the Greek equivalent of Zelem is Eikona (ACC.), Eikona is the very word used in Hebrews⁷⁰; although in another place in Hebrews⁷¹ the Greek word for image is Character. By a coincidence Eikona⁷² is associated with the Law of Moses. In Ben Manir (C.p.650) the mention of Zelem is closely connected with Moses receiving the two tablets of the Law. Manir's composition was written for The Day of Atonement (Yom Ha-Kippur). So also the Epistle to the Hebrews in general, and Chapter X in particular, have The Day of Atonement for the theme.

The great religious systems of the world lay especial emphasis on the concept of light, and it would be difficult to trace it back to the time of its initial appearance.

Scientifically it is known that without light there would be no life in the world. Indeed the latest scientific thesis is that life occurs on the face of the earth due to radiation. The writer of Genesis⁷³ makes the first great utterance of God to be:-

"Let there be light."

From the great benefits accruing from physical light men have been led to postulate its significance in other realms, and to use it metaphorically. In the Christian religion Jesus Christ is known as "The Light of the World."⁷⁴ The 14th cent. Sam. writers began to refer to Moses as "The Light of the World", (C.pp.746; 768). In the 4th cent. Marqah (C.p.20) had referred to God as:-

"O Light, whose brightness fills the world,
O Light, all lights are derived from Thy
goodness."

It is in the 14th cent. that Abdullah b. Solomon and others refer to Moses as

"The drop of Light"

(C.pp. 746; 768).

A drop of light, passing from generation to generation (distillation to distillation) was placed within Jochebed⁷⁵. Montgomery⁷⁶ states that:-

"This doctrine is nothing else than a replica of the Islamic legend of the 'Light of Mohammed.' It is in accordance with this notion that Moses is called, in

Christian terms, 'Light from Light.' " It may be hard to prove that in this matter of the drop of light, the Sam. borrowed from Islam, although the Defter does not allude to the concept. It must not be overlooked that the ideological background for this concept may be found in Gnosticism where emanations formed an integral part of its teaching.

The concept of light receives its sanction as much from the Hebrew as from Hellenistic sources. From the Hebrew side light tends to have a moral content. Indeed "the basis of the Johannine conception of light is Jewish."⁷⁷ So also with the Sam. Light for them leads on to illumination. Turning to Hellenistic religion the conception of light is semi-physical, and has its basis rather in knowledge than that of a moral content. Philo when thinking of the Divine Light laid stress on its moral content. In rabbinical thought, following on after the Johannine Gospel, God Himself was spoken of as "The Light of the World", which indicates the kind of divine context, in which both Jesus Christ and Moses were held; the former by the Christians, and the latter by the Sam. The Sam. utilize the concept of light both in a literal and metaphorical sense, but eventually the latter predominates in a guise both spiritual and moral, rather than intellectual. The light of Knowledge (Gnosis) associated with the Hermetic

and Mystery religions, is not an obvious trait among the Sam.

M.M.⁷⁸ makes mention of "seven special things in the world which the True One chose and set apart as divine." Of these,

"The Light is from the fire, for fire is the origin by which everything is controlled and made to exist."

A.D. Crown⁷⁹ states that Creation was an emanation of the Divine Will, which was wrought for the seven things which pre-existed; Light, The Sabbath, Mount Gerizim, Adam, The Two Tablets of Stone, The Great Prophet Moses, and Israel. His sequence is identical with that of the recently translated M.M. It is likely that "the seven things which pre-existed" (emanations or aeons?) may have been conceived on the basis of the Gnostic system of Valentinus, perhaps rather loosely, but in close proximity, such as on the following suggested plan.

MEMAR MARQAH	VALENTINUS
Adam	Man
Israel	Church
The Two Tablets	Truth (i.e. Torah)
Light	Life
Moses	Word
Sabbath	Silence (Rest?)
Mount Gerizim	

The above hypothesis may not be beyond a possible acceptance, for even the Johannine Prologue is enhanced in meaning, if the Gnostic system of Valentinus is kept in mind;

a Prologue which not only mentions Light, but also Moses."

The Sam. would concur with the writer of I John⁸⁰
that "God is Light, and in Him is no darkness at all."

(C) MANIFESTATION OF GOD
IN THE WORLD

1. I N N A T U R E

N O T E S

N O T E S

1. IN NATURE

1. Gen. i, 1.
2. St. John i, 1.
3. Gen. i, 1 and Gen. ii, 4.
4. Gen. i, 31.
5. Gen. i, 2.
6. Joad. C.E.M. op.cit. pp. 162-163.
7. Brown. S. op.cit. p. 316.
8. Baynes. Charlotte Augusta, A Coptic Gnostic Treatise contained in the Codex Brucianus. Cambridge, 1933.
ibid. p.4.
9. Fitzgerald. Edward. The Rubaiyat, and Salaman and Absal. London.
10. cf. Isa. xxix, 16.
11. Friedlander. M.
12. cf. II Peter. iii, 10,12.
13. cf. Heb. V. 12; Col.ii, 8,20; Gal.iv, 3,9.
14. Whinfield.E.H. Jalaladdin; Masnavi.
ibid. p.162.
15. ibid. p.188.
16. cf. Gen. xlvi, 15-16.
17. Sam. Pentateuch. Gen. i, 26.
18. Wilson. R. McL. The Gnostic Problem. London.
19. Grant. R.M. Gnosticism and Early Christianity.
20. cf. Hastings. J. (Ed.). Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edinburgh, 1920.
ibid. Vol. viii, pp.380 - 393;
Art: Mandaean.
21. Epstein, Isidore, op.cit. p.227.
22. ibid. p.232
23. Gaster. M. The Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions. Vol. I, p.134; The Hilluk.
24. Epstein, Isidore, op.cit. p.228.
25. cf. Ex. xxv, 9,40; xxvi, 30; Num. viii, 4.

26. Gesenius. Guil. Carmina Samaritana E Codicibus Londinensibus Et Gothanis. Leipsig, 1824.

2. THE LOGOS

27. Gen. 1, 3,6,14.
28. St. John i, 1.
29. Epstein, Isidore, op.cit. p.197.
30. ibid. p.198
Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges.
31. St. John, p. 62.
32. ibid. p. 63
33. Epstein, Isidore, op.cit. pp.197-198
34. Gesenius, Guil. Carmina Samaritana.
Guillaume, Alfred, Islam. Pelican Book, A.311.
35. ibid. p. 149.
36. ditto
37. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.227
38. ibid. p.228
39. Bowman, J. B.J.R.L. Spring, 1958.
Art: The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans.
Vol. 40, p.298 f.
ibid. p.305.

3. REVELATION

40. Ex. iii, 18.
41. Ex. vi, 2-3.
42. ditto
43. ditto
44. Ex. iii, 14-15.

4. THE NAME

45. cf. Acts, xvii, 23.
46. Martin, W.J. Stylistic Criteria and the Analysis of the Pentateuch. London, 1955.
ibid. pp. 17-18.

47. Macdonald, J. Dissertation, Leeds, 1958.
48. Friedlander, M. op.cit. pp. 81-82.
49. ibid. pp. 146-147
50. ibid. p. 90
51. Martin, W.J. op.cit. pp.17-18

5. THE VOICE

52. cf. Deut. xxx, 8.
53. cf. Ex. ix, 20.
54. Ex. xix, 19.
55. Whitham, A.R. op.cit. p.106
56. Tennant, F.R. Philosophical Theology.
ibid. p.313
57. Friedlander, M. op.cit. p.238
58. Whinfield, E.H. op.cit. p.274
59. ditto
60. ibid. p.40.

6. LIGHT

61. Gen. i, 3.
62. Whitham, A.R. op.cit. p.108
63. St. John i, 8.
64. cf. Hastings. J. (Ed.) op.cit. pp.380 - 393.
65. I John, i, 1-6.
66. ditto i, 5.
67. Ex. xxxiv, 30.
68. Friedlander, M. op.cit. p.13
69. Gen. i, 26.
70. Heb. x, 1.
71. Heb. i, 3.
72. Heb. x, 1.
73. Gen. i, 3.
74. St. John viii, 12; cf. Legends of the Jews, Vol.V,
p. 397.

75. Montgomery. J.A. op.cit. p.228
76. ditto
77. Strachan, R.H. The Fourth Gospel. London, 1941.
ibid. p.205.
78. M.M. Book ii, Par.10.
79. Crown.A.D. Dissertation, Leeds, 1958.
ibid. p.185
80. I John, i,5.

2. I N M A N

2. MAN

The object of this chapter is to discover what the Sam. concept of Man was, to collect the data, and interpret the evidence afforded by the Defter and later Sam. sources, and to see how God manifested Himself to Man; in so doing to ascertain what ideas the Sam. had about the psychology of human personality. It has never been suggested that the Sam. had any formulated statement of belief on the matter. The information has to be garnered from different sources, and then sifted. As the underlying theme is that there is the unique activity of divine purpose exemplified in the universe, it is an a priori assumption that God manifests Himself to men. It has to be discovered whether the Sam. concept of Man is such that it warrants a belief in the Hereafter, or whether Man is but "transient dust", and having no more value than dust.

The Defter never deviates from the concept that Man was created by God. Marqah states (C.p.72):-

"We are called His works",

and Amram Darah (C.p.31) adds:-

"Thou didst make them perfect, there was no defect in one of them:
Thou didst make known their perfection, for
Thou art the Lord of perfection."

Yet Man is held to be dust for Marqah states (C.p.24):-

(Man is) "A created thing of dust, and all else
was created because of him,
All that comes from Adam, must serve Thee."

Philo, the Gnostic Justin, and the Valentinians all emphasize that Adam was made from the best and finest kind of dust. Montgomery¹ says, Adam was "created out of the dust of Mount Safra" - another name for Mt. Gerizim. The impermanence of life is stressed by Marqah when he refers to Man (C.p.25) as "Transient mouths", and also stating (C.p.26) :-

"We are transient mortals, and our duty is to praise Him."

There is no suggestion in the Defter about Man possessing eternal life. Indeed the eternity of God is often compared with the frailty of Man. As Marqah puts it (C.p.26):-

"Eternal life is His, and all other life He maketh perish."

The prevailing atmosphere is that death is the inevitable conclusion for men. Indeed neither Marqah nor Amram Darah ever speculated upon Sheol. There is a marked conspiracy of silence.

1. DICHOTOMY OR TRICHOTOMY ?

But the question to be asked is, what is it that lives and dies? The Defter considers Man to be composed of body and soul. Soul is referred to by the Hebrew word Nephesh. The word used for body varies. All writers use the word Besrah, and Amram Darah frequently uses the word

Gawiyvah (C.p.30).

The hymn of Ab-Hisdah (ABUL-HASAN of TYRE; 11th cent. C.p.70) is of great interest for there is mentioned "our bodies" (Gawiyva); "our souls" (Nephesh); and "our spirits" (Ruah). Amram the H.P. (1255-1269; C.p.30) also mentions "our souls" (Nephesh) in the same hymn as "King of our spirits" (Ruah). In Ab-Hisdah's hymn (C.p.70) it is possible to see that "spirit" can be equated with "soul" for he writes:-

(1) "Before Thee we subdue our spirits,
Ourselves we benefit,
When we fulfil Thine ordinance."

and (2) "Our souls are at rest,
When we fulfil Thine ordinances."

The Defter then, as an ideological background of later Samaritanism, subscribes to a dichotomy. The Sam. concept of personality is akin to that of the Hebrew in the O.T. "The Hebrew idea of personality is that of an animated body, not (like the Greek) that of an incarnated soul."²

Unlike the Gnostics, the Sam. never conceived of matter as evil. He never accepted a belief in a dualism of matter and spirit. All that God created was good. He never conceived of the soul (or spirit) of Man being continually at war with the body or flesh, as for example St. Paul did. Neither did the 4th cent. Sam. believe in the Orphic sōma-sēma concept. For the Sam. the body was not a tomb or

prison of the soul. The body and soul were complementary. Without the soul (or spirit) the body was dead. Philo held that the soul was composed of two parts, a rational and an irrational. He would ascribe evil to the irrational part (i.e. The Yetzer Harah).

The question to be asked is, did the Sam. in later cent., especially in the 14th cent., come to regard the soul as tripartite? Do the Sam. come to prefer a trichotomy to a dichotomy? The evidence to be assessed comes mainly from Ben Manir. He writes (C.p.179):-

"Those who have not seen the Garden of Eden, shall see this night of Passover, a light, which comes forth from Eden, shines upon it, and the tree of life, abides in it."

"A light which comes forth (emanates) from Eden" is suggestive of the Zohar, a writing ascribed to Moses de Leon (D.1305), in which it states that after death that part of the soul called "the Ruah enters Eden, where it dons the body it tenanted in the world, so that it may enjoy the lights of Paradise."³ Ben Manir ends his Shebua by referring to Moses as the "choicest of all souls," (Neshamah). This is the highest part of the soul as conceived in the Zohar. The Zohar divides the soul into three elements; the Neshamah (Super-soul); the Ruah (Spirit); and the Nephesh (Vitality). It is the Neshamah that "receives the 'kiss of love' from the Infinite, and returns to the source, whence it emanates, there to live

for ever in the pure sparkling reflection of the Divine Light."⁴ It would seem that Ben Manir agrees with the Zohar on this point; Moses is the choicest of all Neshamah, namely the highest part or element of the soul. These writers of the Middle Ages appear to have anticipated Freud, for he divided the Psyche into three parts; the Super-Ego, the Ego and the Id. In the N.T. there are three terms employed to denote the "breath-soul", namely, Neshamah, Nephesh and Ruah. Neshamah only occurs twenty-four times in the O.T. In less than twelve cases does the word approximate to the meaning suggested by Nephesh. "This usage does not appear before the Deuteronomistic School of writers."⁵ In the Hebrew Bible Nephesh occurs 754 times; Ruah is found 378 times. In Gen. ii, 7, mention is made of "Breath of Life" (Neshamah), and "A living soul" (Nephesh), whereas in Gen. vii, 15 "Breath of Life" is equated by Ruah. Ben Manir (C.p.184) uses Ruah for "spirit", at the same time making use of Nephesh for "soul" (C.p.178). It could be that in using Neshamah in connection with Moses, he was aware of the graduated distinctions of the soul made by the writer of the Zohar.

In the Hymn of Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.490) there is an interesting extension of the Sam. creed. He writes:-

"So that they will not hear a word about my faith in Thee, O Lord, and in Moses, and the Law, and in Mount Gerizim, Beth El, near the Oak of Moreh; and in the Day of Vengeance and Recompense, and in the hour in which flees the spirit from this body, from this world to the next."

In this Hymn mention is made of body, soul and spirit, whereas the 4th cent. writers usually spoke only of body and soul. If Abdullah actually believes that the spirit does "flee" from the body, then Abdullah could be influenced by those who uphold a kind of sōma sēma doctrine. The Persian Jallaladdin (1207-1273) in the Masnavi speaks of that which "steals away our souls from the prison-house of earth."⁶ He also asks, "With what object are souls imprisoned in the bonds of flesh and blood?"⁷

Another Persian writer Omar Khayyam (C.1071-1123) also upholds a dualism of flesh versus spirit. Jami (B.1414) a Sufi poet of Persia dwelt upon the same subject when he composed a poem called "Salaman and Absal."⁸ The poem has to do with the union of Salaman (Soul) with Absal (Body). It would seem that the age-old problem of the relationship of the body to the soul was a recurring theme in the minds of poets and theologians of the 12th-14th cent. It is a problem that has to be faced by those who are mystically inclined.

Abisha b. Phinehas also falls into line with his two 14th cent. colleagues, for in a hymn of Praise (C.p.241) he

makes reference to Neshamah, Nephesh and Ruah.

An assessment of the evidence shows that the 4th cent. writers normally accepted a simple dichotomy of body and soul. In the Defter Ab-Hisdah (11th cent.) mentions spirit, supported by Amram the H.P. (13th cent.). The 14th cent. writers resort to a tripartite analysis or division of the "Breath-Soul." So that in Sam. philosophy it is possible to see, if no more, a reflection of two ancient schools of thought. Plato advanced beyond Socrates in his psychological analysis of the soul and arrived at a three-fold division. These he referred to as Nous or Logistikon, Thumoeides and Epithumetikon.⁹ This triple division of the soul was accepted by the school of Alexandria, whose debt to Plato cannot be denied. The Stoics on the other hand rejected Plato's analysis of the soul. They preferred a straightforward dichotomy of body and soul.

It may well be that no assessment of this matter in the 14th cent. is valid; that the terms referring to the soul and spirit were used in the general and matter-of-fact way, without dogmatism. It might however be that the use of the terms affords evidence of a new school of Sam. thought superceding earlier opinions. The 14th cent. writers were influenced by Damascus, where not only Maimonides had made an impact, but also where Greek philosophy was in evidence.

Has a different complexion been put on the situation of

what M.M. now reveals? When God speaks to Moses He asks:-¹⁰

"Who has created the body and its structure;
and enclosed the spirit within it?
Who has founded the intellect with spirit?
Who has made the soul along with the heart?"

It is possible that a dichotomy is still in evidence here for the body is created and the soul made, but not the spirit. This appears to be imparted. Up to a point the position is clarified in M.M.¹¹ for it says:-

"The body of Adam was created by God, and perfected with holy spirit, and a living soul."

While it is noted that holy spirit is a rare Sam. expression, there is no suggestion here that it is hypostatized and known as the Holy Spirit of God. Everything coming from God partakes of the aspect of holiness, even the spirit which He imparts to Man.

M.M.¹² describes a discussion which takes place between Heart and Mind, after Heaven and Earth have finished their dialogue. Mind said to Heart, "I have heard these words." Heart answered it, "O Mind we receive succour from you and you are the fountain from which we drink, and from which we prepare a lamp with pure oil, that your light may extinguish all deep darkness; for you are before body, soul and spirit." There is no hesitancy whatever in M.M. to departmentalize, for it is written,¹³

"When it comes about, how long judgements; how long recompense, without us seeing and fearing; the one in the heart, and the other in the soul; the one in the spirit, the other in the body," etc.

It would appear on examination that the Sam. even in M.M. still hold to a dichotomy, for the basic concept is that of the material (i.e. body) and the immaterial (i.e. spirit and/or soul). As has already been stated, while the Defter keeps to body and soul in the 4th cent., the 14th cent. writers introduce spirit, and use it in a way that does not suggest any clear demarcation between it and soul. Should M.M. be dated early, then a new assessment, not only of this problem, but others would seem to be inevitable. For on the matter of dichotomy or trichotomy, as well as of other aspects of Sam. theology and philosophy, the precise relationship of M.M. to the Defter would call for further examination. It is fair to assume however that M.M.¹⁴ comes down firmly on a dichotomy, and the position is adequately summed up with the words:-

"You say that spirits are shared among the dead and the living;
But we speak of soul and spirit, referring soul to the body and spirit to the living.
The governing of (living) human beings is by both soul and spirit.
The governing of the dead is sufficiently done by soul."

This differentiation comes very near to that of Maimonides when he wrote,¹⁵

"The soul and the spirit of man during his life are two different things."

He states that they exist in Man, but separate from the body only one of them exists.

2. FREEDOM OF THE WILL

There is never any suggestion in the Defter or later works that the Sam. looks upon Man as an automaton. They believed that he was responsible for his own actions. So, they are able to say with conviction (C.p.12):-

"For we are transgressors and our inclination is evil."

Also (C.p.13):-

"All our murmurings are against ourselves, for we have brought destruction upon ourselves; Man smites himself with his own hand."

The Sam. point of view approximates to that of Pelagianism. Pelagius appeared in North Africa about 410 A.D., and taught that human nature was not totally depraved, but was capable, with the aid of divine grace, of attaining to righteousness. This attitude was condemned by Augustine, (354-430) who held that as a result of Adam's sin mankind is involved in total depravity and unable to fulfil the Law of God. He argued that freedom of the will only existed in Adam before the Fall; that Adam lost for himself and for the human race, through disobedience, the freedom of obedience to the will of God. The Sam. never doubt they can obey the Law of God if they so choose. The Semitic viewpoint does not blame the soul or the body of Man for sin, but the Yetzer Harah, for the "imagination of Man's heart is evil from his youth."¹⁶ The Sam. does not feel that his moral judgement is impaired because Adam sinned. Their

attitude is that all men do sin. There is no doctrine of Original Sin to be found in Sam. theology in the Defter. Indeed they have no philosophy on sin. It just happens. The Sam. tends to think of sins as a series of wilful actions as distinct from a state of sin. This attitude is consistent with not upholding a Doctrina De Peccato Originali.

The recent translation and publication of M.M. however has shed further light on this matter, so that a modification of what has already been stated appears inevitable. In Book V dealing with the Death and Glorification of Moses, Moses says:-¹⁷

"I turn away from life and am about to be cast into the pit which Adam dug out."

And,¹⁸

"I am purchased by the word of the serpent; taken up through the eating by Eve; pledged through the action of Adam. There is no hope in me ever."

And again,¹⁹

" 'What can I do', said the great prophet, Moses, 'when my war is lost, through the fruit that Adam ate, and the days of God's favour are hidden.' "

These expressions certainly uphold a doctrine of Original Sin, tracing, as it does, the proneness to sinning, due to the action of both Adam and Eve. Previously the position held by the Sam. on this matter was Pelagian in content. Now the attitude in M.M. is one that approximates to that

upheld by St. Augustine, the antagonist of Pelagius in the 5th cent. and eventually his conqueror.

3. SIN AND EVIL

It was the manifestation of God to Israel through the Law that led them to a knowledge of their shortcomings as a people. When they did not act in harmony with the will of God then, to that extent they sinned, sin being construed as rebellion and refusal. The Sam. like other religious people, were aware that sin led to an alienation of Man from God. The Sam. prays (C.p.83):-

"I pray Thee, O Lord, forgive our iniquities, our sins, our transgressions and our trespasses, and redeem us from the hand of our enemies, and from those who hate us, and deliver us from our evils, from the evil of the nations that surround us."

From such a prayer it is to be observed that, on occasion, a state of sin is to be gauged by the prevailing material circumstances; an idea not completely unknown in the O.T., where the prosperity of a nation came to be associated with moral well-being.

In this matter of sinning the Sam. acknowledge the possession of free-will, affirming (C.p.4):-

"Thou hast rewarded us with good, and we, Thy people, have repaid Thee with evil."

The Sam. is aware that rebellion is a cause of sin for the Defter has it (C.p.39):-

"But rebellious have we been and we learn not."

There is no suggestion here of an inability to do good.

And of this rebellion the Defter says (C.p.14):-

"Yet there is no man in our generations, who is not associated with sinning, fathers and sons, parents and their offspring, in that they are all culpable and rebellious."

Yet, in spite of the above statement, there is no evidence for a belief in a doctrine of Original Sin in the Defter.

In this matter of sinning the 4th cent. Sam. writer never dwells too long on this bias towards sin. For example, there is no attempt to lay the blame for sin on the body or on the soul. On this point The Masnavi²⁰ states:-

"And bodies derive their good and evil from souls."

Ezekiel the Prophet says:-²¹

"The soul that sins shall die"

while Micah²² writes:-

"Shall I give the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? "

"The Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions"²³, in referring to Adam in the Garden of Eden, states that Adam sinned by disobeying God about the tree. It adds²⁴ that sex was not the cause of evil for Adam knew Eve after leaving the garden.

If the Sam. is cognizant of God as a Creator, he is

equally aware of God, who acts recreatively in the sense that God, by His very nature, is able and desirous of re-habilitating those, who although sinners, desire to be penitent, and to repent. This operation can be achieved by the machinery of ritual acts, such as, for example, the Day of Atonement. Prayer also with the Sam. is efficacious. God is ready and willing to cement any broken alliance, having in mind the covenants already made with the Patriarchs. Right through the Defter sin basically is still construed as rebellion against God, rather than on grounds of Ethical contravention, for as Ab-Hisdah (C.p.71) says of Man:-

"He rebelled against Thee, but Thou didst pardon him."

Ben Manir has a composition (C.p.676) in which he alludes to the moral lapses of the Nation. As it is a poem for Yom-Ha-Kippur it is natural that the evil of past deeds, iniquities, transgressions and abundant guilt, should be brought to the light and examined. Forgiveness is sought. The repetitive theme is :-

"To Him we were once good."

He believes in the concept that material well-being is a sign of moral rectitude and vice versa ; a frame of mind which brings to recollection the teaching of the Book of Job, and of Habakkuk. He lays the blame for moral turpitude on the soul, for he says:-

"Our souls are stubborn and do evil works."

Indulging in the same theme (C.pp. 677 and 679) he speaks of the evil of past deeds. He refers to violence and lying; dealing treacherously; we extort, and cheat and deal iniquitously in judgements; slander against persons; envy; words become blows; loving vanity and hating truth; lies and stealing; confine and rob; taking bribes; walking with harlots - all of which recalls the condemnation of the Prophet Amos. Ben Manir tries to show that there is design in moral precepts by indicating the inevitability of the evils, that have befallen them, by saying, "We are smitten with every kind of plague"; "our houses occupy desolate sites"; "The synagogue has departed from us"; "The Lord has done with us this, because of all the evil-doing of the people."

With reference to sin Abisha b. Phinehas makes mention of Adam and Eve who dwelt in "a Paradise called the Garden of Eden" (C.p.697). Through disobedience, "The Chosen ones came forth from the choice place in anger, wrath and fury." Here Abisha introduces a piece of ancient tradition for he writes:-

"The Lords of the eminent ancestors said that Adam was dedicated a hundred years after he left the dwelling of Eden to reprove himself."

During that period of time he is supposed to have remained aloof from Eve.

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.238) says of God:-

"Oh, Good One, none can think bad of Thy goodness, for Thou preparest all goodness, and relievest of all evil."

He therefore has passed beyond that stage when evil as well as good was attributed to God in order to show that He was omnipotent.²⁵ Neither does he imply, as does Moses Maimonides, that evil is the absence of good. Maimonides²⁶ affirms that all evils are negations. The danger of adopting his ethical principle that evil is the absence of Good; that good is positive in actuality, and evil, by the absence of good, is negative, is obvious in that evil is so positive in its results. Shakespeare puts this very concisely when he writes:-²⁷

"The evil that men do lives after them;
the good is oft interred with their bones."

4. JUDGEMENT: INDIVIDUAL OR NATIONAL?

The Sam. conclude, as other religious communities have done, that a judgement is passed by God on Man for having committed sin. But a distinction must be made between judgement present and future, for judgement is both interim and final. Final judgement symbolized in the Day of Vengeance and Recompense will be considered in a later chapter on Eschatology. It has to be ascertained whether the Sam. conceived of judgement as being passed on individual or national misdeeds. This question arises because up to the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel the

Israelites had believed in Corporate personality. "The older thinking of Israel, in every sphere was largely conditioned by a conception of corporate personality."²⁸

When Achan "took some of the devoted things", God said to Joshua, "Israel has sinned."²⁹

In seeking confirmation in the Defter, for evidence either supporting or denying a case for Corporate Personality, it must be taken into consideration that the Defter, as being a Liturgy for corporate worship, would obviously lay the emphasis in prayers and hymns, on the community generally, and not on individuals. This makes the matter of deciding whether in thinking of God's judgement, the nation is the object, and not the individual more difficult. The bulk of the evidence has the nation in mind. The Prayer of Moses (C.p.45) states:-

"Pardon us and our fathers, in Thy kindness
O Lord, from all that we have sinned, and erred
and transgressed before Thee."

Corporate Personality would appear to be to the fore in the statement (C.p.14):-

"Alas, because of our sins, are we slaying
ourselves; the dead and the living perish:
Although there be virtue in them, although they
be sons who have not acted wickedly, although
they be chosen ones, sons of the good ones, they
are stricken for sins which they commit not."

In the same composition however (C.p.14) the emphasis appears to be on the individual:-

"For there is none among us to endure this
judgement, for the sinner is stupified when
tried by judgement."

Marqah (C.p.26) singles out the humble sinner saying:-

"He granteth pardon to him that forsaketh his sinning; He that repents his sin, verily He granteth him compassion."

This point of view comes very close to that upheld by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and it would seem safe to conclude that judgement is both individual and corporate; so also with God's mercy; it is extended to both spheres. As Marqah points out (C.p.19):-

"That He accepteth sinners, who forsake their sins",

for,

"He seeth and knoweth what is hidden in every heart."

While the Defter refers to God as the "Living King" (C.p.60) and "Living God" (C.p.72) Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.240) alludes to God as the "Living Judge", for this aspect of God appears to be one that is continuous; as He rules so also He judges. But mercy is always supreme among His abiding traits. The basic theme so often in the 14th cent. writers is that God is Creator, Judge and Redeemer, thus re-echoing the thoughts of Marqah. Marqah refers to God a number of times as Judge (C.pp.21,25). On the other hand Amram Darah never refers to God as Judge.

M.M. (Book IV) has much to say about God, Man, and Sin, and as the subject is not dissimilar to the Epistle to the Hebrews in presentation, it could be suggested that both

books look to the High Priest, to secure atonement for sins both individual and national. The Epistle³⁰ says:-

"And inasmuch as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgement."

And again:-³¹

"For we know him that said, Vengeance belongeth to me; I will recompense. And again, The Lord shall judge his people."

While the Epistle would suggest condemnation of the whole nation, hence the concept of the High Priest and the Day of Atonement, the individual response is not excluded for the eleventh chapter specifies individuals who responded by faith and achieved salvation. Bowman³² has shown the central position that faith occupies in Sam. thought. The matter of judgement occurs again in the chapter on Eschatology.

M.M. (Book IV) states that all God's ways are just. It goes on to say that He deals justly with the orphan and widow. His greatness deals justly when Cain stole his brother's secret and killed him.³³ Yet previously, in a corporate sense, it speaks of the deed of Cain and what happened to him and his descendants after him. It mentions that God will recompense every doer according to his deed, whether good or bad. "In proportion to the action is the reward." M.M.³⁴ shows that God deals with individuals (Adam, Cain, Lamech, Pharaoh); He also judges communities and peoples (People of Babel: Sodom and Gomorrah: and the

Egyptians). It mentions the day of vengeance and the great judgement, but that "we are unable to comprehend how it will be."³⁵ As there is a fire for the evildoers, people will be judged separately, "for He recompenses every doer according to his deed."³⁶ Woe to the sinner when the True One asks him about his deeds. Woe to the sinner when the True One says to him, How is it that you have deviated in life?" There is to be "the day of resurrection for all men."³⁷ This is the only occasion when the resurrection is mentioned, and the isolated mention of it recalls to mind the sparcity of mention of it in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is to be the day when "every person receives recompense."

The Sam. ultimately reach that position held by Jews, Christians and Muslims that judgement is finally to be resolved on individuals, who will be segregated into groups of good and evil. Because God is both just and merciful there will be no judgement en masse, based on the Semitic concept of Corporate Personality - with Sheol in the background - but judgement based on individual assessment where the stress is on an individual resurrection. The day of vengeance and recompense becomes more clearly defined with the line of demarcation between good and evil becoming more accurate, and God being more clearly apprehended as a Moral God.

5. PARTICULARISM OR UNIVERSALISM

To the Sam. God is the Universal God for He is the "maker of all the Universe" (C.p.35), and in the words of Marqah (C.p.19) "the Lord of the world", and "creator of the world" (C.p.22). Such thoughts had led the Canonical Prophets to sound the note of universalism. Prior to them Yahweh would appear to have had no concern with any people but Israel. The basis of that parochial relationship between God and Israel had been that of personal contracts or covenants. The province of Canonical Prophets was to take a much wider perspective, and to see that God was concerned with the destinies of all peoples. The universalist concept received its fullest expression in the writings of Deutero-Isaiah, who saw Israel as being raised up to minister to the world. Amos denounced not only the wickedness of Israel, but also of Damascus, Gaza, Tyre, Edom, Ammon and Moab. For God is the Lord of Universal morality. The Book of Jonah shows how great, at one period in Hebrew history, was the vision of Universalism, which however receded as a morning mist before the rising sun.

In spite of asserting that God was the "Lord of the World" (C.p.22) the 4th cent. Sam. writers still stress an almost exclusive claim on Him. Marqah writes (C.p.17):-

"Thou art our God and the God of our fathers,
The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob."

A marked feature of Theology in 4th cent. Samaritanism

is that the Gentiles are not brought into consideration. In spite of asserting God's supremacy, the Sam. does not draw the obvious corollary, as Deutero-Isaiah did cent. before, that God is actually the God of all nations, and that they also come under His providential care and judgement. In the Defter Amram the H.P. (C.p.31) in the same composition refers to God as "The Lord of all living," and then alludes to Him as the "God of our fathers." He reverts to the Particularist viewpoint by saying:-

"Thou madest it a covenant between Thee and
between Thy servants."

The marks of Particularism are always mentioned, i.e. Sabbath, Covenant and Circumcision. There is no evidence whatever for the concept of the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of Man in the Defter, nor for that matter in later Sam. writings. God is never conceived as "Father," so that the Brotherhood of Man is a non sequitur. The Sam. like the Judaist was never prone to proselytize. The Judaist never forgot the injunctions of Ezra and Nehemiah. The Sam. also was most fastidious on this matter.

Eleazar b. Phinehas in a prayer in the Defter (C.p.35) uses a familiar Sam. expression when he affirms:-

"And after the Day of Vengeance, Thou art
without end."

It is not specified whether the "Day of Vengeance" is associated with sinners generally or with the enemies of

Israel in particular. Its companion phrase, "The Day of Recompense" is not mentioned. The "Day of Vengeance" here may have the same connotation as the "Day of the Lord", before the prophet Amos gave it a fuller and deeper meaning, to include not only the enemies of Israel, but Israel too!

In the Defter "The Day of Vengeance" occurs seven times, and the expression "The Day of Vengeance and Recompense" three times, the latter being in credal form with a possible reference back to the Creed (C.p.3). In the main "The Day of Vengeance" is used to denote a specific period in time, and is left unexplained. It could refer to the enemies of Israel, or to Israel itself. One is left wondering whether, in the Creed (C.p.3) "the Day of Vengeance" is not for the enemies of Israel, and "the Day of Recompense" for the Sam. After all those who believe and recite the Sam. creed would not include themselves in "the Day of Vengeance", where the implication is that "the Day of Vengeance" is reserved for non Sam. people.

The position is not radically changed by the 14th cent. Indeed the Sam. people appear to have become more introspective, probably by virtue of being so long under the heel of the oppressor. In a KIME (C.p.97) Ben Manir refers to God as the God of a particular people, from Abraham right down to Caleb, Joshua and the Seventy Elders. This God is concerned with every aspect of Israel's life, not only in a

spiritual and moral sense, but also politically and materially. He writes:-

"May the God of Ithamar, the Overseer,
destroy every enemy of yours."

Ben Manir does not appear to have the vision of Deutero-Isaiah in seeing God as a Universal God concerned about all people. This defect may be either the cause of him reciting God with each patriarch and elder of Israel, or else it may be the result of such a frame of mind. In spite of him writing:-

"The Lord, the God of Mankind",

he does not hold to the attitude of quicumque vult. The Sam. do not have the "vision glorious" of the Hebrew Prophets. They could not envisage a world where its kingdoms could become the kingdom of God.

Abisha b. Phinehas would also seem to be a particularist for he writes (C.p.503):-

"Run and stand in the Garden of Eden. Go
over to the Garden of Eden!
See what is in the midst of it! Behold what
resides therein!
Let Israel dwell securely, in settled isolation,
from all thy fear."

On the Day of Vengeance "there remains only the everlasting mountain in the midst of the garden for good tidings" (C.p.515). As Mount Gerizim is the locus classicus for true Sam. believers, it appears that the Gentiles are to be excluded. Yet is he a Universalist after all? For he

says also (C.p.512) that there will be "a continuous kingdom until the final day." The enemy will say, "How good are your tents, O Taheb", and "How great is his presence." "He will rule over eleven nations who are mentioned in his laws." "They will come and believe in him, and in Moses, and his Law." It appears then that "the nations and the uncircumcised" are to "come under the shade of his roof."

The sifting of the evidence leads one to believe that the Sam. were particularists, and at best "only tolerate" those who are not Sam. and who are not hostile to them. Their religious beliefs had crystallized to such an extent that the Sam. had become intensely nationalistic. To be a Sam. in a national sense meant to be a Sam. from a religious point of view.

In M.M.³⁸ the Taheb is associated with the Particularist point of view. It is stated:-

"Let the Taheb come safely and scatter the enemies who here provoked God."

Also,

"Let the Taheb come safely and separate the chosen from the rejected, and let this affliction be turned into relief."

The Sam. held that the Taheb (i.e. Restorer) would come to Mount Gerizim, and re-establish true worship, and recover the Temple vessels so that the Sam. themselves might enjoy Divine Favour to the full.

This attitude to segregate is borne out by M.M.³⁹
further on where it says:-

"From this I have taught you that a
foreigner cannot ascend Mount Gerizim
or stand in the place of Blessing. This is
a warning to the congregation of Israel that
no stranger may appear among them."

So that even in the Sam. field there is evidence for an
attitude of mind that prescribes the verdict, Nulla Salva
Extra Ecclesia.

6. WISDOM

As if in keeping with the Pentateuch the Deifter does
not over-emphasize the wisdom of God. Wisdom is generally
used, not only for learning, but for skill in the arts.
It is also used for discretion and spiritual insight when
referred to men. Ex. xxxi, 3 says:-

"And I (i.e. The Lord) have filled him with
the spirit of God, with wisdom (Hocmah) and
intelligence, with knowledge and all
craftsmanship."

In the Pentateuch there is no suggestion or indication that
wisdom would eventually attain the position it came to
occupy either in Proverbs⁴⁰ or in the Book of Wisdom. In
the Book of Proverbs, wisdom does not denote skill,
knowledge or understanding in any narrow or parochian sense,
but as regarding life generally. In the Pentateuch wisdom
is definitely a gift from God⁴¹. On the other hand, in
Proverbs⁴², wisdom can mean a body of knowledge. In

Proverbs⁴³ also wisdom is personified, appearing to fall just short of becoming a distinct hypostasis. Proverbs⁴⁴ reaches a concept of a deeply philosophical view of wisdom in relation to the Universe. Wisdom⁴⁵ is created by the Lord; a concept not found in the Defter. The question, however, does arise, is wisdom personified in this chapter? A.E. Morris⁴⁶ says of wisdom:-

"We have here not a definite hypostalization of wisdom, but a mere personification - a preparation for, but not an actual anticipation of, the Christian doctrine of God."

Wisdom in the Apocryphal book, The Wisdom of Solomon, conceives of both Creation and Salvation, though acts of God, as mediated through wisdom, but this mediation is never divorced from the activity of God Himself. Amram Darah (C.p.27) holds to this point of view when writing:-

"When Thy wisdom saw fit to create, Thy power brought together all things at Thy word."

The Book of Ecclesiasticus shows that the concept of wisdom held by Jesus,⁴⁷ the Son of Sirach, bears favourable comparison with that of Proverbs⁴⁸, but with this distinction that he identifies wisdom with the Law. A man cannot be wise regardless of the Law.

In the Defter wisdom is never hypostasized on the seventeen times that it occurs. It is never objectified and represented as an intermediary between God and the world. Wisdom is nearly always associated with Creation. Amram

Darah (C.p.27) points out that because of the wisdom of God creation came into being. But he associates the pronoun "Thy" with wisdom. Wisdom does not stand in its own right; it is an attribute of God along with "power" and "word." But Amram also says (C.p.27):-

"We perceive Thy wisdom in us, and we
worship Thy glory,"

but this wisdom arises, for :-

"We know Thee by the creation of our
own selves."

The Sam. associate wisdom with the Law, for reference is made to:-

"A book of life, with wisdom, majesty and
glory."

(C.p.11).

It is more specifically stated (C.p.12) when the writer says

"Thy book of wisdom teaches us Thy light."

Marqah (C.p.16) speaks of creatures as:-

"Thy powers, the harvest of Thy wisdom."

God sowed words into the silence and the harvest was of created beings. Marqah like Amram associates God's wisdom with creation (with things seen). But wisdom retains the possessive pronoun. Referring to the creation of heaven and earth, Marqah (C.p.20) alludes to God,

"With His great wisdom."

In this prayer Marqah may have in mind the place that wisdom

had in the Gnostic systems. In the system of Valentinus the Pleroma is full of light with darkness outside. In this prayer Marqah juggles with the concepts of light and darkness. He also states that:-

"Everlasting Life is Thine, which requires no fullness."

God with

"His great wisdom"

"fixed the heights and the depths."

In the system of Valentinus, Hachamoth or "Desire of Wisdom" was cast out of the Pleroma into the depth of darkness. Like the Gnostics Marqah differentiates between wisdom and knowledge. Concerning God, Marqah says (C.p.20):-

"O Light, whose light is the fullness of the world; O light, all lights are derived from Thy goodness."

Marqah thus construes his own Gnostic system, but instead of speaking of wisdom (Sophia) and Hachamoth (Desire of wisdom) he refers to

"His great wisdom."

Wisdom here not being in isolation but an attribute of God. In a previous prayer (C.p.19) he has referred to God as:-

"He that hath knowledge of the unseen world."

He also speaks (C.p.22) of:-

"Him who hath knowledge of the unseen."

Marqah therefore appears to associate wisdom with creation

(with things seen) and knowledge with things unseen. He also states (C.p.22) that God has brought forth all that He "desired from the vision of Thine intelligence." The word "intelligence" however can be translated as "knowledge."

Marqah definitely associates wisdom with the scriptures. He makes mention that (C.p.49):-

"All the water-drawers have drawn from its wisdom"

and that (C.p.52) the sacred book:-

"teacheth us His wisdom."

But Marqah (C.p.59) having referred to God as "The Illustrious One" gives a complete picture when saying:-

"The depth of the unseen and the seen (world) is the Law, that was given us of His wisdom; no man sees God but through wisdom."

So the two worlds of the seen and unseen can be comprehended through God's wisdom exemplified to us through the Law, for knowledge (Gnosis) of God is through the Law. Thus does Marqah disregard the challenge of Gnosticism, yet making use of its language. The Christian apologists had no greater grasp of Gnostic ideology than did Marqah.

Abul-Hasan of Tyre (C.p.79; 11th cent.) states that:-

"He knoweth all, and no hidden thing is concealed from Him,"

and that:-

"There is no wisdom but His."

Here again wisdom is associated with creation.

The 12th cent. writer Ab-Hisdah (C.p.72) states that:-

"All cometh by His wisdom,"

but in this prayer wisdom is a concept similar to that in The Wisdom of Solomon; in that, wisdom is exemplified in creation and salvation. He speaks of:-

"A creation full of gifts"

and,

"He it is who brings salvation to all
the world."

And as a God,

"He hath knowledge of the hidden things of
our hearts; he seeth that which is unseen."

Amram the H.P. (C.p.31; 13th cent.) states that
creation was great

"Because of Thy wisdom."

This association of God's wisdom with creation reaches right
to the 14th cent. for Eleazar (H.P.1363-1387; C.p.32) says:-

"In the beginning, He created mighty creatures;
In His wisdom He reared them with perfection,
and without fault."

It is this association of God's wisdom with perfection, that
leads ultimately to the association of His wisdom with
salvation. Salvation is the status after imperfection has
been overcome. This is the point that St. Paul⁴⁹ has in
mind when he says:-

"Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is
a new creation."

In another hymn (C.p.36), Eleazar b. Phinehas states that:-

"His wisdom brought to pass all things with goodness; Wisdom, with fulness of knowledge, by the power of the Eternal One of old."

If Eleazar had written in the 4th cent. it would have been said that he had been influenced by a Gnostic environment.

The 14th cent. writers continue to extol wisdom not only as a quality peculiar to God but as something attainable by Man. Abisha, for example (C.p.496) states that the beginning and end of all wisdom is the fear of God. It is a fear which bespells a reverence for God and a realization of His power and glory. This fear should lead to obedience which is reciprocated by God's love for Man. That the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, is an established Semitic concept.⁵⁰

Abisha b. Phinehas may be looked upon as reflecting the opinions of other 14th cent. writers regarding the wisdom of God. In two hymns at least (C.pp.494; 504) he alludes to the great wisdom of God. This adjective (i.e. great) may be added for the writer makes mention of the fact that:-

"God imparts wisdom to the mind"

(C.p.505) of those who are prepared to receive it. The writer states (C.p.505):-

"By the light of having knowledge the wisdom of God springs forth."

Abisha points out that this is a hymn,

"which is intended as a fount for all wisdom."

But is there not a more subtle meaning to wisdom as Abisha mentions the great wisdom of God? St. Paul in mentioning the topic of wisdom⁵¹ refers to Jesus Christ⁵² as:-

"The power of God and the wisdom of God."

Jesus Christ⁵³ Himself hypostasizes the wisdom of God. When Abisha mentions wisdom does he sometimes have Moses in mind? Moses, according to Abisha (C.p.499) is to reveal every mystery:-

"Whose name is Moses, who will deliver the Hebrews; who will rise to reveal, and he will reveal every mystery."

Abisha mentions the great wisdom of God, which might indicate that while wisdom in the 4th cent. was used in a superlative sense, Abisha now, subconsciously, has degrees of comparison. When Scholars refer to Ad majorem gloriam dei (A.M.G.D.) they commit themselves to a fallacy, in that the glory of God, as with other attributes of God, is always superlative in degree. The attributes of God are absolute, and not relative. If Abisha is the scholar he is claimed to be, he must have been aware of the Logos doctrine. The work of Philo in this direction would be known. Philo carrying further the concept of wisdom in the Book of Wisdom, developed the Greek notion of the Logos. In his disquisition on wisdom

St. Paul⁵⁴ refers both to the Jews and the Greeks. The Logos while replacing wisdom (Hochmah or Sophia) still retains the function of being the instrument of God's creation, and revelation. Indeed also as a mediator between God and Man in the matter of salvation. The Logos is indicative also of God's immanent activity in the universe. There is every possibility of Moses being conceived as the Logos in the Sam. faith. Abisha (C.p.375) gives Moses an exalted position.

"What man among men is like thee?"

"Thy Lord shall teach thee the secrets of the world from before the beginning until after the day of vengeance" (C.p.379).

Ben Manir (C.p.385) says of Moses that "he brought the Law to illumine our hearts." In the 14th cent. Moses is conceived of tacitly, if not overtly as the Logos, who pre-existed, and who was at the beginning of creation. If there is a close analysis between "The hymn of the birth of Moses" (C.pp. 746-753) by Abdullah b. Solomon and the opening chapters of St. John's Gospel, Abdullah must not only have believed Moses to be "The light of the world," but also the Logos. In this hymn there is continuous stress on "The Word."

In one of Abisha's hymns (C.p.496) mention is made that:-

1. "Knowledge is a well for those who know, teaching everyone who perceives."

2. "For when it is dark, there is no light and eyes cannot see."
3. "All His waters are living waters and all who pray to Him, the Living One."

It is suggested that Abisha had in mind Maimonides⁵⁵, where the latter states that wisdom has frequently been called "water." Maimonides refers to the expressions of "eating" and "drinking" in connection with "wisdom." Maimonides quotes Jonathan, son of Uzziel, who speaks of "the wells" (Ma'ayene) as being identical with "the eyes of the congregation." Jonathan does so because he plays on the close similarity of "eyes" and "wells" in Hebrew; "wells" being "Ma'ayene" and "eyes" as "Ma'ayine".⁵⁶ If Abisha has paraphrased Maimonides, he has been prepared to see the close association between "wells" and "eyes", but in his case to refer to knowledge as a well. Nevertheless there is a close affinity of ideas indicated here by Maimonides and Abisha (C.p.496).

It is more than likely that the 14th cent. Sam. writers were influenced by Kabbalah, which by the time of the 14th cent. became the pursuit of many Jews, particularly in Europe. The Hymn of Praise (C.p.265) written by Mattanah ha-Mizri seems to be a good example of how the concepts of Kabbalah had an influence upon Sam. writers. Kabbalah would appear to be part of the ideological background of these writers. Wisdom is one of the Ten Sephiroth

mentioned in the Zohar. Mattanah hopes that:-

"Thy wisdom will descend upon us."

Indeed Kabbalah might well be the cause, or one of the causes, why the Hebrew language came to the fore again in Samaria in the 14th cent. Kabbalah holds that the Hebrew language is the "Language of Creation;" that the Ten Sefiroth were bound together with the Hebrew Letters to produce corporeal beings. Both Kabbalah and Mattanah follow a plan in which the male principle Hochmah (wisdom) unites with the female principle Binah (understanding) to produce Daath (knowledge). Wisdom in Kabbalah is closely associated with creation. The theme behind the Sefiroth being bound with the Hebrew Letters of the Alphabet is closely akin to Plato's Theory of Ideas. The Theory of Ideas became the starting point of Philo's philosophy when he sought to interpret the sephrah, wisdom, as the Logos principle immanent in the Universe.

But in spite of environment, and of interpretation, wisdom in the 14th cent. is still closely associated with creation. It is never entirely divorced from God. While Mattanah hopes that:-

"Thy wisdom will descend upon us."(C.p.265), he is not conforming to a Neoplatonic theory of emanation, associated chiefly with Plotinus (d.290), whereby powers, emanating from the Godhead, achieved varying degrees of

remoteness and independency, for Mattanah makes mention of Thy wisdom.

For Man, therefore, true wisdom is to be derived from God alone, but it is mediated in and through the Law. The sacred book (C.p.52):-

"Teacheth us His wisdom,"

for the Law itself (C.p.59):-

"was given us of His wisdom,"

as "no man sees God but through wisdom."

2. I N M A N

N O T E S

NOTES

2. MAN

1. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p. 236.

1. DICHOTOMY OR TRICHOTOMY?

2. Robinson, H. Wheeler. The Christian Doctrine of Man.
ibid. p. 27
3. Epstein, Isidore. op.cit. p.242
4. ibid. p.242
5. Robinson, H. Wheeler. op.cit. p.16.
Whinfield, E.H. Masnavi.
6. ibid. p. 16
7. ibid. p. 25
8. Fitzgerald, Edward. The Rubaiyat and Salaman and
Absal. Collins; London.
9. Robinson, H. Wheeler. op.cit. p.159
10. M.M. op.cit. Book I. Par.2.
11. M.M. ibid. Book II. Par.10
12. M.M. ibid. Book III, Par. 5
13. M.M. ibid. Book IV. Par. 11.
14. M.M. ibid. Book I, Par. 8
15. Friedlander, M. op.cit. p. 106.

2. FREEDOM OF THE WILL

16. Gen. viii, 21.
17. M.M. Book V. Par.2
18. ibid. Par. 2
19. ibid. Par. 2
Griffith Thomas, W.H. op.cit. p.161.

3. SIN AND EVIL

20. Whinfield, E.H. op.cit. p.29
21. Ezekiel. xviii, 4,20.
22. Micah. vi, 7.
Gaster. Moses. The Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient
Traditions.

23. ibid. Vol. I. Sam. Eschatology.
24. ibid. Vol. I. p. 180
25. cf. Ex. xxxii, 14.
26. Friedlander, M. op.cit. p.226
27. Shakespeare. W. Julius Caesar.

4. JUDGEMENT: INDIVIDUAL OR NATIONAL?

28. Oesterley. W.O.E. and Robinson. T.H.
Hebrew Religion. London, 1930.
29. Josh. vii, 1,11.
30. Heb. ix, 27.
31. Heb. x, 30.
32. Bowman, J. B.J.R.L. Vol. 40, p.308.
Art: Faith in Samaritan Thought.
33. M.M. op.cit. Book iv, Par.4.
34. M.M. ibid. Book iv, Par. 4.
35. M.M. ibid. Book iv, Par.6.
36. ditto
37. M.M. ibid. Book iv, Par.12.

5. PARTICULARISM AND UNIVERSALISM

38. M.M. Book i, Par.9
39. M.M. Book iii, Par. 3.

6. WISDOM

40. Prov. Chap. viii.
41. cf. Gen. xLi, 38 f.
42. Prov. i, 2; xiv, 6.
43. Prov. i, 20; viii, 1 f; ix, 1-6.
44. Prov. viii, 22-31.
45. Prov. viii, 22.
46. A New Commentary on Holy Scripture. Vol.I, p.387;
The Proverbs; A.E.Morris.
47. Ecclesiasticus, Chap. xxiv.

48. Prov. Chap. viii.
49. II Cor. V, 17.
50. cf. Job xxviii, 28; Ps. cxi, 10; Prov.i, 7; ix, 10.
51. I Cor. i, 18-25.
52. I Cor. i, 24.
53. St. Luke, xi, 49.
54. I Cor. i, 24.
55. Friedlander, M. op.cit. p.40
56. cf. Num. xv, 24.

3. I N H I S T O R Y

GOD'S DEALINGS WITH PATRIARCHS AND

ISRAEL.

3. IN HISTORY

God's dealings with Israel.

In 1859 Charles Darwin published the Origin of Species in which he propounded his theory of natural selection. After many years of research into Natural History, he came to the conclusion that the survival of the fittest types of life was based on evolution, and the principle of Natural Selection. Species of fauna and flora continued to live and survive by perfect re-action to their physical environment. Others who did not react became extinct. The basic principle of life, and of survival is that of selection. It is possible to affirm that what Darwin sought to establish in his book in a physical sense, is also to be found in the O.T., but in a moral and spiritual sense. The principle of selection is a theme running through the different books in the O.T. But in this case it is a spiritual and moral selection by God. God selects and God rejects. This selection therefore is on a higher plane than that of the physical. Man is not only a physical being, and so conforming to the laws of Nature, and what is propounded by Darwin in the Origin of Species. Man also is both spiritual and moral. For Man is both body and soul. Darwin takes into consideration factors dealing with the body or biological phenomena; the O.T. deals with aspects having reference

to the soul and spirit of Man. If Man does not react to his physical environment by conforming to its laws he dies; if he does not live according to the higher laws of life he dies. Ezekiel¹ said:-

"The soul than sinneth, it shall die."

But selection in the O.T. is not left to the haphazard methods of Natural selection. The choice and selection as traced through the O.T. is left entirely in the hands of God. It is selection based on spiritual and moral grounds. It is this principle that is now to be examined and discussed, not only as exemplified in the O.T., particularly the Pentateuch, but also as seen through the eyes of the Sam..

The history of God's manifestation to Man as accepted by the Sam. is as exemplified in the Pentateuch. After God had created Man in "his own image"² He revealed Himself to Adam. The next Patriarch is Enoch, for "Enoch walked with God, and he was not."³ Following Enoch in the matter of distinction is Noah. Noah is held very highly in the ranks of the Patriarchs for "Noah found grace in the eyes of God."⁴ Noah and Enoch are the two antediluvians who are referred to as having "walked with God."⁵ They are also mentioned among those who were actuated by faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews.⁶ Then follow the great exemplars of faith, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. These

three are always closely associated in the minds of the Sam..

The expression God of Abraham, God of Isaac and God of Jacob, however, became widely known and used.⁷ Then follows Joseph, who became highly esteemed by the Sam. and who follows on after Jacob in the list of the heroes of faith.⁸ The last of the Patriarchs mentioned by name in the Epistle to the Hebrews⁹ is Moses. In "Key-texts in the Epistle to the Hebrews." the author, Bishop Marcus L. Loane¹⁰ selects Moses as the key-man amongst the heroes of faith in Chapter xi, without however giving an explanation why he did so. It was to Moses that God revealed His great name. It was belief in Moses that became an essential and integral part of the Sam. creed following immediately after the statement of belief in God.

The Defter Liturgical material makes reference to lists of the Patriarchs and others, but these lists vary. The variations are shown in the Analysis which follows.

ANALYSIS
(PAGES)

Cowley	11	42	68	77	77	288
Brown (Thesis)	132	191	162	310	313	137

NAME	1st List 2nd List					
Adam		x		x		
Seth		x		x		
Enosh		x		x		
Enoch		x		x		
Noah		x		x		
Abraham	x	x	x	x	x	x
Isaac	x	x	x	x	x	x
Jacob	x	x	x	x	x	x
Joseph	x	x	x	x	x	x
Moses	x	x	x	x	x	x
Aaron	x	x	x		x	x
Eleazar	x	x	x			x
Ithamar	x	x	x			x
Phinehas	x	x	x	x	x	x
<u>CHOSEN ONES</u>	x					
Joshua		x	x	x		
Caleb		x	x	x		
Holy Angels			x			
70 Elders			x			
THE TAHEB		x				

The list on page C.p.11 makes a differentiation by referring to the "later Chosen Ones," a phrase that came to be used more freely by later writers. The sixth list (C.p.288) mentions Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as "The forebears, the pure ones of the world." The second list introduces Joshua and Caleb. Joshua in later cent. became very prominent in the writings of all Sam. Aaron b. Manir (C.p.322) makes use of a legend where Joshua carries on an argument with Amalek antiphonally. In the Midrash (C.p.322) Joshua boasts that he is of the "meritorious ones." The midrash on the battle of the Amalekites is continued later by Ben Manir (C.p.327). Eleazar b. Phinehas (C.p.329) also refers to Joshua in another midrash on the same battle. In this list of succession mention is also made of "the holy angels" and "the seventy elders." The second list begins with Adam (Durrant; C.p.42), followed by less frequently included names like Seth, Enosh, Enoch and Noah. It continues; "A congregation whose like there is not to be found in the world." Succeeding this "congregation" mention is made of the fact that "The Taheb and his assembly cometh." This is one of the four occasions when the Taheb is mentioned in the Defter (C.pp.4, 42, 45, 56). The Taheb would seem to be the culmination of a train of thought beginning with Adam. The remaining two lists are those of Ab-Gelugah

(12th cent.; C.p.77). He refers to Noah as "the pure one." Ab-Hisdah (Abul-hasan) of Tyre (11th cent.; C.p.70) makes mention of:-

"The pure ones worship Thee, The Pure One."

The "Pure Ones" is also used elsewhere in the Defter (C.p. 4,84). Mention is made of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as the "Three pure ones" (C.p.84). The three are also referred to as "The Perfect Ones" (C.pp.62, 69). The "Good Ones" also possess "merit" (C.p.75). Ab-Gelugah (C.p.75) speaks of the "Pure Ones in the Cave."

The Defter affords evidence for what could be spoken of as an "apostolic succession;" of certain ones who had been "chosen" by God, for their purity and perfection. Because they were so, they were held by the Sam. to have acquired "merit" which could be invoked for others less worthy, because of their filial relationship with them.

2. THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION

The Book of Deuteronomy lays emphasis on the fact that God chose Israel. "For you are a people holy to the Lord your God; the Lord your God has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, out of all the peoples that are on the face of the earth." ¹¹ It was this concept of being God's chosen people that led them to be rather exclusive in outlook. The Covenants were between God and

their fathers. Both Sabbath and Circumcision were rites which tended to differentiate them from the rest of Mankind. Everything tended to make the Israelites particularists.

Even within the chosen people there was a tendency to division. Israel was formed by a federation of several groups of clans. There was the Leah group including the tribe of Judah, and the Rachel group headed by Joseph. The two leading elements came to be those of Joseph and Judah, the latter "reaching eminence only in the time of David."¹² The Sam. make much of Joseph, and when the time came to speak of a Messiah, he was to come from the tribe of Levi, and not from Judah. The Sam. also believed that they were the chosen ones from the rest of Israel, hence the emphasis they place on Mount Gerizim as the chosen place and not Mount Zion. As the Sam. as a race were the chosen people there is no mention in their religious literature of a doctrine of the remnant.¹³ That the doctrine of "a remnant shall return" (shear jashub) was a prophetic teaching, might be the real reason, for the Sam. religion allowed more for the priestly side rather than the prophetic. The hymns and prayers of the Sam. emanated from the priestly school, many pieces being attributed to the High-Priest of the day. The Jews believed on their return from exile, and even before that time of testing, that "however much Judah suffered for her sins there must

always be a remnant, who should be ready to start a new life in a better community and a more perfect order."¹⁴ An outstanding characteristic of the Sam. religion was the faith of its devotees, but it was a faith in the future well-being of the nation as a whole; the future held promise because of the faith of the Shomerim (keepers of the Law). So introspective were the Sam. on this matter, probably because they had no one with the prophetic instinct of an Isaiah, that they never felt under any obligation to teach the world. In this respect they had no vocation. If there was any remnant then that remnant of God's people in the world was the Sam. But it is fair to say that if they had no doctrine of a remnant, they had, as it were, in its place a doctrine of merit. This concept of merit attaching to particular people because of their good lives is not alien to religion. It is found also in Jewish and Christian Religions. Even Buddhism has a doctrine of merit.¹⁵ It is not strictly correct to say that this doctrine of merit was a mature one in the 4th cent. But the genesis of one is certainly to be found in the Defter.

The Defter is prone to use the expression "By the merit of" (becamal). It is used with the suggestion that those alluded to hold a unique position by virtue of their goodness, perfection or purity.

1. By the merit of Moses" (C.p.83).
2. "By the merit of the three perfect ones" (C.p.15).
3. "By the merit of Joseph, and our Lord Moses, Aaron, Eleazar, Ithamar, and Phinehas, Joshua and Caleb, the holy angels and the seventy elders, by their merit turn not Thy face from us" (C.p.68).

Some of these are also referred to as "The Chosen Ones" (C.p.11):-

"And the covenant of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Thy servants, our fathers, and Joseph, and our Lord Moses, our prophet, and Aaron, Eleazar, Ithamar and Phinehas, our priests, and the later chosen ones."

Marqah, Amram Darah and Nana b. Marqah do not refer to Merit (Zekhut). When it is used in the Defter, it is used by Ab-Gelugah (12th cent.; C.p.75 and C.p.77). In the former prayer (C.p.75) he refers to:-

"The merit of the good ones who have passed away."

In the latter prayer (C.p.77) mention is made of Jacob:-

"By the merit of Jacob, abundant in merit."

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.335) mentions election when he writes:-

"He chose Israel, whom He foreordained from among the peoples."

Abdullah therefore is of the opinion that not only was Israel the chosen of God, but was also pre-elected. This means that God had all along a purpose or plan in regard to the welfare of Israel. Abdullah would appear to support

a doctrine of pre-destination, even in a full Calvinistic sense for he states (C.p.324):-

"He (i.e. God) put men into different categories; one speaks, one is dumb; one is an ordinary man, one is a mighty man; one is in darkness, the other is in light; one poor, one rich; one is fallen, the other uplifted; from of old the matter is so, and the world proceedeth thus."

He also adds (C.p.336):-

"He chose us, He sanctified us with the instruction of the truth, by the hand of the prophet."

Ben Manir subscribes fully to the doctrine of election when he wrote (C.p.387):-

"God chose Israel for Himself from among all families."

The Israelites never forgot that history exemplified the dealings of God with their nation. The speech of Stephen before the Council¹⁶ shows that the argument from history was one that would always gain an attentive audience, even if it be a hostile one. Stephen showed how God dealt with the Patriarchs and people in foreign lands such as Mesopotamia¹⁷ and Egypt¹⁸. How He appeared to Moses in the desert of Sinai¹⁹. That God had dealings with the Israelite race even before the giving of the Law, and the covenant of Circumcision.²⁰ As far back as the Canonical Prophets of the eighth cent. Yahweh was held to be the Lord of History; that He was concerned with human relationships in general, and with the fortunes of His own

people in particular. The Israelites saw continuity of purpose in God's dealings with the race. This idea was secure in their minds because of a belief in Corporate Personality. This was re-inforced by upholding a doctrine of election, of which the patriarchal succession was indeed an earnest. This attitude was further supported by a doctrine of accrued merit transferable from one to another. There were also the signposts of historical significance such as the Law, Circumcision, the Covenants and the Sabbath. The Sam. believed that although they were passing through an era of Disfavour, God was actually with them, although His face was turned away from them. Their confidence was steadfast because of their interpretation of History, of which the Pentateuch was an imperishable record.

3. THE DOCTRINE OF THE MERITORIOUS ONES.

The Sam. emphasis on certain people because of their holiness, purity, perfection and righteousness led in time to them being placed in a special category. These meritorious ones came to be looked upon as a "Pure Chain." They were held to possess merit which could be used for the benefit of others, who prayed for help or forgiveness, because of the abundance of merit which certain people had accumulated by living virtuous lives. For example Ab-Gelugah (C.p.77) makes a petition :-

"For the sake of Jacob, abundant in merit"

It was from the ideological background of the 4th cent. that the concept of the "Pure Chain" began to be developed. Ab-Hisdah (Abul-Hasan) of Tyre (11th cent.) indicates the trend of thought when he writes (C.p.70):-

"The pure ones worship Thee, The Pure One."

The Sam. (like some sections of the Christian Church) accept a kind of "apostolic succession." There were actually "two generations in the world" according to Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.510):-

"One generation from Adam to Noah;"

"A second generation rose up."

"Among those are the elders, Moses and Aaron after him."

"They are your elders, the seventy, upon whom was transmitted the spirit of the prophet of all mankind."

The Sam. are at pains to show a strict chronological tree of descent from Moses with regard to their priests. They only have authority in so far as they possess the spirit of Moses, and he has a portion in them. Hence the import of the words (C.p.515):-

"I am a prophet's progeny, I cannot lie."

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.490) makes a petition when he says:-

"My Lord, unite us with Moses, and the Pure Chain, and make not Thy covenant void."

The Sam. by now were coming to make great play with the "Pure Chain" of their ancestors. Not only were they now in a position to emphasize the importance of the covenant, but also of those who had been, in any way, connected. It is to be noted also that it is a chronological rather than a genealogical tree, for it includes Joshua and Caleb.

The Sam. doctrine of Zekhut, or the "Merit" of the Fathers comes into fuller prominence in the Liturgies of the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread, the foundation of which is exemplified in the Defter. The Jews limited their doctrine to the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, while the Protestant community of the Christian Church offers up prayers solely "for the sake of" Jesus Christ. The Roman Catholic Church has a doctrine that also embraces the Blessed Virgin Mary and numerous Saints, whose name is legion. The Sam. concept of the Meritorious Ones, for whose sake all manner of favours are sought, extends from Adam down to Aaron and his sons. Montgomery²¹ refers to a section of the Sam. community as the guiltless ones, or with reference to the notion of Zekhut, the Meritorious Ones. These are primarily, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He states that the list is sometimes enlarged to seven and can include Joseph, Aaron, Eleazar and Phinehas, to which Moses may also be added.

The Commentary on the Asatir²² says:-

"Know that every one of the Meritorious Ones had to suffer great troubles in his lifetime. These were trials from God to purify them from the sins of the world. Then he accepted their repentance and made them great in the world to come."

In the Sam. story of the death of Moses²³ "Joshua said, 'O ye dwellers of the Cave, O ye Meritorious Ones of the world! Does your spirit know what is in store for your children? O thou son of Terah, thou the root of the Perfect and Meritorious Ones! Dost thou know that the plants of thy garden, which thou hast planted are being spoilt through sins and rebellion?' "

The Quran²⁴ reads:-

"God has surely chosen Adam, and Noah, and the family of Abraham, and the family of IMRAM (AMRAM) above the rest of the world; a race descending the one from the other."

One of the sections of the Feast of Passover (C.p.157) is entitled "The Qataf of Meritorious Ones," in which the re-iterated format is Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Dr. Lerner²⁵ gives the Qataf in full from the Ms. L. 6, f 1 b. It ends :- "Remember for good, for ever, the virtuous ones of the world, the righteous Abraham, Isaac and Jacob who rest in the cave of Machpelah, all prayers in whose name are accepted in their memory." This Qataf really reflects the position obtaining in the 4th cent. as exemplified in the Defter, although the Qataf itself is of 14th cent.

vintage. The 4th cent. Sam. writer, Marqah (C.p.62) writes:- "And remember thy servants, the perfect ones, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and repent of my wickedness for their sake" (A paraphrase of Ex. xxxii, 12-14).

The Defter (C.p.69) reads:- "Three friends did the Great God create, and He said, that through them was necessary, and for them was made, the world; for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the meritorious ones, who are placed in the cave, and their pleasure is that which pleased God, and He called their names sons, and no son shall perish, who prays and remembers them."

In the Defter, the Prayer of Joshua (C.p.4) is unique for it associates the three with the Taheb; "Praised be the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, merciful to the penitent (in bringing the Taheb)." It seems to be established, with the Defter as evidence that originally the ancient doctrine of the Meritorious Ones alluded only to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob possibly on the grounds that for cent. the formula had been: "The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." But even the Defter shows a tendency to go beyond this sacred formula, for we read (C.p.67) "God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, hear our voice, and have mercy upon us in Thy compassion. My Lord by the merit of Joseph, and our Lord Moses, Aaron, Eleazar, Ithamar, and Phinehas, Joshua and

Caleb, the holy angels and the seventy elders; for their sake, turn not Thy face from us."

In the Liturgies of Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread the position has become somewhat stabilized.

Abisha b. Phinehas

C.p.240

"The three meritorious ones."

"The covenant with His meritorious ones."

"The meritorious one of the world (Joseph)."

"The meritorious ones our fathers."

C.p.243

"May He have mercy upon you on the day of vengeance upon which He will declare, 'It is I,' 'It is I', for the sake of the meritorious ones of the world."

C.p.248

"The meritorious ones of the world, the Lords of status:- Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron and his sons, and Phinehas."

C.p.241

Abisha calls them "The Chain of Merit." These include the usual names, plus "the pure Eleazar," "the officer Ithamar," "Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb and the seventy Elders, and the hosts (i.e. angels) of the zealous God." Which brings Abisha into line with the thoughts expressed in the Defter, a thousand years before.

While Aaron b. Manir omits any mention of the meritorious ones, Abdullah b. Solomon does refer to them. He mentions the "three meritorious ones," then adding Joseph, Moses and Aaron and his sons (C.p.239). He alludes to "My meritorious ancestors," Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (C.p.214).

Also "Prosper my toil by the merit of the pious Joseph"
(C.p.214).

The meritorious ones are referred to also by Mattanah Ha-Mizri (C.p.268) and Sa'Dallah Al Kethari (C.p.229) of the remaining 14th cent. writers. But there are, in the Liturgies, in the later writers, and also in the Rubrics, further references to the meritorious ones, but in a stereotyped form.

An examination of The Legends of the Jews²⁶ shows that the Jews upheld the merits of the Matriarchs as well as the Patriarchs. In this respect the Sam. do not follow their Semitic neighbours. The Jews refer to the merits of Miriam²⁷; of Sarah²⁸; Rebekah²⁹; and Jochebed.³⁰ This is but another instance of the Sam. following another tradition from that of the Jews. The Muslims do not have a doctrine of the merits of the Matriarchs. They have a saying of Mohammed,³¹

"That among men there had been many perfect, but no more than four of the other sex had attained perfection; to wit, Asia, the wife of Pharaoh; Mary, the daughter of Imram; Khadijah, the daughter of Khowailed (the prophet's first wife); and Fatima, the daughter of Mohammed."

In this matter of the Doctrine of Merit it is seen how the Jews, the Sam., and the Muslims pursue independent courses.

4. FAVOUR AND DISFAVOUR

The Sam. believed that not only did God manifest Himself to men, but that in history there were periods when this epiphany was withdrawn. When God was present with men then it was a period of Favour (Rahutah). The absence of God was declared to be one of Disfavour (Panutah). The Sam. philosophy of history is set forth clearly in a book called The Samaritans.³² The first period in the history of Man was in the time of Adam's perfection (Rahutah). At that time God saw that everything that He had made was good. But alas Adam disobeyed God, with the result that days of Disfavour followed (Panutah). This word probably has a connection with the cognate word, of God turning away His face from the people. This period of disfavour was an era commencing with the fall of Adam to the time of God's epiphany and revelation on Mount Sinai. With the age of Moses the world was regenerated. Now were the days of Favour, an age of **Grace**. This period of God's favour lasted 250 years. Then followed the second stage of Disfavour, the present Panutah. This era began with Eli, the Evil Priest. But the Sam. look forward to the future. The second or great period of divine Favour is to come. There will be perpetual peace and prosperity. The enemies of Israel will be suppressed.

While there is evidence for the terms Favour and Disfavour in the Defter, the eras are not referred to often. Marqah

(C.p.19) makes one reference to the era of Favour, but does not mention Disfavour. He writes (C.p.19):-

"It is the penitent who are victorious in battle;
Who bring the era of Favour, and serve their God."

The Durran³³ mentions Favour seven times, on two occasions associating the return of the era of Favour with the Taheb, the Sam. "Messiah." Mention is made of the fact that the beginning of the seventh month is of significance because (C.p.47):-

"All the festivals of Divine Favour are in it."

Another Durran (C.p.46) is a reflection on the times, when it says:-

"We weep for Thee O Israel, how once thou wert in the days of God's Favour, and how thou art now in the days of God's Disfavour."

The Durran (C.p.45) also says:-

"He who wishes to see Divine Favour must be blameless on the Sabbath."

The Durran associates the Days of Favour with the Taheb on two occasions (C.p.42; C.p.45). The Taheb is the Sam. "Messiah" who will bring back again the days of God's Favour (C.p.42). He will bring peace; misfortune will be removed; wickedness will be withdrawn; they will dwell in God's Favour. The Durran (C.p.45) mentions Divine Favour three times, and also the Taheb. Of the Taheb it says:-

"He who brings his peace with him, comes and reveals the Divine Favour and purifies Mount Gerizim, the house of God, and removes trouble from Israel, when God gives him great victory, overcoming therewith the whole world."

Ab-Hisdah (Abul-Hasan of Tyre (11th cent., C.p.72)

writes:-

"Our souls are once more at rest, when we fulfil
Thine ordinances;
Our bodies are highly exalted, when we entreat
Thy Divine Favour;
Happy is the world when the penitent and the
perfect come,
And are ever pleasing to Thy holiness."

Ab-Gelugah (12th cent., C.p.75) prays to God to:-

"Supply the needs of all who hope for the Divine
Favour, in the merit of the good ones who have
passed away in affliction,"

thereby connecting the concept of merit with Divine Favour.

Phinehas the H.P. (1308-1363; C.p.34) refers to God's
Disfavour when he writes:-

"Bring to an end the time of Disfavour which
prevails over us."

Brown³⁴ incorporates in his work an extract from Cowley
(pp.288-289) where he not only refers to being brought:-

"From the darkness of Penutah to the light of
faith",

but uses "RATSON"³⁵ for "(The days of) Favour".

In the Passover Service³⁶ Ben Manir draws attention to
the fact (C.p.184) that the Sam. are aware of their evil
deeds and abundant sins, because of the era of Disfavour
which prevails. This interpretation permeates itself right

through the Passover Liturgy. They conclude that they are sinners because of the reflecting mirror of adverse material circumstances. They are in an epoch of Disfavour (Panutah). Dr. Moses Gaster³⁷ writes of the Sam:-

"The misery of the times left an indelible impress upon their minds: they became self-centred and morbid, spending their lives in contemplation of the terrible things through which they had passed. On all sides they saw the darkness of the Fanuta (Sic.)only."

With regard to Mount Gerizim Abdullah b. Solomon writes (C.p.235):-

"May He reveal the 'favour' in your days upon the holiest of worshipping places."

Sam. legend connects the disappearance of the Tabernacle containing the Ark, and the Holy of Holies, with Mount Gerizim. The legend affirms "that it was taken away by UZZI, and placed in a cave in Mount Gerizim after which the cave suddenly closed."³⁸ This disappearance was held to be the sign of God's displeasure, and the turning away of His face from Israel, hence Panutah. The Sam. believe that "the favour" will be revealed on Mount Gerizim when the holy vessels are found and restored. This conception has deeply influenced the spiritual outlook of the Sam. and writers such as Abdullah reflect the legend in their hymns and prayers.

Abdullah himself associates the Divine Disfavour with contemporary circumstances for he writes (C.p.309):-

"May divine Disfavour pass away"

and

"May the plague be caused to depart."

While the plagues were fairly regular in the Levant in the period 12th to the 14th cent., it is possible that Abdullah here is making reference to the plague which swept Asia Minor and Europe, and came to be known as the Black Death (1348).

He refers also to the "Bondage of Disfavour" (C.p.311); this being a possible allusion to being an "occupied" state with all the misery that occupation by a foreign power brings with it.

The position in the 14th cent. regarding Favour and Disfavour is summed up and adequately covered by Cowley³⁹ when he writes that since the schizm of Eli, and the disappearance of the Tabernacle, the world has been suffering under Divine Displeasure, and that this will be terminated by the coming of the Taheb, who will restore the period of Favour. This restoration has Mount Gerizim for its focal point.

The question to be asked is, from whence, if anywhere, do the Sam. derive their concept of periods of Favour and Disfavour? And if there is an ideological background for these periods of time, have they, in any way, been modified by Sam. influence? Is there not a clue to be found in the

statement (C.p.289):-

"From the darkness of Penutah to the light of faith" ?

Dr. Tisdall⁴⁰ points out that according to Zoroastrian ideas the contest of good and evil goes on for four periods of three thousand years each. These are periods when light is opposed to darkness. Gaster⁴¹ states that "according to Sam. computation, which again records some of the most ancient traditions, the world will subsist for 6,000 years, at the end of which the final doom will take place." It is more than likely that the Sam. derive the idea of a world epoch of 6,000 years from Judaism, and the concept of four periods of alternating Favour and Disfavour from the Persians. The question as to how far the religion of the Jews was influenced by that of Persia is a very controversial one. One of the basic themes of Zoroastrianism is that of light versus darkness.

The theme of light versus darkness is also to be found in the Gospel according to St. John, and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Indeed the main thesis of the Gospel of St. John⁴² is:-

"The light shines in darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it."

Such evidence therefore teaches one to be cautious in suggesting that the Sam. may have derived their concept of Favour and Disfavour from an Iranian source. In religious

matters there seems to be a melting pot of ideas, ideas which reach a wide area, and it becomes exceedingly difficult to trace any relationship or connection. To mention one major issue, those who see a very close affinity between the Gospel of St. John⁴³ and the Sam. must face the wide difference of opinion over calling God Father. The Father concept is to be found right throughout the Gospel, but not once mentioned in the Defter or the later Sam. Liturgies.

An examination of the Sam. concepts of Favour and Disfavour has shown how they believed that God has manifested Himself, not only in Nature and to Man, but also in History. They became aware that not only did He manifest Himself in certain epochs, but also that He is a God historically, in absentia, for the present period is that of Panutah or Disfavour.

M.M.⁴⁴ makes use of the concept of Favour, and uses it eschatologically. It has already described the Day of Vengeance very fully, and that "The desolation of the earth will return, and with it brimstone and fire." In this condemnation are the evil doers. But as for the good, there will be,

"The angels of The Favour round about them, and mercy's dewdrops showering upon them."

It was inevitable that the Day of Judgement, with especial treatment shown to Israel, should eventually be identified

with the Day of Divine Favour. The Sam. came to see that the return of Rahutah would coincide with the Day of Vengeance and Recompense; that as God turned away His face from the evil doers, He would, at the same time, look with favour on the good. This simultaneous existence is hinted at in M.M.⁴⁵ when God announced to Abraham that,

"He would be remembered during the time of Favour and Disfavour."

It is not impossible to see the genesis of an eschatological interpretation here. M.M.⁴⁶ also mentions that the Taheb will come,

"And clear away the darkness which has become great in the world;"

that,

"The Lord will have mercy and reveal His Favour;"

and that the Taheb will,

"Separate the chosen from the rejected."

The Sam. hold that the Taheb will separate the good ones from the evil ones, and that this is part of his function on the Day of Judgement. A remarkable omission from the six books of Memar Marqah is that there is no mention of "The Hundred Years." An attempt has been made to show that "The Hundred Years" is an eschatological concept associated with the advent of the Taheb. It has been shown that, from analysis, it is a 14th cent. concept. It could have been omitted from M.M. either because M.M. is very early - a

viewpoint held by the translator of M.M., Dr. Macdonald - or that the "millennial" period of "The Hundred Years" has been dropped because the Divine Favour is no longer an epoch in time, but now coincides with the end of time. The concept of "The Hundred Years" would also have to be dropped - being itself a period of Rahutah - if the writer of M.M. believes that the complementary aspects of Rahutah and Panutah are eventually to prevail simultaneously. From the point of view of the writer of M.M. one period is not to exclude the other, but that they are complementary, and will coincide with the Day of Judgement (i.e. vengeance and recompense.)

5. "MEANS OF GRACE"

Ever recurring themes in the Sam. writings are the Covenant, Circumcision and the Sabbath. These received from the Sam. the same high veneration that they did with the Jews. So vital were they in the lives of the Sam. that they could almost be regarded as "means of grace." They believed that the covenant relationship with Yahweh was essential to their physical and spiritual well-being. Not only in the Sam. writings do they remind themselves of the covenant basis in their attitude towards God, but they also are not backward in reminding God of the covenants that were made with the Patriarchs. Indeed the covenant was the

instrument whereby the tribes were welded together as a whole with Yahweh as their God. A covenant with God was virtually a modus vivendi for it meant that the person or persons entering into a specific relationship with God thus became separate and apart from the world.

If the covenant was the contractual basis for an exclusive relationship with Yahweh the instruments whereby this exclusiveness was maintained were the Sabbath and Circumcision, which in one sense are means of grace within the means of grace. These external religious observances assumed a greater prominence after Israel returned from Exile. The rite of Circumcision and the rite of Sabbath were marks of distinction, which only served to emphasize the separation of Israel from the world. Of the reasons which the several legal codes give for Sabbath observance, the Sam. accept that of the E⁴⁷ source, namely because God rested on the Sabbath day; the J⁴⁸ source gives no reason; the D⁴⁹ source in memory of the Exodus; Source P⁵⁰ as a sign between Yahweh and His people. The Code of Holiness⁵¹ gives no reason, while the Book⁵² of the Covenant states that the reason is so that beasts, slaves and strangers may rest.⁵³ Therefore, the real reason for the origin of the Sabbath is unknown. However, the continual emphasis in the Sam. writings is on Rest.

Circumcision is an ancient institution, although in the

O.T. it is claimed as of Hebrew origin. The P⁵⁴ Source attributes it to Abraham; the E⁵⁵ Source to Joshua; and the J⁵⁶ Source to Moses. It was, however, common to most of the Semites. The Sam. ascribe it to Abraham; thus, in this instance preferring the P Source, whereas for the reason for keeping the Sabbath they have preference for the E Source.

In spite of the ideological background of the Covenant, Sabbath and Circumcision receding so far back into history they constitute for the Sam. an invaluable vade mecum possessing a spiritual significance for them, and thus becoming "means of grace."

The Covenant

The Covenant between God and Israel, especially the one effected at Sinai, was not a natural connection but an artificial one. It had not always existed. It had a definite beginning in time, and would conceivably have an end. While this obvious fact was well known, it is not always stressed by the Sam. Indeed they assume that it would not happen, although being fully aware that it could happen. The appeal is always that God will not forget the Covenant He has made. For example Amram Darah (C.p.29) writes:-

"Forgive us my Lord, for we live like the dead,
And remember unto us the covenant of the dead,
who are as alive."

This is not to mean that the dead were alive, but that the Covenant of those now dead was to be still effective for those who followed on; that the dead had not died "intestate." The instrument was effective for those who followed on. In other words although a Covenant had been contracted sometimes on an individual basis - as with Abraham - the benefits were for the nation.

However, the Sam. also knew that they should not forget their obligations. The Defter (C.p.12) states:-

"Thou didst reveal unto them all Thy decrees and sendest them the writing of Thy hand, that they forget not Thy covenants with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Thy servants."

Marqah makes topical reference to the Covenants when he writes(C.p.18):-

"Thou rememberest and forgetest not the Covenants with those who love Thee."

The 14th cent. Sam. writers still stress the Covenant relationship with God. Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.496) writes of God:-

"He will come because of His Covenant."

This confidence in the Covenant, even in the 14th cent. in spite of adverse physical conditions, speaks well of the Samaritans' faith in God. They are still convinced that God is with them, and that as the Covenant was of great value in the biblical past, so in the 14th cent. it possesses qualities akin to "means of grace." On the other

hand the insistence of the validity of the Covenant, even in the 14th cent. could suggest to the modern psychologist that the Sam. never grew up spiritually; that so inhibited were they, by looking back, like Lot's wife, that they still needed a "prop." It could, however, be maintained that the Sam. wants to convince himself, if not others, that he has maintained continuity with the Israel of biblical times; that he is a true descendant of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and that the Covenant is not "a prop", but a "bridge" or "connecting link" uniting the present with the past, and that the Covenant is efficacious for the future. In other words, the Covenant was a symbol of the Sam. fidelity in God's steadfastness and mercy.

Circumcision.

Circumcision is closely associated with the Covenant, for as Genesis⁵⁷ affirms:-

"It shall be a sign of the Covenant between me and you."

The writer of Deut.⁵⁸ came to use the word Circumcision metaphorically when saying:-

"Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no longer stubborn,"

implying that Circumcision was an instrument of conformity. Metaphorically it meant being purified spiritually. The Defter stresses the spiritual side of the rite of Circumcision, saying (C.p.83):-

"We shall circumcise our hearts to reverence
Thee"

A Qaddishah (C.p.11) states:-

"And circumcise the foreskin of our hearts
to love Thee."

In every case in the Defter Circumcision is used metaphorically suggesting that if the physical form of Circumcision was a sine qua non for a Sam., the spiritual side of the rite was not to be overlooked.

Ab-Gelugah (12th cent., C.p.77) in his prayer, in which he beseeches the acceptance of it "on behalf of" the various Patriarchs he names refers to "Abraham the circumciser who circumcised himself."

Against this ideological background the 14th cent. writers add nothing that is new. Circumcision is a sign of Particularism; it separates the Sam. from the uncircumcised. As a mark of distinction Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.512) has already referred to it. He makes mention of "the nations and the uncircumcised."

The Sabbath

The Sam. approach to the Sabbath is based on the fact that God rested on the Sabbath day. The Defter has a prayer (C.p.68) where circumcision and sabbath are stated to be revealed means of grace. It states:-

"He revealed circumcision to Abraham, a requirement never to be abolished, the sabbath he revealed to Moses, a festival which cometh every six days, he that forsaketh them both and goes his way is like a choice thing desecrated."

Rest is a prominent characteristic throughout the Sam. Liturgies, so much so that God is designated as the Creator of Rest. This aspect is further emphasized by the 14th cent. Sam. writers, stressing as the Defter does, that God created the world without fatigue. Hymn One⁵⁹ (in the CAR. SAM.) says:-

"You have created without fatigue Thy excellent works."

Also:-

"You have rested without fatigue on the seventh day."

No doubt this was but a further extension of the anti-anthropomorphic concept so much in evidence among the Sam.

The Durran (C.p.45) says:-

"Mighty is the power of Him, the Creator of Rest, which did not come from toil, so that mortals might rest."

It may be suggested that familiar expressions like "Creator of Rest", and "God of Rest", might be better translated as "Creator at Rest" and "God at Rest." What has the writer of the Durran (C.p.45) really in mind? It might be that a more correct exegesis occurs if the religion of Brahminism is kept in mind, especially their teaching about God. "Power" for them is God in action (Sakti), and

"God at Rest" is Siva (Stasis). One is an aspect of God as active, and the other of God as passive (Aristotle's "Unmoved Mover"). The God at Rest signifies a Rest which does "not come from toil", the kind of toil which leads mortals to rest.

An analysis of one of Abdullah b. Solomon's hymns (C.p.746) shows a very close affinity with the tenets of the Religion of Brahminism, and it is from an examination of these tenets that a possible clue to a mystery in this hymn arises. L.C. Green⁶⁰, in translating the hymn (C.p. 746) leaves Aholam Ala untranslated. The line is:-

"Aholam Ala said."

If A is considered to be a negative particle, and the verb to be Halam (to strike or make), then Aholam Ala would mean the "non-making" or "non-striking" God, or God at Rest. So that the translation would be:-

"The God at Rest (Siva?) said."

In Brahminism it is Siva who speaks the "words" and Sakti who creates the world of objects.

While Covenant, Circumcision and Sabbath are deeply embedded in biblical history, the Sam. considered them to be "symbols" whereby God manifested Himself to man. By observing strictly the rites of Circumcision and Sabbath, they never forget that they had a Covenant relationship with Yahweh; they were His people, and He was their God. They

could be conceived as "Means of Grace", for with them, they the Sam., through faith, were able to face ordeals as they occurred from cent. to cent., if not with complete confidence, yet with resignation. Their faith in God never wavered. God was ever brought near to their notice via the means of Covenant, Circumcision and Sabbath. From these the Sam. received spiritual comfort in their commemoration and observance. To that extent therefore God was continually manifesting Himself to them. Are these "symbols" then not to be accorded recognition of "Means of Grace" ? They could be so considered.

M.M.⁶¹ also retains the concept of the Covenant as a "Means of Grace." It says:-

"Perhaps the wise will cry out, 'were it not for the covenant we would have perished, for we have secrets and signs from Abraham. Because they are (yet) with us, deliverance is near.'"

There is mention⁶² later of,

"The meritoriousness of Abraham, through whom the origin of the covenant was revealed."

Book ii⁶³ mentions Israel exulting after their deliverance from Egypt,

"Giving thanks to the Lord of the world, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who remembered for them the covenant with them."

The writer may here have in mind the fact that in Marcion's Gnostic system a distinction is made between the Supreme God (i.e. Most High) and Yahweh of the O.T. Yahweh the

Demiurgos⁶⁴ or Cosmo-Crator was held to be a just God but not good. This is not an irresponsible conjecture for the writer has already said⁶⁵:-

"By it (i.e. My great name YHWH) the world is bonded together, and all the covenants with the Righteous are bound by it for ever. I shall not forget it as long as the world exists. Since you are with the Most High of the whole world, I have revealed to you my great name."

There are two Gods implied here; YHWH and the Most High; in the Gnostic system of Marcion Yahweh the creator, and the Supreme God (i.e. The Most High). The writer of M.M. is emphasizing that, for him, the Lord of the world (i.e. Yahweh of the O.T.; the Just God) has wrought salvation for Israel out of the hands of Egypt, by means of the covenant, an instrument of grace.

⁶⁶ Book ii makes reference to the Sabbath as a city, all of it blessing; it is a place wholly sacred. The writer states:-

"Then included the creation and Sabbath, abundant existence wholly good, for God established it on the foundations of creation."

Abraham⁶⁷ is mentioned in a similar context:-

"For he looked for a city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

The context could be read as suggesting that, as a sojourner in the land⁶⁸ he was looking for blessing associated with rest; one of the key-words in the Epistle. The uniqueness of Sabbath is indicated by being one of the seven special

things set apart as divine⁶⁹. The Sabbath was set apart by itself, bringing a blessing to those who "kept Sabbath", and thus affording efficacy accorded through means of grace.

"He gave a perfect law to His servants to provide life and length of days, for by the observing of it is the soul disposed, and according to the state of the soul is the body rightly disposed." ⁷⁰

This statement regarding the efficacy of the Law, in some respects, anticipates the modern theory of psycho-somatic medicine. There is a close affinity between body and soul, the one so often affecting the other. The Law is put forward in M.M. as having an effect for good if fully implemented. It is a perfect law and leads Man into perfection - a means of God's grace - if Man will but follow. So important is the "Two stone tablets" (i.e. The Law) that it was one of the "seven special things in the world which the True One chose and set apart as divine." It⁷¹ states that:-

"The two tablets are from the Divine One. He produced them by His power from the will of His mind."

Assuming the Gnostic basis, the two tablets would go forth from the Divine Light, as an emanation of light, and reach forth into the darkness of the world, and of Man's soul; the therapeutic quality of the Law helping to heal Man.

It⁷² is said of Moses:-

"You are the one who supplied the world with the light of life, to make men great who believe in Him."

The writer of M.M.⁷³ states that:-

"If it had not been for the great prophet Moses, the Law would not have been revealed."

He also ends the Book with the simple creed of but four tenets, one of which says:-⁷⁴

"For the holy law is your book."

M.M.⁷⁵ lays down the injunction of not deviating from the Law,

"For if you do, you will perish through defiling the Law; purity will not come near you again,"

thus stressing the qualitative aspect of life, with its motif of moral values; it being precisely in this sphere and context that God's grace comes to full fruition.

St. Paul had made a distinct contrast of the letter of the Law, and the spirit of it, but had emphasized:-⁷⁶

"For we know that the Law is spiritual."

The Sam. like St. Paul did not look upon the modus operandi in regard to the Law, as being one of merely mechanical compliance with its precepts. The Law came alive with subjective acceptance. It was failure to comply and react positively to the Law that brought about condemnation, for as St. Paul⁷⁷ said,

"The power of sin is the law."

Nevertheless the Sam. saw in the Law a means of grace; of

being in harmony, not only with one's own nature, but with God.

The writer of M.M.⁷⁸ says:-

"Thus our Lord has taught us that we possess light that illumines the world, written by God's finger."

But first and foremost the Law is the light which illumines the mind, but as it is for all then it can ultimately illumine the world. A little later the writer alludes to "The Lord of the World", and darkness. Marcion in order to resolve the difficulty of sin and suffering in the world took refuge in dualism. For him only light would dispel darkness. The writer of M.M. holds that the darkness is to be dispelled by illumination, but it is to be achieved by the Law. He⁷⁹ requests that:-

"Praise be to the illuminator who fills the wise with the spirit of wisdom."

That if it were not for the wise the world would not be crowned with grace. That thanks should be to the Divine One, who brought into being a "Holy scripture, wholly life, and blessings and mercies."

The writer of M.M. subscribes fully to the Law, the covenants therein, and the Sabbath as constituting means of grace. Circumcision is not stressed. It has already been shown how close is the relationship with God, the Law, and Moses. A lot of what is said about the Advocate in the Johannine Gospel, can be attributed to the Law, for the

spirit of truth⁸⁰ can be derived from the Law, whose synonym is Truth (Kustah). God sent the Law, that it might be with them for ever. The Law did teach Israel all things. The Law it was which proceeded from the Father. That it was there to guide Israel into all truth. Just as the means of grace was to be effected by the presence of the Holy Spirit, so God's grace was to be effectual to those who read the Law, for therein was the spirit of healing, and of harmony.

3. I N H I S T O R Y

GOD'S DEALINGS WITH PATRIARCHS AND
ISRAEL.

N O T E S

3. IN HISTORY

GOD'S DEALINGS WITH ISRAEL

1. Ezekiel, xviii, 4,20.
2. Gen. i, 27
3. Gen. v, 24.
4. Gen. vi, 8
5. Gen. v, 24; vi, 9.
6. Heb. xi, 5,7
7. Ex. iii, 6; Matt. xxii, 32.
8. Heb. xi, 22
9. Heb. xi, 23-29
10. Loane, Marcus L. Key-Texts in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Chap. xi.
Marshall, Morgan and Scott.

2. THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION

11. Deut. vii, 6; cf. vii, 7; xiv, 2; xxi, 5.
12. Oesterley, W.O.E. and Robinson, T.H.
op.cit. p.15
13. cf. Isa. vii, 3; x, 21.
14. Oesterley, W.O.E. and Robinson, T.H.
op.cit. p. 241
15. Humphreys, Christmas. Buddhism
ibid. p. 115
16. Acts vii, 1-53
17. Acts vii, 2
18. Acts vii, 9-28
19. Acts vii, 30
20. Acts vii, 8.

3. THE DOCTRINE OF THE MERITORIOUS ONES

21. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.231.
Gaster, Moses, The Commentary on the Asatir.
22. cf. The Pitron, p.221.
23. ibid. p.303
24. Sale, George. The Quran; Chap.iii, p.34.

25. Lerner, I. Dissertation, Leeds, 1956.
ibid. pp. 1-4
26. Ginzberg, Louis, The Legends of The Jews. 7 Vols.
27. iii, 49
28. v, 305
29. v, 305
30. v, 295.
31. Sale, George. The Koran.
ibid. p.418

4. FAVOUR AND DISFAVOUR

32. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. pp.241-242
33. Durran. Part of the Defter Attributed to Amram Darah
but all the Durran is not 4th cent.
cf. Cowley A.E. Vol.II, p.xxi.
34. Brown, S. op.cit. p.137
35. cf. Deut. xxxiii, 23.
36. Lerner, I. op.cit.
37. Gaster, Moses. op.cit. p.97
38. ibid. p.9
39. Cowley, A.E. : The Jewish Encyclopaedia.
Vol. X, p.669.
40. Tisdall, Dr. The Sources of the Koran, p.243
41. Gaster, Moses. op.cit. p.90
42. St. John 1, 5.
43. Bowman, J. B.J.R.L. Spring, 1958.
Art: The Fourth Gospel and The Samaritans.
44. M.M. Book iv, Par. 12
45. M.M. Book 1, Par. 1.
46. ibid. Book 1, Par.9.

5. "MEANS OF GRACE"

47. Ex. xx, 8-11.
48. Ex. xxxiv, 21
49. Deut. v, 12-15.
50. Ex. xxxi, 12-17

51. Lev. xvii - xxvi.
52. Ex. xxi - xxiii.
53. Ex. xxiii, 12
54. Gen. xvii, 1-14.
55. Josh. v, 5 ff
56. Ex. iv, 25 ff
57. Gen. xvii, 11
58. Deut. x, 16
59. Gesenius, Guil, Carmina Samaritana.
60. Green, L.C. Dissertation, Leeds, 1958.
61. M.M. op.cit. Book i, Par.2
62. ibid. Book i, Par.9
63. ibid. Book ii, Par. 3
64. Green, Samuel G. op.cit. p.176
65. M.M. Book i, Par.4.
66. ibid. Book ii, Par.7
67. Heb. xi, 10
68. Heb. xi, 9
69. M.M. Book ii, Par.10
70. ibid. Book ii, Par.1
71. ibid. Book ii, Par.10
72. ibid. Book vi, Par.8
73. ibid. Book ii, Par.10
74. ibid. Book ii, Par.12
75. ibid. Book iii, Par.7
76. Rom. vii, 14
77. I Cor. xv, 56
78. M.M. Book vi, Par.2
79. M.M. Book vi, Par.7
80. cf. St. John xiv, 17; xv, 26; xvi, 13.

P A R T II : B E L I E F I N M O S E S

1. The Doctrine of Moses as exemplified in the Defter.
2. Son of His House.
3. Moses as Saviour.
4. Pre-existent Moses.
5. Did the Sam. have a Logos-Doctrine connected with Moses?
6. The Drop (or Spark) of Light.
7. The Birth of Moses.
8. Moses Redivivus.
9. Other features in the Sam. Doctrine of Moses
 - (a) Aaron b. Manir
 - (b) Abisha b. Phinehas
 - (c) Abdullah b. Solomon.

1. THE DOCTRINE OF MOSES AS
EXEMPLIFIED IN THE DEFTER.

With regard to the Doctrines held by the Sam., J.W.Nutt¹ states that no very exact account of the tenets held by them in the earlier stages of their existence can be obtained. This lamentable situation, in no small measure is due to the effective and rapacious policy of Hadrian, in the punitive methods adopted both against the Jews and the Sam. It is very likely that he did not stop to differentiate between Jew and Sam. Hence the vital importance attaching to such evidence as that incorporated in the Defter, in presenting a picture of Sam. beliefs. The danger always is that of reading into the data more than is actually present. Exegesis therefore is not only important to this case, but must be exercised with the usual safeguards and provisos. It is not always possible to arrive at a concise exposition of the philosophy or theology of a people only by studying their hymns, or their Book of Common Prayer, but it is possible to try to follow the road, by attempting to read the signposts, as accurately as is possible.

After stressing the Supremacy, Unity and Character of God, the Sam. give a very high status to Moses. To the instrumentality of Moses is not only attributed the Decalogue², but also the revelation of God's name. The Exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt also made a deep psychological impression on the Semitic mind, and this escape from bondage

was associated with Moses.

If the Jews held Moses in high esteem the Sam. did too, and indeed much more so. It is necessary therefore to examine the earliest documents in the Defter, to see how the Sam. conceived of Moses, especially as in the cent. following the fourth Moses, in the eyes of Sam. tradition, increased in stature or at least in their perception of him. Legend is never far away from fact, and the inevitable tendency to "rationalize" facts is a peculiar property of all nations, as exemplified in Mythology. Belief in Moses constituted an article of faith. In the early Sam. Creed (C.p.3) Moses follows immediately after God. The creed begins:-

"I am, that I am; My Lord, we worship none but Thee, nor have we any other faith but in Thee, and in Moses Thy prophet."

This formula or pattern was one which was later adopted by the Muslims, who affirm:-

"There is no God but Allah, and Mohammad is his Messenger."

Moses, for the Sam., was the prophet par excellence: none of such status followed or preceded him.

The insistence upon the Oneness of God in the Defter leaves no doubt as to the actual position of Moses in the hegemony of Israel. Amram Darah (C.p.28) says of God:-

"Thou alone art the Creator",
and, "Unique without associate, there is neither second nor consort."

As God existed at Creation "without an associate", any statement implying the pre-existence of Moses has to be carefully scrutinized and handled with care. What the 4th cent. Sam. thought about Moses is found epitomized in the following statement (C.p.84):-

"Remember for good, for all time, the righteous, the pure, perfect and faithful prophet, Moses, son of Amram, the Man of God, the universal prophet whom God raised up for the creation and for the day of vengeance. There hath not arisen a prophet like him nor shall there rise in the world a prophet like him."

It is not easy to understand precisely what is meant by being "raised up for the creation and for the day of vengeance." In the same paragraph (C.p.84) it also says:-

"From Adam up to the day of vengeance."

It may therefore be that Yahweh raised up Moses "for the beginning and for the end of time." But this terminus a quo and terminus ad quem does not clarify the position, unless the thought to be conveyed is that Yahweh had fore-ordained that Moses should be raised up, not in a pre-existent sense, but that he was raised up for the benefit of the created world, and that he was to be concerned with the day of vengeance, for the Sam. hold that God created the world "without associate." Or do we see here a modification of that teaching due to external influences? The Logos-doctrine³ would certainly, by the time of the 4th cent., be widely spread in Syria, and Palestine. The Sam.

subconsciously would attempt to keep abreast of the times, even in matters of doctrine, and on every occasion, and at every turn. Moses would be eulogized especially as the Christian Church did not, at any time, disparage Moses. The rapid growth of the Christian Church - receiving official status in the 4th cent. and becoming a religio licita - must have given the Sam. outside of the Christian Church an "inferiority complex." The tendency to elevate the name, and position of Moses, would be accentuated by external events. That the Christian Church compared Moses with Jesus Christ can be deduced from the evidence afforded by the existence of the Epistle to the Hebrews.⁴ It is not unlikely that the Sam. also made such a comparison but vice versa, and to the advantage of Moses.

What does the statement "whom God raised up" really mean? The word used in the Deftor is the Aphel of the verb Qum. There seems little doubt but that the writer has Deut.xviii.15 in mind where it says:-

"The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brethren." 5

For this verse the LXX uses the verb Anastesai. This verse is also used by Peter as a "proof-text" when speaking to the people at Solomon's Porch⁶; also by Stephen in his defence before the council, when he was accused, and arraigned, for speaking "blasphemous words against Moses, and God."⁷ With

reference to the coming prophet the verse Deut.xviii.18 was used as a "proof-text" by the Dead Sea Sect.⁸ Peter and Stephen are implying that Moses was referring to the advent of Jesus Christ. Peter in another speech⁹ says "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we are witnesses." The word here used for "raise up" is Anastesai, and from this word is derived Anastasis (Resurrection). Anastesai is used both in Deut.¹⁰ and in Ruth¹¹ to mean "To raise up the name (i.e. seed)." That the verb Anastesai implies continuity is seen in I Kings ii.35 (LXX version); "And I will raise up (Anasteso) to myself a faithful priest, who shall do all that is in my heart, and in my soul, and I will build him a sure house, and he shall walk before my Christ for ever." St. John¹² uses the word Anastesai in an eschatological sense; Kai (Kago) Anasteso Auton Ego En Te Eschate Hemera.¹³ It is therefore shown that the verb "raise up" has a number of meanings including:-

1. To cause to stand up, raise up, set up
2. To awake, raise up from sleep
3. To raise up from the dead.

But when the writer says that Moses "was raised up for the creation and for the day of vengeance," he may have been actuated by an outside source such as the Prologue of St.John. As Moses is to be raised up for two periods of time (i.e.The beginning and the end), it would seem that he occupies a position similar to that of the Logos. If the Prologue of

St. John was, as some scholars are inclined to opionate, a detached hymn, but filled out later by the writer of St. John's Gospel, then it could easily have been known by people in places like Antioch, where the Sam. are held to have had a synagogue. The Logos teaching in the first cent. was not unknown at Alexandria, where Philo lived, and where many Sam. also had a synagogue.

Dr. Solomon Brown¹⁴ in his Thesis on the Ancient Sam. Defter does not hesitate to translate Adonan as our Lord, when referring to "Our Lord Moses the Prophet" (C.p.82). To ascribe Lordship to Moses does not lead to any change in the status of Moses in relation to God, for Adonan could easily be rendered as our Master (cf. Jewish Rabbenu Moshe): in any case Adonan is distinct from Adonai, which as Lord is applied exclusively to God. The Pentateuch reserves the title Lord for God, especially where Moses is mentioned in the same context as God.¹⁵ The early Christian Church soon came to associate Lordship with Jesus Christ, and this attribute to Jesus cannot have gone unnoticed by the Sam. people. The status of Moses is established and stabilized, when Moses is alluded to as "Our Lord Moses, the messenger of God" (C.p.82). When the expression Lord is applied to God, the Defter uses Adonai, Yahweh or Mar. In the LXX these terms are usually equated with Kurios. "Although in O.T. regularly applied to God as equivalent of Adonai,

Yahweh, this word does not in itself necessarily involve divinity. The Jews applied it to their Messiah (Mark xii, 36, 37, 41; Psalms of Solomon xvii, 36, BASILEUS AUTON CHRISTOS KURIOS) without thereby pronouncing him to be God."¹⁶

The Durran (C.p.46) refers to Moses as "The Holy Prophet." An examination of this adjective, and the use of it indicates that the word "holy" is not always used in a moral or spiritual sense. Rather is "holy" used as a quality of dedication and exclusiveness, for it is applied generally to people, places, the congregation and to angels. It carries with it the meaning of being devoted to God, rather than a moral quality. It is of that person or place "set apart", as for example the "Holy of Holies" in the O.T. This shade of meaning is prominent in the O.T. and is not an interpretation peculiar to the Sam.

Moses is also referred to as "the great light Moses" (C.p.46). The principle of illumination has become a prominent feature in different religions, and the Sam. religion is no exception. The concept of light, both physical and metaphorical as opposed to darkness is exemplified in many sacred writings. The O.T. and N.T. afford examples with "light" as a prominent feature. The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, and the Gospel of St. John make mention of "light" as a prominent motif. In the early

centuries the religious climate was charged with varying trends of thought, including Gnostic, where light began to have a mystical connotation, and a religious significance. But this does not mean that extraneous influences were at work in prompting the Sam. to speak of Moses as "The great light." Light had been associated with God for many cent. In fact, from the time when it was recorded that God pronounced the Lux fiat, light has possessed a mystical quality. That the Defter speaks of Moses as (C.p.46):-

"The great light Moses, the one trusted with hidden things",

recalls the words in the Book of Daniel¹⁷:-

"He (i.e. God) revealed the deep and secret things: He knoweth what is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with Him."

The Sam. were always aware that Moses was a priest; they never stressed the office of prophet to the exclusion of that of priest when thinking of Moses. The Defter (C.p.49) states that God said to Moses when he received the sacred scriptures,

"O priest, begin to read."

Yet Moses is also (C.p.288):-

"The prophet of all generations."

The point that Moses was a priest is not to be lost sight of when the problem of the "two Messiahs" is considered later.

There is no evidence in the 4th cent. that Moses is

other than a human being. There is no evidence that he is sui generis; at least not in this cent. Yet the Defter (C.p.40) eulogizes Moses, stating that, as a prophet, he is exalted, and glorified; that he was clothed,

"by a garment, such as no king is clothed with his fullness."

But his position in the economy of God is a unique one. The Sam., as also the Jews, were aware that God had a scheme of salvation for His people Israel, and that Moses was a vital link in this scheme. Dr. Ryder Smith¹⁸ says that

"A doctrine of salvation underlies all the thought of Israel",

and that,

"Moses under Jehovah, was the saviour of Israel."

Also that,

"He was a mediator between God and Man,"

for in an ideal sense he was

"Moses the man of God."

The O.T. states¹⁹ that as Israel had sinned, Moses said:-

"And now I will go up unto Jehovah: peradventure I shall make atonement for your sin."

By now it is seen how important a place Moses came to occupy in the hearts and minds of the Sam.; indeed he could not be left out of their creed. Marqah (C.p.50) brings Moses very near to God when he writes:-

"That all generations might believe
in God and in Moses."

Moses is fast becoming an article of Sam. belief, necessary to salvation, and in very close association with God.

The Council of Nicaea had taken place in 325 A.D., the conclusions of which were mainly embodied in the creed now called Nicene. As the majority of the Bishops present came from the East, the effects of this creed would soon permeate to every stratum of society, and every district. The Christian Church, we know, was in Samaria. Indeed the Bishop of Sebaste (Samaria) was actually at the Council.²⁰ In this creed a belief in "One Lord Jesus Christ" was included.²¹ It would not be difficult, in such circumstances, for the Sam. to postulate a positive belief in Moses as well as in God. A precedent for a belief in someone other than God, but not opposed to God, had been created. The Sam. while maintaining the unity of God, would have to give consideration to the position of Moses, especially as the fragile minds of men were inclined to postulate, and to seek comfort in a "deus - homo" at that time. Many people were looking for the advent of a Messiah. The Gnostics, particularly the Valentinians, like the Christians, conceived of this Messiah becoming a real Saviour of Mankind. In the Defter while Marqah (C.p.26) speaks of God as:-

"Saviour of our fathers,"

Eleazar b. Phinehas (1363 - 1387; C.p.36) states:-

"Moses His servant, is a mighty prophet,
mighty of name; Our saviour who saveth;
now and hereafter we shall rest."

Moses is mentioned by Marqah (C.p.50) as:-

"The faithful one, who was entrusted over the
house of His God." 22

The Epistle to the Hebrews²³ refers to the faithfulness of both Jesus Christ and Moses, the former as a son, and the latter as a servant. The Sam. continuously refer to Moses as "The Faithful One" (cf. C.p.83 passim). It was in the 4th cent. in Marqah's great Memar that the concept, "The son of His house"²⁴ first occurred with reference to Moses. There is no mention of it in the other available 4th cent. material.

The pregnant question here is whether Marqah is propounding an Adoptionist theory with regard to Moses. The Adoptionist theory in connection with Jesus Christ reared its head about 200 A.D. One, Theodotus by name, taking up an error from the EBIONITES, asserted that Jesus Christ was "adopted" as son of God. However there is a legitimate doubt as to whether the Sam. ever accepted an Adoptionist theory about Moses for the Sam. right up to the 14th cent. and beyond never conceived of God as Father. Yet this might well have been the very bulwark on which to build an Adoptionist theory. The "son of Thy house" appears to be more than a mere solecism; even if a periphrasis, it still pin-points a vital filial relationship. Amram the

H.P. (C.p.31) states specifically of God:-

"He magnified the son of His house from
all the sons of the house of Adam."

By a simple process of analogy is the expression "Son of His house" parallel in meaning to "The sons of the house of Adam"? No Sam. writer ever dares to refer to Moses as "Son of God", but as "Man of God" (C.p.84). And as the Fatherhood of God is never mentioned by the Sam. the "sonship" of Moses is in some doubt. Yet the principle of adoptionism is not to be completely left out of consideration. The inuendo must carry responsibility, and there is, at least, an implied "divinity", however that "divinity" may be conceived. Eleazar b. Phinehas (C.p.32; or Amram Darah?) plays with this possibility for he writes:-

"Happy are we with Thy teachings which
Thou gavest to the son of Thy house.
Glorious is the prophet, garbed, with
the name of Thy divinity."

Anderson Scott deals with such a suggestion in Living Issues in the New Testament²⁵. He writes:-

"John too thought of Christ not as the absolute God, but as divine, one with God in an inherent and eternal relation which could best be described as Sonship, worthy to be loved, obeyed and worshipped as otherwise men love, obey and worship God alone."

This completes the survey of Moses as exemplified in the Defter. There has been attempted, as it were, a survey separated from that early scene by more than 1500 years. If any details have escaped this careful scrutiny, at least there

has been achieved an outline of what the 4th cent. Sam. believed about Moses. It is a background which will be useful as a criterion, by which later ventures in the doctrine of Moses can be assessed.

2. SON OF HIS HOUSE

An attempt to ascertain the first occasion for the use of this expression is fraught with difficulty. In Sam. literature it is found both in the Defter, and in M.M. In Book I of M.M.²⁶ in a narrative dealing with the deliverance of Israel out of the hands of Pharoah, God says:-

"Arise, go, Moses the son of my house, for I intend to teach you wonderful things."

The fact to be noted is that the expression occurs in a context dealing with the Israelites in Egypt. In the Epistle to the Hebrews where Moses is "faithful in all His house as a servant"²⁷ and Jesus is "faithful over God's house as a son"²⁸, we read that they all came out of Egypt by Moses.²⁹ But in the original reference to God's house where it says³⁰ :-

"My servant Moses is not so; he is faithful in all mine house",

it is not in a context dealing with Egypt, which might suggest that the writer of M.M. either knew of the Epistle to the Hebrews, or was aware of the contents of this third chapter. Or there might be a link between the Defter and

M.M.

In Book II³¹ of M.M., also in the Egyptian context, it says:-

"Moses, the son of His house, be magnified,
son of Amram, whom the Lord knew face to
face, in things concealed and revealed."

In the Defter the expression occurs in the hymn of Amram Darah the H.P. (C.p.31). In this hymn "Son of Thy house" is mentioned once, and "Son of His house" twice. This hymn could be accepted as a commentary on the third chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In both cases God's house is mentioned three times, while there are other corresponding features.

The other occasion in the Defter when the expression "Son of Thy house" is used, is in a hymn (C.p.32) where there is a doubt about authorship. Brown³² ascribes it to "Amram Darah or Eleazar." Cowley³³ writes, "probably Eleazar, wrongly ascribed to Marqah." It appears safer to ascribe it to Eleazar (14th cent.). Here again the hymn could be taken as a commentary on the third chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Should the writer be the 4th cent. Amram Darah, who probably was the father of Marqah³⁴, this hymn would also tend to confirm the hypothesis already put forward by the author of this thesis, that Amram knew of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There might be a link here with the Defter and M.M. with the third chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews as an

ideological background.

Aaron b. Manir (C.p.182) refers to Moses as:-

"His servant and son of His house",

which again pin-points the discussion occurring in the Epistle to the Hebrews,³⁵ where the contrast is between Moses as a "Servant"³⁶ and Christ as a "Son."³⁷ To Ben Manir Moses is both "servant and son of His house."

"The son of Thy house" is mentioned by Jacob Ha-Rabban (D.1348; C.p.658) in the Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy. The only other occasion when the phrase "His servant and son of His house" is used is in the Passover Liturgy in a 14th cent. hymn of praise composed by Mattanah Ha-Mizri (C.p.266). It is a phrase that does not seem to have become over-popular with the Sam. who are vulnerable to ideas that already have the imprimatur of precedence.

According to Sa'Dallah Al-Kethari (C.p.256) God is held to have seen the affliction of His people, and to have referred to Moses as:-

"O my servant and son of my house."

Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.375) in his hymn has much to say about Moses. Here again it appears to be a fairly accurate and close commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. He refers to Moses in language ascribed to Jesus Christ, such as Glorified One, Prophet, Priest, Prince, and Apostle of God. He mentions Moses as:-

"Son of His house",

and

"The faithful one over all my house."

The original text on which this assertion is made is

Numbers³⁸ :-

"Not so with my servant Moses; he is entrusted with all my house."

The latitude shown by the Sam. writers in using either "His house" or "All His house", has sound warrant in that Hebrews³⁹ shows a similar deviation. In this Greek verse⁴⁰ "All" is omitted by papyri 13 and 46; Codex Vaticanus; The Egyptian Texts both Sahidic and Bohairic; Cyril of Alexandria and Ambrosiaster. The word "Son" has crept in from a source other than the Pentateuch, which could be Christian.

That Moses is referred to as the "Son of His house" means that the Sam. imply "Sonship" to Moses, without ever referring to God as "Father". As God is never mentioned as "Father" up to and including the 14th cent. Moses can never be described as "Son of God." He is "Man of God", and "Apostle of God", but never described as "Son of God." He is not described as the Messianic "Son of Man." Yet Abisha writes of Moses (C.p.378):-

"What man among men is like thee?" "Who hath attained unto this except thee, O Apostle of God, and son of His house?" "What is this? One of the sons of men coming up unto us?"

As God was not acclaimed by the Sam. as "Father", the

mention of "Son" should not have arisen. It is hard to suppress the conviction that Abisha has copied the concept from his Sam. predecessors, or else has been influenced by the Christian atmosphere obtaining in Samaria. The ideological background of the idea of Moses being "Son of His house" would certainly appear to be Christian.

In the Legends of the Jews⁴¹ there is no reference to Moses as "The son of His house", but Moses is designated as:-

"My servant Moses, who is faithful in all Mine house."⁴²

Montgomery⁴³ says of Moses:-

"He is according to biblical terms, the Confidant of God, the Son of His house, with whom God talked face to face; he is also the end, the limit of all revelation, a very ocean of divine utterance."

In a footnote, Montgomery⁴⁴ draws attention to Gesenius's discussion of these epithets, and continues:-

"'The son of His house', properly 'slave', is used honourably, and seems to antagonize such an argument as appears in Heb. 3."

Gesenius does translate into Latin, "Son of Your house"⁴⁵ and "Son of His house."⁴⁶ Montgomery, however, is at fault for "The Son of His house" is not a biblical term, relative to Moses, as he states, neither is he correct in suggesting that "The Son of His house" should be equated with "slave." He also misstates and misconstrues the argument as it appears in Heb.iii. The core of the

argument in Heb. is that of a distinction between Therapōn, one who serves, attendant, servant, minister; and Huios, implying kinship, a son. The writer does not use Doulos or slave. St. Paul⁴⁷, in a similar domestic situation, uses the word Doulos for "Servant" or "Slave." The Doulos is a bondservant or slave, and in a certain domestic situation envisaged by St. Paul, "a child differeth nothing from a bondservant;"⁴⁸ whereas in Heb. iii a Therapōn is a servant, but not under bond. Montgomery's⁴⁹ case, therefore, that "The Son of His house", is but a "Slave" cannot be sustained.

The Muslims⁵⁰ do not refer to either Moses or Muhammad as the "Son of His House", so that the Muslims would appear to differ with the Sam. on this point.

3. MOSES AS SAVIOUR

Gnostic redemption consisted in an illumination of the mind, and a knowledge (Gnosis) of the secrets and mysteries, whereby Man attained to a perfect knowledge of God. In the Gnostic scheme of redemption a saviour came down to earth to liberate sons and enable them to escape from the mother (hulē) of the world.⁵¹ It is more than probable, however, that the concept of "saviour" is derived from Christian influences. God is not spoken of as saviour in the Pentateuch, although "the Lord saved Israel that day"⁵²

and Moses exhorted the Israelites to "see the salvation of the Lord."⁵³ In the N.T. God is referred to as saviour,⁵⁴ and Jesus is made mention of as "Saviour of the world"⁵⁵ by the Sam. woman. The only other mention of Saviour in a Gospel is when the angel of the Lord spoke to the shepherds and said⁵⁶:-

"For to you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord."

That the Gospels of Luke and John look favourably on the Sam. should not pass unnoticed. Is it mere chance then that Sa'Dallah Al-Kethari calls Moses "saviour"? (C.p.228; Abisha b. Phinehas also does so, C.p.410).

In the Defter, Marqah (C.p.26) speaks of God as:-

"Saviour of our fathers, from the hands of their enemies."

There is no mention of Moses as 'saviour' in the Defter.

A Malifut (C.p.667) of Abdullah is concerned solely with Moses whom,

"The Lord chose, the deliverer, the saviour."

Marqah in the 4th cent. applied both these terms to God, who was Deliverer (C.pp. 16,18) and Saviour (C.p.26).

Closely associated with the office of saviour is that of mediator. "A doctrine of salvation underlies all the thought of Israel,"⁵⁷ and is closely associated with the story of the Exodus with Moses as the instrument of intervention. Yahweh saved Israel through one man, Moses.

He was a mediator between God and man. Moses spoke for God to Israel; he also spoke on behalf of Israel to Pharoah. His unique position in the Pentateuch is epitomized when Moses spoke to the people⁵⁸ :-

"You have sinned a great sin; and now I will go up to the Lord; perhaps I can make atonement for sin."

This concept is retained by the Sam.. Ben Manir, speaking for them, says (C.p.322) of Moses:-

"Who maketh intercession on our behalf."

It is he always and not, for example, angels or aeons who come between God and Man. Montgomery⁵⁹ states that in heaven Moses figures as greater than the angels. Indeed in the Midrashic drama Moses always follows upon the Creator.⁶⁰

Abdullah (C.p.375) expresses the hope:-

"That he (i.e. Moses) may deliver from disfavour", and "He shall be set apart in the day of vengeance." Moses' ability to mediate is further achieved by the fact that, according to Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.379),

"The great prophet was 'glorified' and 'sat upon the throne', there 'to judge' and live 'for ever'."

A status not dissimilar to that accorded to Jesus Christ.⁶¹

That prayer came to have an important place among the Sam. was, in no small measure, due to the fact that "Moses had prayed to God on behalf of the people while he was on earth."⁶² It was due to this example, as well as to prayer

taking the place of the sacrificial system, when the latter became impossible through political events, that the Sam. developed a doctrine of intercession. Macdonald⁶³ continues:-

"Moses was the great intercessor; only through him could prayer be efficacious (cf. Heb. 5, 7,9)."

So the great intercessor came to be looked upon as a saviour. A doctrine of salvation underlies all the thought of Israel, and as the Exodus was the locus classicus, the Sam. have it as a recurring theme in their liturgies. While for Israel, Yahweh, in an ultimate sense, was the only saviour, "He saved her in the Exodus through one man, Moses."⁶⁴ He was the chief mediator and advocate between God and Israel. It is not without some significance that on the Sam. "Day of Atonement prayer took the place of sacrifice prescribed in the Law."⁶⁵ Moses anteceded Jesus Christ in an historical sense by making atonement for the people. Even with Moses the personal element in sacrifice is to be seen.⁶⁶

"And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin; and now I will go up unto Jehovah; peradventure I shall make atonement for your sin. And Moses returned unto Jehovah, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin - ; and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written."

Moses had, during his lifetime saved Israel from suffering,

from slavery and from perishing. Above all he wanted to save them from sinning. He did not save them from punishment - hence the forty-years wandering in the wilderness - but he did save them from the uttermost consequences of Yahweh's justice and vengeance. So the Sam. Day of Vengeance and Recompense is associated directly with Moses in his traditional role of intercessor. The Sam. believe that on this great day Moses will ask forgiveness of God for Israel. Indeed so great is Moses that he will pray for the guilty and save them! He is to be the great advocate and intercessor on the last day. "He will come again at the Resurrection, will gather his people together, the dead and the living, restore true worship, and bring in an era of peace. In God's own time will come the Day of Vengeance and Recompense when he as Intercessor will save his people."⁶⁷

4. PRE - EXISTENT MOSES.

The pre-existence of Moses is implied by Abdullah (C.pp. 746-753) for he writes:-

"He walked in the knowledge of the Lord from the day of the creation of Man."

He was established as a "drop of light." This drop (or spark) of light eventually received human form when, via the ancestral line, it materialised in Moses; a kind of metempsychosis. In some respects it recalls to mind

the Kenosis doctrine of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians.⁶⁸ The Johannine verse, "The true light that enlightens every man was coming into the world",⁶⁹ seems to reflect the concept that Abdullah had anent Moses. That Moses' birth was abnormal - a seven-months old premature baby - was advanced by Abdullah, probably on the assumption, influenced by ancient tradition that seven-months old babies are extra-ordinary babies. Robert Graves draws attention to this tradition, referring to Apollo⁷⁰ as a seven-months child; and to Dionyseus and Eurystheus⁷¹ as children of seven-months. Abdullah, on the other hand, may have had Semitic reverence of the number seven as the precipitating factor in mind. An analysis of the Sam. mind reflected in the 14th cent. writings suggests that Moses was a prototype of a kind akin to Jesus Christ. Moses was for them sui generis.

Referring to the Sam. doctrine of the pre-existence of Moses, Montgomery⁷² says this theologumenon is infrequent. He states that God set Moses as a drop of light, passing from generation to generation (distillation to distillation), and then he descended into Jochebed's womb and was placed in her.⁷³ This doctrine is nothing else than a replica of the later Islamic doctrine or tradition of "The light of Muhammad."

Of Moses Abdullah continues:-

"He shone in the firmament of the Migdol
(Constellation) of Jochebed."

This "spark" or "drop" was reserved by God, and inserted into the womb of Jochebed,⁷⁴ Mother of Moses, so that when Moses was born he was born parthenogenetically (cf. The Christian Creed re Jesus: "Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.")⁷⁵

Of Moses it could be said he was the quintessence of light. Abdullah states that whereas the Daleth (= 4 in Hebrew) of the name Adam constituted the "four elements", the "Mem" symbolised Moses, who partook of the fifth element or essence, "the quintessence." In ancient and medieval philosophy the fifth element, apart from the other four elements of fire, earth, air and water, was latent in all things. It was the pure essence, the essential principle constituting purity. For the Sam. Moses was the quintessence of light. This "distillation" of light was inserted into the womb; the womb psychologically being symbolic of the material world, or realm of animated nature.

That Muhammad in the Muslim world is also referred to as the "drop of light" posits an interesting problem. Did the Sam. borrow this doctrine from the Muslims, or vice versa? Another possibility is that both derived the concept from another primitive source. Dr. T.H. Gaster suggested to me in conversation that it appears to be a

mixture; that an interplay of ideas cannot allow of the truth being reached. Another opinion is that the Muslims borrowed from the Sam. On the other hand, Dr. J. Bowman, in conversation, said that the Sam. had the idea originally. The opinions of various acknowledged authorities in the field of Sam. studies only shows how difficult the problem is to resolve.

On the birth of Moses, Abdullah continues:-

"And the day of his birth was celebrated with rejoicing among the Angels."

The supernatural aspects of the birth of Moses are in alignment with the Christian doctrine of the birth of Christ. In the gospel story,⁷⁶ "An angel of the Lord appeared to them (i.e. the shepherds), and the glory of the Lord shone around them." "And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host."⁷⁷ Abdullah writes:-

"The glory is his companion, and the hosts of the Holy One in their places."

As Abdullah refers to Moses as "The light of the world", the Gospel of St. John comes to mind. An analysis was made of both Abdullah's Hymn of the Birth of Moses and of the Gospel of St. John. It was discovered that quite a number of the features in the Hymn had their counterpart in the Gospel. A further examination and analysis revealed that a number of features in the Hymn had a very close similarity to the tenets of the religion of Brahminism.

This, however, need occasion no surprise, for the Brahmins are a priestly caste, tending to have a "Levitical" outlook. Such evidence must, in the very nature of the case, in the light of Sam. conservatism, always be tentatively received, but while the allusion to the religion of Brahminism does restrain enthusiasm for affirming that Abdullah had the first eight chapters of the Gospel of St. John before him - especially the Prologue - the analysis would tend to confirm the view that he not only did so, but that he looked upon Moses as the "Logos" (The Brahmin Vak) and that he pre-existed.

It is not always possible to discover whom Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.494) has in mind when he refers to the "Speaker" or "Proclaimer." He writes:-

"The Speaker at Creation, the Speaker of
'Let there be light'."

Macdonald⁷⁸ states that the Speaker here is Moses. If Abisha is not guilty of a confusion of thought, then he is seeking to eulogize the position of Moses by innuendo. If he intends it to be understood that Moses said, "Let there be light", then Moses certainly pre-existed, being taught (C.p.379)

"The secrets of the world from before the
beginning until after the day of vengeance."

The Sam. look upon Moses as "the light of the world" (C.pp. 746-753); "the light of the prophets" (C.p.292),

while Eleazar b. Phinehas (C.p.329) refers to Moses as:-

"O Light of creation."

The inference is that when God said,⁷⁹ "Let there be light" Moses was involved. Montgomery⁸⁰ has indicated that this theologumenon of the pre-existence of Moses is infrequent. This pre-existence of Moses is not obvious in the 4th cent. Defter, but is to be found in M.M.⁸¹ Rather in the Defter it exists chiefly as a doctrine by implication; it is assumed rather than demonstrated. The doctrine became much more prominent by the 14th cent.

Book vi of M.M.⁸² deals with creation, and its general outline and plan recall one of the outstanding examples of Kabbalah literature, the Sefer Yetzirah. The great prophet Moses is concerned with the origin of the Earth, and is brought into discussion with certain of the Hebrew letters. After Alaf had finished speaking, Bit goes on to say:-

"O great prophet, whose position has been exalted throughout the generations of the world, you are the faithful one whom God entrusted over all that is past, and all that is to come. That which preceded creation was revealed to you, and what is to be after the day of vengeance you know."

The Sam., probably due to the influence, if not pressure, of the Christian Logos doctrine, elevated Moses to such a supremacy, that pre-existence became a necessary corollary. That comparisons were being made between Moses and Jesus Christ is evidenced from the Epistle to the Hebrews.⁸³ After

Moses had been declared to be "The son of His house" (surely a Sam. comment on the polemic of chap.iii), it would not be difficult to revert to the concept in Chap.i, and say of Moses

"Through whom also He made the worlds."

The ideological background of the pre-existence of Moses would appear to be sought, if anywhere, within the context of Christian doctrine, rather than Jewish or Islamic.

5. DID THE SAM. HAVE A LOGOS-DOCTRINE
CONNECTED WITH MOSES?

Moses Gaster⁸⁴ raises the question of the Logos doctrine in Sam. theology. He refers to "the theory of the Logos" as if not too certain about the "Ten Words" (Decalogue) being precisely what one would conceive as strictly a Logos doctrine. A Logos doctrine occurs where there is a relationship between the Word (or Words) spoken, and Creation. Is it possible to infer that Moses was in any way the "Creative Word"? The first point to be established would be that Moses pre-existed. If this matter, previously dealt with, has been satisfactorily examined, then what further evidence is there that Moses was the Logos? So much depends on the interpretation of Abdullah b. Solomon's hymn of the birth of Moses (C.pp.746-753). If Abdullah had in mind the first eight chapters of the Johannine Gospel and used them, then he

accepted the thought forms of that Gospel referring to Jesus Christ and appropriated them for Moses. If Jesus was the "Light of the world"⁸⁵ then so was Moses.

In the Gospel the beginning is associated with the Word. In the hymn the beginning is connected with the name of Moses. The Gospel states that "All things were created by Him."⁸⁶ The hymn affirms that Moses knows what preceded in creation. The writer of the hymn continues to refer to the key-theme of The Word. This cannot be without some significance in a hymn whose chief motif is the birth of Moses. At least the "Word" is not to be disassociated with the birth of Moses. Is not the inference from the hymn that Moses is,

"The word of the Lord" ?

Hippolytus is quoted as saying: "God spake and it came to pass . And this - as men do say - is what was declared of Moses: 'Let there be light.'⁸⁷ In the light of this statement, the sentence of Sa'dallah Al-Kethari (C.p.229)

"He was given a drop of light from the time that God said, 'Let there be light'",

might have a more recondite meaning that is at first supposed.

Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.508), while stating about the creation:

"A word from the mouth of Moses went forth",

also says (C.p.510):-

"And him who is nothing but a prophet - and thus came the word".

However, Montgomery⁸⁸ points out that in Sam. theology there is no development of a Logos doctrine. He states in this connection that there is little to show that Samaritanism was ever Gnostically minded.

Another point to consider regarding Moses and the Logos doctrine is that, on occasion, the Sam. writer is ambiguous in his intention. Aaron b. Manir (C.p.322) refers to God as:-

"The Proclaimer who proclaimed to the chief of the prophets."

Yet elsewhere (C.p.736) before the reading of the Ten Words in a Qataf the opening verse is:-

"Let the Proclaimer be glorified, who proclaims the Ten Words",

when the inference could be that it refers to Moses.

Indeed Green⁸⁹ adds a footnote:-

"This (i.e. the inference) seems most likely though the Proclaimer may mean God; but the very ambiguity itself testifies to the unique position of Moses."

Bowman⁹⁰ states that:-

"Moses in the 14th cent. thought and later is the word of God, the light which was created in the beginning, the spirit of God."

And if an ideological background is sought for these and other concepts, he goes on to say:-

"These ideas have more in common with early Christianity and Qumran than with orthodox Judaism."

It does appear therefore that the 14th cent. Sam. writers were entertaining the possibility of a Logos Doctrine in relation to Moses but that this tendency had not reached finality. No explicit statements are made, but the inference is there from which the conclusion may be drawn. The evidence therefore on the matter is very scanty indeed, and only tends to confirm what Montgomery has already stated, that there is no development of a Logos Doctrine in Sam. theology.

6. THE DROP (OR SPARK) OF LIGHT.

The 14th cent. writers Sa'dallah Al-Kethari (C.p.768) and Abdullah b. Solomon (C.pp.429 and 746) introduce a new concept when, in relation to Moses, they mention, "The drop of light." It is an emphatic piece of evidence that the Sam. were amenable to outside influences. First of all it is not without some significance that Moses is described as "The light of the world" (C.pp.746 and 768) in the Liturgy of the Feast of Tabernacles (Hag Ha-Succoth).⁹¹ When Jesus Christ said that he was the light of the world,⁹² it probably occurred at the Feast of Tabernacles. "Large candelabra were lighted in the Court of the Women on the evening of the first day of the Feast in memory of the

pillar of fire at the Exodus."⁹³ Abdullah was probably aware of the fact that the words were uttered at, or near, the Court of the Women. It seems also that he had the exodus in mind for he refers to Migdol when he wrote (C.pp.746-753):-

"He shone in the firmament of Amram, and he ascended into the Migdol of Jochebed."

Abdullah, like other 14th cent. writers, uses the Hebrew word Migdol (= Constellation) in an astrological sense, but Migdol⁹⁴ was the site of an Israelite encampment before they were led across the Red Sea by Moses. If Abdullah had the Gospel of St. John before him, he probably had the Court of the Women in mind, having alluded to the light of the world, and would be naturally led to think of Jochebed, the Mother of Moses. Also if he was aware of the tenets of Brahminism, as it is suggested that he was, then he would also be aware that "the drop of light" (Bindu) was placed in the womb of darkness.⁹⁵ Knowing of this tenet, and of Moses being the "Light of the World," it would be an easy transition of thought to conceive of Moses as the "Drop of Light" (C.p.746; Sa'dallah Al-Kethari, C.p.768).

But might not the concept of the "Drop of Light" be derived from another source? In the Gnostic Ophite system consisting briefly of the Supreme Being as "Light," there is a material world of four elements. There is an overflow of light which falls down as dew,⁹⁶ and the purpose of Christ

is to descend, and gather together all the dew of light. The consummation is effected when all the dew (drops) of light are gathered together and restored to the incorruptible Aeon. This may be the Gnostic way of handling material from the Stoics, for they speak of the divine seed or spark.

G. Gesenius⁹⁷ in Hymn No. three refers to:-

"Praecipua omnium creaturorum scintilla est de veste tua (igne tuo)."

Posidonius of Apamea (D. circa 50 B.C.) is held to have stated that the soul is a portion of the fiery cosmic spirit descended from heaven and imprisoned in a body. Plotinus, the early disciple, if not founder, of Neoplatonism, stresses that Man's supreme goal is the return of his soul to God, after it has been cleansed from all that separates it from God. The last Neo-platonist, Damascius, came from Damascus. There was a Sam. community in Damascus from early times.

The authoress, Charlotte Augusta Baynes,⁹⁸ points out that the name "Light" is continually applied to the Deity. It is stated that a "spark" (Spinther) comes forth from the Monad.⁹⁹ This "Monad also came forth from the Father as a spark of light."¹⁰⁰

The above evidence would tend to lead to the conclusion that when Abdullah wrote of Moses:-

"He shone in the firmament of Amram and he ascended into the Migdol of Jochebed,"

he is giving allegiance to a kind of sōma-sēma doctrine, in

which Moses "shone" as a light, and ascended into the material body (or constellation) of Jochebed his mother. There is an indication that the Sam. were prepared to use current literary figures and expressions without adopting the particular theological significance associated with those expressions.

The key-word "Light" is to be found in different religions, and indeed there are verbal parallels of the use of the word in Hellenistic mystery religions and philosophies. Light is a familiar expression in the Johannine Gospel, but here the conception and meaning is Jewish rather than Hellenistic.¹⁰¹ Later than the Canonical O.T. rabbinical thought referred to God Himself as the "Light of the World." The term "Light of the Messiah"¹⁰² is to be found also. "This 'Light of the Messiah' is also interpreted as the original light at creation, which it is said, God ultimately withdrew, in order to keep it for the righteous."¹⁰³ This concept the Sam. accept, hence their doctrine of the "Pure Chain."

Sa'dallah Al-Kethari (14th cent.; C.p.229) says Moses

"Was given a drop of light (Taphath Nur) from the time that God said, 'Let there be light.'"

But it is difficult to prove how Sa'dallah Al-Kethari came by the idea of a "Drop of light." Cowley¹⁰⁴ quoting Adler puts Sa'dallah Al-Kethari about a cent. earlier than Abdullah b. Solomon. The evidence showing that Abdullah was

influenced by the Johannine Gospel is strong.

Cognizance must be taken of the fact, in attempting to assess the ideological background of the Sam. that they were not entirely impervious to outside influences. There is no evidence that the Sam. had a great writer to be compared with the great writers of other nations. It remains to be seen, when all the Sam. writings are made public, whether Marqah or Abisha b. Phinehas will have any great impact on the literary critics. The concept of the "Drop of Light" is but a further indication, of perhaps something more tangible than a "coincidence of thought" as an explanation, of how the Sam. were prepared to use literary and theological expressions, and to make them peculiarly their own, without subscribing recognition to the source from whence they came, or giving recognition to the original meaning of the literary form adopted. In a sense they were plagiarists, but with a difference. They accepted the symbol, but invested with a meaning that brought it well within the fabric and context of orthodoxy, as conceived by the Sam. mind.

7. THE BIRTH OF MOSES.

The birth and life of Moses, and the important historical incidents appertaining to that life, are to be found in the Pentateuch, beginning at the Book of Exodus.¹⁰⁵

Such was the impact of Moses on the lives of the Sam., that the accretion of legendary material was inevitable, when the Sam. writers quoted him as a subject. These writers also would be actuated by a desire to place Moses on an even higher pedestal than the Muslims' Muhammad, and than Jesus Christ to the Christians. Indeed one cannot but demur from the assessment of Moses Gaster¹⁰⁶ of the later Sam. situation when he says:-

"They had no impulses from without, and no driving force from within, which could compel them to productivity."

J.E.H. Thomson¹⁰⁷ would give a different reading of the situation. He says:-

"Not impossibly the unique honour given to Mohammed by the Muslims, not to speak of the Divine Nature ascribed to our Lord by the Christians, would tend to exalt Moses to the sublime pedestal which he occupied in the faith of the Samaritans."

Thomson¹⁰⁸ points out that "The Birth of Moses" is the subject of writings from the 13th cent. onwards. Among other Sam. writings the Moled Moshe is found in the Asatir.¹⁰⁹ The Death of Moses is also a Midrashic subject as shown in the Asatir¹¹⁰ and in the Marqah's Memar.¹¹¹ It is, therefore, well to observe that there existed quite a fair amount of legendary material about Moses, his life, birth, and death, all of which forms an ideological background which the 14th cent. writers gave utterance to and interpreted, but, at the same time, never losing sight of tradition as embodied

in the corpus of 4th cent. writings.

Easily the most impressive piece of literature to be found in the Sam. Feast of Hag Ha-Succoth is "The Hymn of the Birth of Moses" (C.pp. 746-753). In it Abdullah b. Solomon, while expressing himself in the usual Sam. idiom, also introduces new concepts about Moses. The writer sets out to reveal some of the secrets, especially those connected with the name of Adam, with Moses in mind. The basis of the revelation of these secrets recalls to mind Kabbalah, which, long before the time of Abdullah, was widespread among Jewish people. Indeed part of the ideological background of this hymn is strongly reminiscent of Kabbalah philosophy. Abdullah refers to the Aleph of the name of Adam as the beginning of the signs (Alphabet?) and the numbers. From the second letter Daleth is derived the four elements. Thomson,¹¹² in examining Sam. Theology, states the belief that Man was made from "water and fire, from spirit and from dust;" the four elements first mentioned by Empedocles (495-435 B.C.). "Sparks" of the four corners, spread out into the four-letter name Y - H - W - H suggest the sparkling of a stone such as "sappir." Indeed the commencement of this hymn is phrased in a manner suggestive of "Sephroth" in Kabbalah. A basic feature of ancient Gnosticism was the concept of the soul as a spark from the Divine Light that had become imprisoned in

the dark world of matter.

From the "Mem" of the name of Adam comes Moses, in a manner almost akin to Gnostic "emanation." Abdullah is insistent that the "chain of purity" has linked Moses to Adam. It is not easy to discover whether he has the hereditary principle in mind, or the claims of an "apostolical succession." There is no doubt in the mind of Abdullah, that not only the families of the Patriarchs have their "roots" in Adam, but also "the Gentiles." Yet Abdullah cannot be called a Universalist. From the "Mem" comes Moses, who was "clothed" with the "garment of garments;" "clothed" with the "image;" "clothed" with the "shining skin." There is a continual emphasis on the word "clothe" (Labash). It is noted that the word is used in connection with Moses both in a literal and a metaphorical sense.

There is no doubt that Abdullah holds to the principle of differentiation, of selection and election, for he speaks of "the holy drops of the pure prosperity," and that Abraham takes hold of "the chain of his purity." The doctrine of selection and election is finally crystallized in Moses himself, who is viewed on occasion as being almost quasi-divine - "the most select of all who drew breath." At least his actions and words are vested with an authority more divine than human. Creatures rejoice in him but also fear

him.

Abdullah writes that when Pharaoh's daughter came down to the river and opened the ark, she and the women with her saw "The light of the world," and beheld this "Glory." By gazing on the babe Moses "The hurt that was in her and those with her was healed."¹¹³ "The light of the world" is an expression found in the N.T.¹¹⁴ The Prologue of St. John¹¹⁵ also associates "light" with "the world." The reference to Moses as "The light of the world" is first used by the Sam. writers in the 14th cent. viz. Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.746); Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.107), and Sa'dallah Al-Kethari (C.p.768).

It is indisputable that there is no reference in the Defter or in M.M. to the Moled Moshe in a miraculous sense. It was at one time held that the Asatir¹¹⁶ was early, and that it afforded evidence of the miraculous birth of Moses being accepted by the Sam. at a very early date. Moses Gaster¹¹⁷ mentions the chronicle Moled Moshe, and not only places it early but states that:-

"its structure and form reminds one very forcibly of some of the apocryphal gospels of the Nativity."

If this chronicle was so early it is surprising that there are not echoes of it in the Defter or M.M. Thomson¹¹⁸ has already been quoted as saying that the birth of Moses became a favourite subject of Sam. writers from the 13th cent.

onwards.

That there were Nativity Legends of Moses in existence cannot be denied in the early cent. These legends are mentioned in numerous documents such as "the Talmud, and Midrashim, the Palestinian Targum, the Antiquities of Josephus, the so called Biblical Antiquities attributed to Philo, the Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, the Book of Jasher, and the Chronicles of Jerahmeel."¹¹⁹ Schonfield¹²⁰ refers to the existence of Messianic nativity stories connected with Jesus Christ and John the Baptist. He alludes to the ancient promise in the Deuteronomic Code which was attributed to the great Lawgiver Moses. This promise said¹²¹ :-

"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me."

On this passage the Sam. based their faith in the advent of the Taheb, who was to be of the tribe of Levi (Moses' brethren). Jewish sages were inclined to draw analogies between the Messiah and Moses. Schonfield¹²² states that:-

"In the Jewish and Samaritan traditions of the birth of Moses we have the principal source of the Baptist and Christian nativity stories."

In the light of the evidence surveyed, it would be as well to enter a caveat in regard to the nativity stories of Moses derived from Sam. sources. In the six books of M.M. there is no mention of a miraculous birth of Moses. Yet Moses

figures prominently in M.M.. Book III refers to "Moses and the Levitical Priests," while Book V mentions the "Death and Glorification of Moses." If there had been a miraculous birth story of Moses in M.M. then the death of Moses would have been an embarrassment. Should anyone resort to the argumentum silentii stating that the miraculous birth story of Moses has been lost in M.M., then the situation has to be faced as to why the Book on the death of Moses was retained, and not that of his miraculous nativity. A noticeable feature of the D.S.S. is that there is no mention of a miraculous birth of Moses. Schonfield¹²³ quoting the Chronicles of Jerahmeel states:-

"And it came to pass at the end of six months from the time of her conception that (Jochebed)bore a son (according to some traditions, without pain.)"

Matthew Black¹²⁴, quoting from the Hymns of Thanksgiving¹²⁵ stresses the agony of a woman in child-birth, and continues:-

"For with the 'waves of death' she shall be delivered of a man-child,
And with pains of Sheol there shall break forth from the womb of the pregnant one
A Wondrous Counsellor in his right (Cf.IS.ix,6.)"

This male-child is identified with the Messiah by M.H.Brownlee,¹²⁶ and there is nothing to suggest that the D.S.S. subscribe to a miraculous birth "without pain."

Those who would see a close affinity of the Sam. with the Qumran Sect have this in their favour, that neither the Sam. nor the D.S.S. mention a miraculous birth of Moses. They

would appear to be outside the normal channel of Jewish nativity legends about the birth of Moses.

The Epistle to the Hebrews¹²⁷ makes no mention of the birth of Jesus Christ or of Moses, but Ps. 2¹²⁸ is referred to:-

"Thou art my Son,
This day have I begotten thee."

Black¹²⁹ points out that there is a possible allusion to this text in the D.S.S. where it says:-

"The following is a Session when God begets the Messiah (to be) with them."

That the writer of the Epistle does not go beyond the position stated in the D.S.S. should be noted. He does not introduce the concept of the supra-natural beyond that of being begotten, to emphasize the claims of Jesus Christ over those of Moses.

8. MOSES REDIVIVUS

Abisha b. Phinehas in The Samaritan Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy has a hymn which gives a picture of Moses in fuller detail that had previously been the case (C.p.494). He says of Moses (C.p.499; Stanza KAPH):-

"There has not arisen, and never will arise, any like Moses ben Amram.
Since the beginning of time, after to-day or up till to-day;
up till the Day of Vengeance and Recompense, a day which is sealed."

Also (C.p.697):-

"The like of him will never again arise, nor indeed has ever arisen."

This assumption is based on Deut. xxxiv, 10. The text (Deut. xxxiv, 10) says:-

"And there hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses."

The Sam. recension is however a contradiction of Deut. xviii, 15 and 18 upon which they rest their expectation of the Restorer.

Deut. xviii, 15

"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken."

Deut. xviii, 18

"I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto me; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him."

The Sam. believe that a man will arise who will restore the Divine Favour, bringing peace, victory and security to the nation. This person they designate the Restorer, the Taheb (rarely Shaheb). He is, in effect, the Sam. "Messiah." This matter will be dealt with more fully in a later chapter. The point to be discussed here is whether the Sam. came to believe that it was Moses who was to return - a Moses Redivivus.

Even in the 4th cent. the Sam. were convinced that another prophet like Moses would not arise. Thus the

Defter says (C.p.84):-

"There hath not risen a prophet like him,
nor shall there rise in the world a prophet
like him."

Indeed there are only four references to the Restorer or Taheb (C.pp. 4, 42, 45, 56) in the Defter. In M.M. however, the Taheb is referred to a number of times. An examination shows that in M.M. as in the Defter, Moses and the Taheb are distinct persons. In M.M.¹³⁰ the Taheb is mentioned five times, yet a little later with regard to Moses it states¹³¹:-

"None has arisen like Moses, and none will
ever arise."

The other occasions when the Taheb is mentioned are, once in Book II¹³² (Par. 8) and five times in Book IV¹³³ (Par. 11 and 12). There is nothing to suggest that Moses is thought of in terms of the Taheb. If Moses had been considered as the Taheb, one would expect there would have been much more evidence in the Defter to that effect. References to the Taheb in the Defter give the impression of being but incidental, which would suggest acceptance without special comment of an old tradition. There is no evidence in the Defter to show that the Sam. believed the Taheb to be another incarnation of Moses. Moses, for them is non pariel.

There is no evidence in the 4th cent. Defter to support M. Gaster¹³⁴ when, with reference to Deut. xviii, 15 and 18,

he writes:-

"They therefore interpret this promise to mean that out of the tribe of Levi, i.e. Moses' brethren, a prophet will arise like unto Moses; and as no one can be like unto Moses in all his perfection, they hold that perhaps Moses himself will come to life again and bring them the promised happiness."

When, therefore, Abisha (C.p.499) states with regard to Moses,

"The like of him will never again arise, nor indeed has ever arisen,"

is he suggesting that Moses is not the Taheb, but that Moses will himself arise again?

That Moses is referred to by Abisha (C.p.496) as:-

"The fourth from Levi,"

keeps the issue open, for the Taheb, when he comes, will be from the tribe of Levi.¹³⁵ The tribe of Levi is preferred to the tribe of Judah by the Sam.. In the original writings of the Testament of the XII Patriarchs, the Messiah was to come from Levi.¹³⁶ For some forty years the hope of a Messiah from the tribe of Judah was abandoned in favour of a Messiah from the tribe of Levi. But after the breach of John Hyrcanus with the Pharisees this hope was abandoned. First cent. B.C. additions to the Testament of the XII Patriarchs revert to the hope of a Messiah from the tribe of Judah.

Abisha subscribes to the doctrine of Moses Redivivus

when he continues (C.p.499):-

"Every one of these will say in his speech,
'Perhaps there will arise from me the prophet
of all mankind, whose name is Moses, who
delivered the Hebrews, who will arise to reveal,
and he will reveal every mystery.' "

For Abisha there will not arise any one like Moses
even "up to the Day of Vengeance and Recompense."

That Moses is not the Taheb is stressed by Abisha in
another hymn (C.p.511). Abisha states that:-

"They will come and believe in him (i.e. The Taheb),
and in Moses and his law."

Abisha again refers (C.p.514):-

"To the mention of Moses and the chosen Taheb."

In a hymn in the Liturgy of Hag Shabuot (C.p.375)
Abisha writes:-

"O Thou (i.e. Moses) with whom there is no
second, O son of Jochebed."

If there is no second like Moses, then the prophet, whose
coming is looked for by the Sam. can only be Moses. So
the 14th cent. Sam. believed in a Moses Redivivus, a
doctrine unknown in the 4th cent. Defter.

That there is an affinity between the concepts of Moses
and the Taheb cannot be denied or overlooked. For example,
in M.M. ¹³⁷ the trend of thought is as follows:-

- (1) "Where is there a prophet like Moses who fasted
40 days and 40 nights; he neither ate nor drank."¹³⁸
- (2) The Taheb will come in peace to possess the places
of the perfect ones and to reveal the truth.

- (3) The Lord will vindicate His people, the people of the Lord - Jacob, a descendant, and a chief root, and descendants from fathers, and sons, from Noah the origin to the Taheb his descendant.

That there is a confusion of thought among the Sam. cannot be denied. Logic is not always obvious in the realm of Theology. Truth sometimes is apprehended intuitively, and cannot always be demonstrated scientifically. Hymn writers are more inclined to approach a situation in a poetical sense, and are not concerned with seeming inconsistencies. The 14th cent. Sam. writers accepted the historical concept of Moses as portrayed in the Pentateuch. Samaria also looked for the coming of a Messiah,¹³⁹ and had done so from earliest times. Abisha b. Phinehas in the 14th cent. had attempted to formulate a clearer picture of the Taheb than had previously been the case. Yet certain questions could be asked where the answers would not be specific. Was Moses the Taheb? Was there to be a Moses Redivivus? It would appear that the Sam. had attempted to face up to the challenge of the Christian Church and its belief in Jesus Christ as the Messiah. The Christian Church believed that Jesus Christ was not only the Messiah, but that there would be a second advent. Logically as a reaction to Christian propaganda, Moses should be the Taheb, and that he should return a second time. Macdonald¹⁴⁰ is of the opinion that Moses is akin to the Taheb, for he says that,

"Tahebship is the true role of Moses."

He goes on to state:-

"It appears that the Samaritan theologians had never reached complete agreement on the question of the return of Moses. None of them speaks of the Taheb as Moses resurrected - at least not explicitly - but after the fashion of John 5,28 it seems that this is what he was, for Moses (in his role of Taheb) has an intercessory role to play in his resurrection."

Black¹⁴¹ would appear to support this view of Macdonald when he writes:-

"For it is well known that the so-called 'Samaritan Messiah', the Taeb (the title 'Messiah' is never applied to him) was conceived either as a returning Moses (the name Taeb means either the Restorer or the Returning One), or as a Moses secundarius."

But just as Thomas Aquinas (1227-74) was never really successful in welding Aristotelianism to Augustinian Theology in his Summa Theologica, so the 14th cent. Sam. writers have difficulty in reconciling Moses of the Pentateuch, with the assessment and interpretation of him, against the overtones of the Christian environment. If Sam. trends are to be crystallized, then Moses' position in the Sam. Church would differ very little from that of Jesus Christ in the Christian Church.

9 OTHER FEATURES IN THE SAM. DOCTRINE OF MOSES.

(A) Aaron b. Manir

In a hymn (C.p.649) which according to the Mss B.K,

A.1, some say is by Ben Manir, the writer places the exaltation of God side by side with the exaltation of Moses, for he says:-

"Let the name of God be exalted and the name of the prophet of Him be exalted,"

and continues by emphasising the unique relationship between them saying:-

"that no third person was between Moses and the Lord."

The Sam. throughout all their history have never deviated from the concept of Moses as being their true mediator and intercessor. The close affinity between an incorporeal deity and a physical prophet is a relationship which the Sam. make mention of quite often, yet never draw from it any metaphysical meaning. They knew from the pentateuch that God had said¹⁴², "with him I will speak mouth to mouth," also that "the Lord spoke to Moses face to face". "Face to face" is the more frequent expression in the Liturgy. Maimonides¹⁴⁴ states the obvious when he says that "face to face" means "both being present, without any intervening medium between them." He goes on to add, "the hearing of the voice without seeing any similitude is termed "face to face." Also, "thus it will be clear to you that the perception of the Divine Voice without the intervention of an angel is expressed by "face to face."

Ben Manir (C.p.679) has a prominent place for the

concept of "the light which illumines." Indeed his own name Manir, is associated with it, and "the light which illumines" is a stock phrase of his. He writes:-

"In the light which illumines, radiates, makes intelligent everyone who perceives:
See it come from his soul, seeking, seeking this light."

"It makes intelligent everyone who perceives" is an echo of what Maimonides has to say. Dr. J. Macdonald,¹⁴⁵ in a footnote indicates that "the reference seems to be to Moses." The Gospel of St. John, where light is a major concept, also refers to Moses on more occasions than do the other Gospels (i.e. eleven times). The above statement of Ben Manir recalls to mind St. John¹⁴⁶:-

"The true light that enlightens every man was coming into the world."

Incidentally in this hymn (C.p.679) Ben Manir also makes reference to "The Way" and of entering "the gateway of truth," stating also "you shall increase, not decrease."¹⁴⁷ Some of the phraseology is reminiscent of the Johannine Gospel. With regard to Manir and the writer of the Gospel there may be but a "coincidence of thought." Yet there does not appear to be any doubt whatever, that, on occasion, Ben Manir is in close alignment with the writer of St. John's Gospel.

The Sam. would be at pains to discover what other religious sects thought of Moses, and it is not an assumption

beyond redemption to believe, that the Johannine Gospel would form part of the ideological background of Sam. writers.

In another hymn (C.p.182) Ben Manir says of Moses:-

"Great was Moses who was first that He created, the last of the patriarchs, for he was given two names."

What is the true exegesis of this sentence? Moses had two names for the Sam.; "Moses" and "The name," the second being a play on the consonants, M. SH. and H. But is this really implied here? By "first" Manir must mean that Moses, in the sight of God, was the first in all creation. But what does he mean by the "last" of the patriarchs? In the Liturgies of Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread,¹⁴⁸ he does not appear to be a strong advocate of the Doctrine of Merit. He omits any mention of the "Meritorious Ones." However, he does mention in the Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy¹⁴⁹ the merit of the king, (i.e. Joseph; C.p.678) and of Moses (C.pp.646 and 678). He mentions also the "Pure Fathers" (C.p.650). On the evidence he does not appear to go beyond Moses in the ascription of merit. It could be that this is what he means by "the last of the patriarchs." But with the mention of "first" and "last" could it not be that he means these to be the two names? The sentence rather gives that impression. Is it not an echo of a concept expressed in "The revelation to St. John" ?

Revelation¹⁵⁰ states:-

"I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end,"

the verse being a fuller version of two previous verses.¹⁵¹

The Alpha and Omega is associated with "recompense"¹⁵².

The Sam. connected Moses with the "Beginning," and with the "Day of Recompense," or the end. It is possible therefore, for Ben Manir to have been influenced by The Revelation to John, and that for the Sam. of the 14th cent. Moses was the "first" and the "last", at the "beginning," and at the "end." In other words for the Sam. Moses was the Alpha and the Omega.

In the same hymn (C.p.182) Ben Manir puts into the mouth of the Egyptians the words;-

"Who made him the anointed one? who raises the dead with supplications; but lo he was righteous, a greater one hath not been created."

That there is an affinity of expression both here and in the N.T. by virtue of using a common coinage, cannot very well be denied.¹⁵³ It is possible in an atmosphere like that obtaining at Damascus and Nablus for there to be an exchange of words and ideas, especially as it is known that Jews, Samaritans, Muslims and Christians rubbed shoulders with each other. Nutt¹⁵⁴ points out that there was a Latin Bishopric at Sebaste (Samaria) kept up by the Roman Church till the 14th cent.

In the Sam. Liturgies for the ZIMMUT PESAH AND SIMMUT

SUKKOT¹⁵⁵ Ben Manir has much to say about Moses, and indeed Aaron. (C.p.95). In this hymn it is Moses who is to take the census. Ben Manir expounds rather mystically the ideas connected with Moses the enumerator, the census, calculation, atonement, and the joyous perpetuation of the celebration of Zimmut Pesah. However, the allusions are somewhat obscure, and it is not always easy to understand the mystical import of the census. It is not entirely outside the bounds of possibility that Ben Manir was influenced by the prevailing atmosphere of Kabbalah. Language and number conjoined together, were declared to be the instruments whereby the cosmos was called into existence by God. This was achieved by combinations and permutations of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, each letter representing a number. Epstein¹⁵⁶ points out that speculative Kabbalah "seems to have originated in Babylon, had its rise in Province in the twelfth century, and attained its zenith in Spain in the fourteenth century." It is known that persecution in Spain drove a number of Hebrew scholars from Spain, and who sought refuge in Egypt, the Holy Land, and Samaria. Maimonides for a time was in Cairo, and also Damascus. Nahmanides, who died in Palestine in 1270, was inclined to mysticism. The two great Kabbalah text-books, the Bahir and Zohar (both meaning "Brightness") appeared first in the thirteenth cent. If

they were not due to his teaching, they were at least in sympathy with it.¹⁵⁷ The Sam. held the "census" to have a peculiar significance. The falling off in the numbers of their population, and of which they were now painfully aware, would lead them to dwell on the mystical aspect of numbers. The "calculation" (of the calendar) they affirm had "been kept from the days of creation," even "from the angels to the father of mankind." Phinehas, "who stayed the plague," was the one who "tested the reckoning on Mount Gerizim, beside the Oak of Moreh." This would be their equivalent of Greenwich Observatory. Such a calculation would be computed by the juxtaposition of the Sun and the Moon. Figuratively, for the Sam., Moses was "the sun," and Aaron "the moon." He is "The sun of the house of Levi." (C.p.99). He is also spoken of as "The light of prophecy and its sun" (C.p.98). Aaron "saw a glorious light which obscured the light of the sun like a fire burning." He said, "This is an angel, not a prophet, not a king, not a servant." The angel of the Lord said to Aaron, "This is Moses, your brother, whom I extol and honour." (C.p.100). This was a day of "Divine Favour" (C.p.100) when Aaron met his brother. A "meeting of loving kindness with loving kindness, a meeting of the moon with the sun." (C.p.100). It is at the conjunction of the sun and the moon that Moses and Aaron are especially recalled to

mind in their peculiar relationship. The impression is that as Moses and Aaron acted together in bringing deliverance to Israel, so a perfect calculation of the sun and moon for the festivals will be a necessary condition for the return of Divine favour, and for a future deliverance from present enemies.

(B) ABISHA B. PHINEHAS

Abisha (C.p.697) makes mention of Moses as,

"The prophet who was entrusted with the house of God,"

and is an obvious reference back to Num. xii, 7. It must not be overlooked however that in Mandaean thought "house" is almost the standard term for "world."¹⁵⁸ In Hebrews¹⁵⁹ "house" can also be made to stand for "ourselves." As strands of Mandaean thought have their parallels in the Johannine Gospel, it is more than likely that the second verse of the fourteenth chapter should read:-

"In my Father's world are many mansions (abiding places)".

This means that Moses is the "prophet of the world," an idea acceptable to the Sam. (C.pp.225, 228, 443).

Abisha goes on to state (C.p.698) that:-

"The prophet fasted forty days and forty nights,"

and is a paraphrase of¹⁶⁰

"I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights: I did neither eat bread nor drink water."

Of the occasion Marqah had said (C.p.59):-

"Moses stood fasting forty days."

It could be suggested that Abisha's statement above (C.p.698) is but an inevitable evolution of thought. It may however be that in the Christian atmosphere obtaining in Samaria he was aware of the sentence as applied to Jesus Christ.¹⁶¹ Incidentally the answers of Jesus Christ to Satan come from the book of Deuteronomy.¹⁶²

It is not always possible to discover whom Abisha has in mind when he refers to "The Speaker" (C.p.494; cf. 502: 700). Abisha says (C.p.494):-

"The speaker at creation, the speaker of
'Let there be light'."

Abisha seems to use the word "speaker" ambiguously on occasion, leaving a doubt in the mind of the reader as to whether he is referring to God or Moses. Dr. J. Macdonald¹⁶³ in a footnote states that the speaker here (C.p.494) is Moses. It may be but a confusion of thought; on the other hand Abisha may be so eulogizing the status of Moses as to bring him very close to God; that "mouth to mouth" may be a metaphor implying a relationship of substance or of essence.

The question is posited by Abisha (C.p.507):-

"Is Moses not an apostle?"

This reference to Moses as an apostle appears to have arisen in the 14th cent. It is used by Sa'dallah Al-Kethari (C.p.380); Ben Manir (C.p.100); Abdullah b. Solomon

(C.pp. 324, 412); Abisha b. Phinehas (C.pp. 250, 367,507) and Phinehas b. Ithamar (C.p.368). This is a classic example of how the Sam. writers tend to depend on one another.

The only occasion in the N.T. when Jesus Christ is designated an "Apostle" is in the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹⁶⁴ In this chapter a comparison is made with Jesus Christ and Moses, and one is left pondering on the possibility as to whether Moses is now designated an "Apostle", after a Sam. writer had seen Jesus Christ referred to as an "Apostle" and thought the title could also be applied to Moses. A monograph in the Leeds University Oriental Society's Monographs Series No. 1, 1961, by R.J.F.Trotter, ends by making a comparison of a hymn by Ben Manir and the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹⁶⁵ If this hypothesis is sustained, then Ben Manir was aware of and used the Epistle. As he lived at the beginning of the 14th cent. he seems to have been the likeliest person to have introduced the concept of Moses as an "Apostle", which he may have derived from the Epistle.

Abisha composes a hymn (C.p.250 ff.) called "Words of Forgiveness" in which it is possible to see strands that may or may not have been culled from a number of sources. He deals with the Creator and the process of creation. The hymn is a pot pourri of the Genesis creation story, of Gnostic shibboleths long discarded; of the four elements of

Empedocles; and the Sam. legend of Moses being a kind of Logos; of Moses being almost designated Alpha and Omega, suggestive of Christian influences. Then Abisha goes on to say, almost as an after-thought, that he:-

"Speaks in error,"

for he had omitted mention of,

"The prophet who comprehended the secret things of creation and the day of vengeance."

Abisha is anxious to show that Moses could not be excluded from any description of the creation. Certain writers such as Abisha leave a research scholar with the impression that Moses, on occasion, is more akin to the "Holy Spirit" of God, in function, if not in essence. The "Holy Spirit" is not mentioned by the Sam. right up to the 14th cent. Yet, on occasion, Moses is almost conceived of as locum tenens. Abisha refers to Moses (C.p.250 ff.) as

"The holy prophet whose figure was clothed with the image."

He is also mentioned as "the goodly Archōn, the prophet Moses," "the one prophet, like whom none will arise, or has arisen." "The prophet (who) comprehended the creation and the day of vengeance;" "the chosen one of the sons of men."

It has already been suggested above that this hymn (C.p.250) includes Gnostic shibboleths long discarded, and that Moses is put forward, via. Sam. midrash, as a kind of

"Logos." In the light of the fact that "Archon", and "sons of men" are Gnostic terms, it is interesting to note that Bultmann considers the treatment of the prologue of John as a Gnostic "hymn."¹⁶⁶ Irenaeus (180) gave an account of Simonian doctrine, which has led some scholars to see a close connection between it, and the Prologue of John. Simon Magus is held to be the father of Gnosticism and he emanated from Samaria.¹⁶⁷ It is likely also that strands of thought in this hymn of Abisha, together with a careful consideration of Hebrews,¹⁶⁸ might yield a profitable investigation. Irenaeus' account of Simonian doctrine is set forth in Grant's book.¹⁶⁹ This doctrine, while it commences with the words, "In the beginning,"¹⁷⁰ also includes the phrase, "At the end of those days."¹⁷¹ It is as safe to conclude that, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews was aware of Gnostic or Neo-platonist teaching, as that he knew his Plato.

In the Liturgies of the Samaritan Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread¹⁷² what has Abisha to say about Moses that is new? It is interesting to discover that he refers to Moses as (C.p.241):-

"The prophet of Thy two worlds," but he does not give an exegesis of this phrase. The two worlds would be the seen and the unseen. The position of Moses as a prophet in the seen world is obvious, but what

of his position in the unseen? The terms seen and unseen are not new to 14th cent. Sam. thought for Marqah, in particular, used them in the 4th cent. (C.pp. 16,18,19,21). He also used the expressions above and below quite often (C.pp. 16,18,20). Or is it rather that the Christian Faith in Samaria was compelling or luring Abisha to ascribe that status to Moses of being "prophet of Thy two worlds," that the Christian Church appeared to give to Jesus Christ? An examination of this hymn of Abisha (C.p.241) reveals parallel features and ideas that are to be found in the Johannine Gospel.¹⁷³ Almost immediately after referring to Moses as the "prophet of Thy two worlds," Abisha continues, "And he shall bless thy bread and thy water."¹⁷⁴ But there is no valid reason at all in Abisha's hymn (C.p.241) why this mention of bread and water should occur, unless he was following a theme,¹⁷⁵ and an "association of ideas" occurred in the mind of Abisha. Ab-Gelugah (12th cent. C.p.75) prays "have compassion on me in both worlds."

In Abisha's four hymns in the Liturgy of Hag Shabuot¹⁷⁶ there is continuous reference to the prophet Moses. In the first hymn (C.p.366) Abisha "dreams a dream." The Sam. do not object to the validity of dreams. In the Defter (C.p.77) allusion is made to:-

"Joseph the interpreter of dreams."

The 14th cent. Sam. writers do not disregard dreams as a

normal experience. Abisha dreams of Moses being in "the Garden of Eden" on "Mount Gerizim, the Everlasting Hill."

In another hymn (C.p.375) Abisha makes reference to "The star." He has Moses in mind when he writes:-

"Praised be God who caused to shine the star of mind, and made it to ride in the firmament of the head".

The introduction of "the star" as a concept into the writings of the 14th cent. Sam. may not be without some significance. Abisha mentions "the star" (C.pp. 375,503, 515, 517) and Abdullah b. Solomon (C.pp. 347, 490). Ben Manir appears to be silent on the matter. That the star was "made to ride in the firmament," suggests that a movement of the star in the heavens may have occurred. It transpires that what is now known as Halley's Comet appeared in 1378 and was visible in Samaria, the Holy Land, as well as in Europe, and also in China. Such a phenomenon would have an impression on minds that were in tune with the prophecy of the Star of Jacob. The oracle of Balaam¹⁷⁷ mentions:-

"A star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel."

Moses in this hymn is given the greatest adulation on four occasions receiving great homage from the angelic hosts. He is called prophet, priest and prince of time. He is referred to mystically as "The tree of life in the midst of

the garden."¹⁷⁸

The dream that Abisha had, bears marks of the vision and dream that St. John the Divine had on the Isle of Patmos, and makes mention of the "tree of life."¹⁷⁹ This composition of Abisha would appear to be a polemic against Christian doctrine, in that the writer would seem to have "The Book of the Revelation of St. John the Divine" before him, or in mind, ascribing to Moses what the N.T. book has to say about Jesus Christ.

In his fourth hymn Abisha refers to Moses (C.p.410):-

"For whose sake the world was created".

Abisha, commemorating Moses in another hymn (C.p.513) says:-

"On account of whom all creation exists."

The 4th cent. Defter however (C.p.69) says:-

"Three friends did the great God create, and He said, that through them was necessary, and for them was made the world, for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob the perfect ones."

Is it possible that there has been a development in thought, with a change of emphasis, from the 4th cent. to that of the 14th? If the 14th cent. Sam. writers now conceived of Moses as being pre-existent, it would be necessary for them to state that the world was created for Moses, and not, for example, Abraham, although the latter was also held in very high esteem by the Sam.

The hymns of Abisha in the Liturgy of Hag Shabuot¹⁸⁰

(i.e. The Pentecostal Series) give a comprehensive picture of Moses as seen through the eyes of a 14th cent. Sam. writer. It is hard to resist the temptation to assume that the doctrine of Moses is one closely akin to the Christian doctrine of Jesus Christ. Moses now pre-existed; the world was created for him. He is primus inter pares so far as the Sam. are concerned. Where Jesus died for mankind, Moses lived for mankind. Moses was a saviour; Jesus was both saviour and redeemer. Christians could think in terms of Anselm's "Cur deus-homo?". Moses was mainly held to be a man, when it came to making obvious statements about him. By innuendo he was almost divine. The attitude of the Sam. generally with regard to Moses was akin to that of a Jewish sect called the Ebionites, and their opinion of Jesus. They looked on Jesus, the saviour, as the last and greatest of the prophets, the natural son of Joseph and Mary. He was not the son of God. The Ebionites lingered on for a long period, the remnants being absorbed into Mohammedanism. Adoptionism also is as old as Ebionism. They stressed the Oneness and Unity of God. He "adopted" the perfect man, Jesus, and raised him to the position of Godhead. The Sam. position in the 14th cent. is very close to that of Unitarianism, with Moses and not Jesus as the "adopted" son of His house. The Christian Church, in the main, rejected the doctrine of "Adoptionism":

the Sam. Church to all appearances accept, but do not have a competent theologian to fashion and formulate the doctrine . The 4th cent. writers like Abisha are to be classified as poets, rather than theologians or philosophers. Although Abisha was reckoned as an outstanding writer, one is left pondering what Marqah might have written in the light of the 4th cent. background. It is because of the Sam. attempt to marry Samaritanism to the prevailing idioms, and ideas, encouraged by other sources, that often the difficulty of translation ends in a nightmare of doubt and tentative hazards.

(C) ABDULLAH B. SOLOMON

Abdullah states (C.p.309) that:-

"Moses was wiser than his brother in the secrets of the Great Name."

The doctrine of Election and Selection became most evident in regard to Moses and Aaron. It was Moses "to whom the truth was entrusted." This could mean the truth in regard to the secrets of God's Name. On the other hand the truth could mean the Law. With regard to the truth, T.H.Gaster¹⁸¹ translates "The Zadokite Document" :-

"It was a time when a certain scoffer arose to distil upon Israel the waters deceptive, and to lead them astray in a trackless waste,"

and makes the comment that this may be a general polemic against the Samaritans. And making further reference to

the Israelites or Zadokites continues¹⁸²:-

"And to these has He ever revealed His Holy Spirit, at the hands of His anointed, and has ever disclosed the truth."

Truth (Kushtah) here means the Torah, as so often among the Mandeans as well as the Sam. According to Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics¹⁸³ truth (Kushtah) had a special significance for the Mandeans, meaning straightness: rectitude and veracity. T.H.Gaster¹⁸⁴, referring to "the Manual of Discipline" states that truth (Kushtah) is often used in the Scrolls specifically referring to the "Torah." The Sam., he says, also call it the "Verity." In the N.T.¹⁸⁵ truth also appears to be a synonym for the Law.

Abdullah refers to Moses (C.p.347) as the "Star of the Levites"; recalling that Abisha (C.p.107) alludes to Aaron as "the star of Levi and minister." Ben Manir (C.p.99) refers to Moses as "the Sun of the house of Levi." It seems, therefore, that while Moses is the "sun", and Aaron the "moon", both can be described as "stars."

In another hymn (C.p.373) Abdullah uses a Kabbalistic expression, and describes Moses as the "Crown of the world." In the Zohar¹⁸⁶ the first sephrah was called the "Crown." The last or tenth sephrah was the "kingdom." The Sephroth are visualised under a human form, i.e. Adam Hadmon.¹⁸⁷ At the head was the "crown," at the feet was situated the

"kingdom." Abdullah, however, describes Moses as the "Crown of the world," going beyond the concept of "kingdom."

Although Abdullah had written a comprehensive hymn about the birth of Moses (C.pp. 746-753), it was a subject which appealed to, and intrigued him. It was suggested at the time when the hymn and its contents were discussed that Abdullah could have been influenced by knowing of the contents of the Johannine Gospel.¹⁸⁸ An analytical comparison had led to that conclusion. In the Sam. New Year Liturgy¹⁸⁹ Abdullah once more has for his subject the birth of Moses (C.p.445). Here again it is postulated that Abdullah could have been influenced by sources other than Sam. A close examination of the hymn leads one to conclude that Abdullah was aware of the story of the birth of Jesus Christ as recorded in St. Matthew¹⁹⁰ and St. Luke.¹⁹¹ The references from the N.T. will be in brackets:-

"The glory was for this one" (Luke ii, 9: The glory of the Lord.)

"For they knew not about his (Moses) birth."
(Matt. ii, 3: Herod the king did not know.)

"However his light was burning, and (the light) came to where Pharaoh was."
(Matt.ii, 9: Till it came and stood over where the young child was.)

"O Sun." (Matt.ii,2: His star.)

"The glorious night had come." (Luke ii,9: The shepherds keeping watch by night: The glory of the Lord shone round about them.)

(Moses was born at night; Jesus was born at night.)

"Pharaoh inquired that the sorcerers should tell him, 'Where is the child?'"
(Matt.ii, 4: He (Herod) inquired of them (The Magi) where the Christ should be born.)

"There was no help sent to Pharaoh for this child."
(Matt.ii, 12: Being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod.)

"Both from here (below) and above, he (Moses) was created."
(Matt.i, 18: Before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Spirit.)

"The foolish ones perished."
(Matt.ii,16: All male children slain.)

"Pharaoh ordered the midwives.....He shall cast them into the river."
(cf. Ex.i,16: If it be a son ye shall kill him:
Matt.ii,16: Male children of two years and under.)

"But I brought out the elect."
(Matt.ii,16: Out of Egypt did I call my son.)

"The elect He led before him to the wilderness of Sinai."
(Matt.iv,1: Then was Jesus led up by the spirit into the wilderness.)

"And according to His direction he (Moses) was born."
(Matt.i, 22: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet.)

If Abdullah did read the N.T. then he, as a representative Sam. certainly considered Moses to be the equal of Jesus Christ. The spread of Christianity as exemplified by the Latin Church¹⁹² in Syria and Samaria, as well as the memory of the Crusaders from Europe, who had invaded the Holy Land in the name of Jesus Christ, would compel Abdullah, and others, to make a re-assessment of the position held by Moses in the economy of God.

Once again there is the external impact of Christianity causing the Sam. to review their doctrine of Moses. It would appear that Abdullah is not impervious to this ideological background. He is influenced by it, in that he is prepared to use Christian thought-forms, and to recast them, so that they pass muster as being typically Sam. On the other hand there is no 4th cent. material for the Birth of Moses as expressed in Christian guise. The 4th cent. Sam. writers are extremely conservative on this point. The picture of Moses in the 4th cent. is one conceived mainly within the context of the Pentateuch. But as the doctrine of Moses' pre-existence began to be crystallized in the 14th cent. one could say that the emphasis is one of movement from the O.T. to that of the more dynamic overtones of the N.T.

PART II : BELIEF IN MOSES

N O T E S

NOTES

1. THE DOCTRINE OF MOSES AS EXEMPLIFIED IN
THE DEFTER.

1. Nutt.J.W. Samaritan Targum pp. 28-29
2. Ex. xx, 1-17.
3. cf. John, i.
4. Heb. iii.
5. cf. Deut. xviii, 18.
6. Acts iii, 22.
7. ibid. vii, 37
8. Gaster,T.H. op.cit. p.353
9. Acts ii, 32.
10. Deut. xxv, 7.
11. Ruth iv, 5,10.
12. John vi, 40, 44, 45.
13. ibid. vi, 39
14. Brown,S. Dissertation, Leeds, 1955.
15. cf. Num. xiv, 41.
16. Sanday,W. and Headlam,A.C.
The Epistle to the Romans. p.10
17. Daniel ii, 22.
18. Ryder Smith,C. The Bible Doctrine of Salvation
pp. 26-27.
19. Ex. xxxii, 30 - 2.
20. Nutt.J.W. op.cit. p.11
21. Whitham,A.R. op.cit. p.199
22. cf. Num. xii, 7.
23. Heb. iii, 2-6
24. M.M. Book i, Par. 4.
25. Anderson Scott,C.A. op.cit. p.142

2. SON OF HIS HOUSE.

26. M.M. Book i, Par. 4.
27. Heb. iii, 5.

28. Heb. iii, 6.
29. cf. ibid. iii, 16
30. Num. xii, 7.
31. M.M. Book ii, Par.11.
32. Brown,S. Dissertation, Leeds, 1955. p.222.
33. Cowley.A.E. op.cit. p. Lxxvii
34. ibid. p.xxi
35. Heb. Chap.iii.
36. ibid. iii,5.
37. ibid. iii,6.
38. Num. xii, 7.
39. Heb. iii, 2.
40. Souter,Alexander, Novum Testamentum Graece; Pros Ebraious, Chap.iii.
41. Ginzberg,Louis, 7 Vols.
42. ibid. Vol.III, p.427. cf. Num.xii,7; Heb.iii,2,5.
43. Montgomery. op.cit. p.225
44. ditto
45. Carmina Samaritana, 1, 12.
46. ibid. 1, 17,20
47. Gal. iv, 1-7.
48. ibid. iv, 1.
49. Montgomery. op.cit. p.225
50. cf. The Quran.

3. MOSES AS SAVIOUR

51. Baynes,Charlotte Augusta. op.cit. p.162
52. Ex. xiv, 30.
53. Ex. xiv, 13.
54. St. Luke i, 47.
55. St. John iv, 42.
56. St. Luke ii, 11.
57. Ryder Smith.C. op.cit. p.26
58. Ex. xxxii, 30.

59. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.226
60. ibid. p.226
61. cf. St. Mark xvi, 19; Rev. iv.
62. Macdonald, J. S.J. O.T. Vol.13, No.2, p.154
June, 1960. The Samaritan Doctrine of Moses.
63. ditto
64. Ryder Smith, C. op.cit. p.26
65. Macdonald, J. op.cit. p.154
66. Ex. xxxii, 30-32.
67. Macdonald, J. op.cit. p.159

4. PRE-EXISTENT MOSES.

68. Phil. ii, 6-7. cf. Ginzberg, Vol.III, p.481.
69. John i, 9.
70. Graves, R. op.cit. Vol.I, p.76
71. ibid. Vol.ii, p.86. cf. Ginzberg, Vol.V, p.400.
72. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.228
73. ibid. p.228
74. cf. Schonfield, Hugh J. op.cit. p.37
75. Church of England. Book of Common Prayer.
Morning and Evening Prayer: Creed.
76. Luke ii, 9.
77. ibid. ii, 13
78. Macdonald, J. op.cit.
79. Gen. i, 3.
80. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.228
81. M.M. Book V, Par.3.
82. M.M. Book VI, Par.11.
83. Heb. Chap.iii, cf. Trotter R.J.F.; Did the Samaritans
of the Fourth Century Know The Epistle to the Hebrews?
Monograph Series, No.1. L.U.O.R. Oct. 1961.

5. DID THE SAM. HAVE A LOGOS DOCTRINE
CONNECTED WITH MOSES?

84. Gaster, Moses. op.cit. p.79
85. John viii, 1.
86. ibid. 1, 3.
87. Baynes, C.A. op.cit. p.50
88. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.210
89. Green, L.C. op.cit. p.122
90. Bowman, J. L.U.O.R. Vol.I, p.50.

6. THE DROP OR SPARK OF LIGHT.

91. Green, L.C. op.cit.
92. John viii, 12.
93. Cambridge Greek Testament; St. John, p.187.
94. Ex. xiv, 2; Num. xxxiii, 7.
95. Wilson, R. McL. op.cit. pp.117-118
96. Dew. cf. Ginzberg, Vol.V, p.11.
cf. Isa. xxvi, 19.
97. Carmina Samaritana. Hymn iii.
98. Coptic Gnostic Treatise, p.34.
99. ibid. p.42
100. ibid. p.49
101. Strachan, R.H. op.cit. p.205
102. ibid. p.206
103. ditto
104. Cowley. op.cit. xxviii - xxix.
(cf. Adler, p.100).

7. THE BIRTH OF MOSES.

105. Ex. ii.
106. Gaster, Moses. op.cit. p.157
107. Thomson, J.E.H. The Samaritans; Their Testimony to
the Religion and History of Israel. p.192.
108. ibid. p.137

109. Gaster, Moses. The Asatir (The Samaritan Book of the Secrets of Moses). Chap. viii.
110. ibid. Chap. xi.
111. M.M. Book V.
112. Thomson, J.E.H. op.cit. p.186
113. Schonfield, Hugh J. The Lost "Book of the Nativity of John." cf. p.60
114. cf. Matt. v, 14; John viii, 12; ix, 5.
115. John i, 1-9.
116. cf. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Vol.19, p.919. 14th Edition; Kitab Al-Asatir, 14th cent..
117. Gaster, Moses, op.cit. p.142
118. Thomson, J.E.H. op.cit. p.137
119. Schonfield, Hugh J. op.cit. p.56
120. ibid. p.48
121. In Extenso: Deut. xviii, 15-19.
122. Schonfield, Hugh J. op.cit. p.56
123. ibid. p.58
124. Black, Matthew. The Scrolls and Christian Origins. p. 149.
125. Hymns of Thanksgiving, iii, 7-10.
126. Black, Matthew. op.cit. p.149
127. cf. Heb. i, 5.
128. Ps. ii, 7.
129. Black, Matthew, op.cit. p.149

8. MOSES REDIVIVUS

130. M.M. Book I, Par.9.
131. ibid. Par. 11.
132. ibid. Book II, Par.8.
133. ibid. Book IV, Par.11 and 12.
134. Gaster, Moses. op.cit. p.91
135. cf. M.M. Book IV, Par.12. "From Noah the Origin to the Taheb His Descendant."
136. Charles, R.H. op.cit. p.224

137. M.M. Book IV, Par.12.
138. cf. Ex. xxxiv, 28.
139. John iv, 25.
140. Macdonald.J. S.J.O.T. Vol. 13, No.2, p.157. June, 1960.
141. Black.Matthew, op.cit. p.158

9. OTHER FEATURES IN THE SAM. DOCTRINE OF MOSES.

(A) Aaron b. Manir.

142. Num. xii, 8.
143. Ex. xxxiii, 11.
144. Friedlander. M. op.cit. p.53
145. Macdonald.J. Dissertation, Leeds, 1958.
146. St. John, i, 9.
147. cf. St. John iii, 30.
148. Lerner.I. Dissertation, Leeds, 1956.
149. Macdonald.J. op.cit.
150. Revelation xxii, 13.
151. ibid. 1, 8; xxi, 6.
152. ibid. xxii, 12.
153. cf. St. Matt. xi, 2-6.
154. Nutt,J.W. The Sam. Targum. p.11.
155. Mowbray.D.D.W. Dissertation, Leeds.
156. Epstein.I. op.cit. p.230
157. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. XI, p.360.

(B) Abisha b. Phinehas.

158. Grobel.Kendrick. The Gospel of Truth. p.101.
159. Heb. iii, 6.
160. Deut. ix, 9-10.
161. Matt. iv, 1-11.
162. Deut. viii, 3; vi, 16; vi, 13.
163. Macdonald.J. op.cit.

164. Heb. iii, 1 .
165. Monograph Series (L.U.O.S.), No.1, p.34. Oct.1961.
(Heb. x).
166. Grant,R.M. Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p.197
(Note).
167. Acts viii, 1-24.
168. Heb. i.
169. op.cit. pp.76-77
170. cf. Gen. i, 1; John i, 1.
171. cf. Heb. i, 2.
172. Lerner,I. Dissertation, Leeds, 1956.
173. John vi.
174. cf. Ex. xxiii, 25.
175. cf. John vi.
176. Boys,D.J. Dissertation, Leeds, 1956. (The Pentecost-
al Series).
177. Num. xxiv, 17.
178. cf. Rev. ii, 7.
179. cf. Rev. ii, 7; xxii, 2,14,19.
180. Boys,D.J. op.cit.

(C) Abdullah b. Solomon.

181. Gaster.T.H. The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect.
cf. The Zadokite Document. i, 1 - ii, 12.
182. Gaster.T.H. ibid. ii, 2-13
183. Hastings,J. op.cit. Vol. VIII, pp.380 - 393.
184. Gaster.T.H. op.cit. p.49
185. cf. Heb. x, 26.
186. Epstein,I. op.cit. pp.235-236
187. ibid. p.237
188. John. Chaps. i - viii.
189. Baguley,E.C. Dissertation, Leeds, 1956.
190. Matt. ii.
191. Luke ii.
192. Nutt,J.W. op.cit. p.11.

P A R T I I I : B E L I E F I N T H E L A W

1. The Doctrine of the Torah in the Defter.
2. The Concept of the Torah in the 14th Century.
3. Illumination and The Defter.
4. Illumination and Memar Marqah.
5. Illumination and the 14th Century Writers.

1. THE DOCTRINE OF THE TORAH IN THE
DEFTER.

The third tenet of the Sam. Creed postulates belief in the Holy Torah; "in Thy scriptures of truth." (C.p.3). To a student of the History and Religion of Israel, it comes as a pleasant surprise to see how a Judaistic Sect outside of orthodox Judaism should hold the Law in such high veneration and regard. Samaria does not subscribe to the full T'nach. With their rabid enthusiasm and high fidelity for the Torah goes the complete divorcement of "The Prophets and the writings" from their midst. When Moses is referred to as the holiest of the prophets, the reference back is to the prophets as found in the Pentateuch. There does not appear to be any doubt, but that the complete separation of Samaria from Judah occurred at a time when the official Jewish Canon was the five books of Moses. This separation must have arisen before the introduction of the LXX at Alexandria in the 3rd. cent. B.C.. Speculation has been rife as to when this demarcation took place. Obviously it was after the return from Exile in 538 B.C. Again it must have been before the building of the Sam. Temple about 250 B.C. The Sam. express their disapproval about Ezra, and it may well be that his name has been handed down as the one who caused the schism. Abisha b. Phinehas (D.1376; C.p.514) writes:-

"Cursed be Ezra and his words, who wrote
in his shame."

The reasons for the parting of Israel from Judah are hard to arrive at. Reasons have been adduced on political, religious, and even ethical grounds. However, when Samaria did separate from Judah, the Torah was the official Canon. This does not mean that other Hebrew writings did not exist. The writings of the Canonical Prophets, and some Psalms existed, and no doubt helped to model religious thought in Exile. While in Exile the Jewish people, denied full opportunity for sacrifice, developed what must have been a synagogal form of worship, with emphasis on the reading of scripture, reciting of prayers, and singing of hymns. It was during the Exile that external religious observances such as the rite of Circumcision, and the Sabbath, came into fuller prominence, and acquired a renewed importance. They became proper marks to know a true Israelite by.¹

On the return from Exile, "The completed Law-book, which had been compiled in Babylon, and was expanded into our present Pentateuch, was now promulgated, and accepted by the people, as a basis on which its social and religious life was to be organized."² Israel was now to be a community whose basis was the Law, and on the fulfilment of the Law its destiny was to depend.

Perhaps the Covenants also call for consideration under the heading of the Torah, for the acceptance of the Torah

was a necessary basis for covenant arrangement between Yahweh, and His people, Israel. The Torah formed the "contractual" basis or document. God gave it to Israel; Moses received it on their behalf. They were "to keep" the Law, and God was to bless them, and to be merciful to them, and thereby afford them means of salvation; the latter word undergoing a change in meaning over the cent., but the purpose remaining the same.

It would appear from the Sam. Chronicles³ that the renaissance in the 4th cent. was initiated by one called Baba Rabba, and that he built or opened the synagogues, and especially enjoined that the Torah should be read. "The Law had been the possession of the priests and read by the priests. Baba taught the people to read the Law themselves."⁴ The Sam. Liturgy is primarily built around the reading of the Torah, but whereas once it was read in extenso, for cent. it has been the custom to read the Law in an abbreviated or token form called Qetaphim. A survey of the Sam. Services as based on the Torah has been achieved by Dr. J. Macdonald.⁵

In the Service for the Eve of the Sabbath (C.p.115) it states:-

"There is nothing like the perfect Torah for ever; Blessed be Yahweh, who gave it, and glorified be the great prophet, who received it from His holy habitation."

This indicates how close the first three tenets of the Sam.

Creed are; they follow logically one upon the other; God, Moses, the Torah. The Law is designated as "perfect." This quality of perfection anent the Law is also descriptive of God's work⁶ and also of "The Way" of God.⁷ It means that the Law is complete; that it is sound and without defect or blemish. Hence Jewish commentators tend to avoid criticizing the Law although bringing their critical apparatus fully to bear on the "Prophets" and the "Writings."

While Abul-Fath denies that Baba Rabba was ever a priest, Bowman⁸ affirms that he was a High Priest of Shechem and that he was a Dosithean. As the Dositheans⁹ were upholders of Gnostic concepts, such a statement as :-

"There is nothing like the perfect Torah for ever,"

would be of especial significance. In passing it should be kept in mind that the terms "perfect" (teleios) and "defect" (husterēma) are part of the Gnostic vocabulary, and that Samaria is held to be an early home of Gnosticism.

Bowman¹⁰ assumes that both Amram Darah, and Margah, the main composers found in the Defter, were also Dositheans.

Independently of this information, the writer of this thesis, on reading the Defter a number of times, became aware of the use of words and ideas closely akin to Gnosticism. Indeed this was one of the strands of thought that led him to postulate the possibility of the Sam. theologians of the

4th cent. being aware of the existence of the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹¹ The word "perfect" and "perfection" come in for special treatment in the Epistle. It should not pass unnoticed that the Sam. refer to the Law as "The Truth," (Kushtah). In the Gnostic system of Valentinus, in which "perfection" is a basic concept, one of the Aeons is Truth, from which is derived the Word, and Life.

The Law is alluded to as the "Holiest of writings" in the Service for Sabbath Morning (C.p.15). The expression "Holiness" appertains to its dedicated purpose, rather than to its ethical content: nevertheless the Law by reason of its social implications is also moral. But morality, as conceived in the eyes of the Sam. is rather that of observance of the Law; it is rather a stress on the letter of the Law, although there is a tendency "to spiritualize," as, for example, in the rite of circumcision. There must be a circumcision of the heart.¹² For the Sam. in an early stage, "To do," and "To do not," were of greater significance than "To be" or "To be not." For them it was the act rather than the state of being which was significant. "Sins" as such had a meaning for them, perhaps rather than a "Sinful state." Hence they have no doctrine of Original Sin¹³ in the Defter.

Marqah (C.p.23) describes the Theophany, and the position that the Torah occupies.

"On two tablets, He wrote the ten words;
He gave them to Moses, life for the
generations."

The Sam. affirm that God personally wrote the ten words.
Later Jewish tradition ascribed the writing on the tablets
to angels.¹⁴ Marqah is insistent when he states:-

"Engraved were they; with the finger of
consuming fire were they written."

and, "The Revered One wrote them, with his own
finger."

Marqah (C.p.24) states:-

"Thy Law is life."

which could easily be a Gnostic echo.

In the Daily Service - Morning and Evening (C.p.3) -
mention is made of:-

"Thy scriptures of Truth."

In Jewish tradition this "Truth" is often identified
directly with the Torah. In Mandaean thought Truth
(Kushtah) is virtually mystic revelation. Prof. T.H.Gaster
suggests, that for the Sam. "The Verity" (Kustah) is a
common term for the Law. The Dead Sea Sect refer to
themselves as "Sons of Truth" (i.e. Sons of the Torah).

In the "Gospel of Truth,"¹⁵ held to have been written by
the Gnostic Valentinus (110 - 165), there is found a hymn on
the "Perfect Book." He may have been purporting to be
writing the "True Gospel," as a challenge to the four
Canonical Gospels already accepted; or again he may have

put forth what he held to be the "true Torah," as offsetting the Torah acceptable to the Jews.

Marqah (C.p.49) brings to the fore the central importance of the Law for the Sam.. Outside of Yahweh, and Moses, the Law is unique. "A shining gateway is the scripture." "It was written with a finger of consuming fire," and "handed over with the sacred right hand." In the Manual of Discipline¹⁶ it says:-

"If a man put forth his left hand, to gesticulate, he shall be mutilated for ten days."

The left hand in the Middle East is used for all unclean purposes. Generally speaking, in religious parlance the left (sinister in Latin) is for that which is evil, or less worthy, and the right for the righteous. Given with the right hand of God, the Law is pure. By stressing the importance of the "sacred right hand," Marqah perhaps unwittingly uses an anthropomorphic expression! It is noteworthy that the Torah is designated "His Treasury," - a kind of Roget's Thesaurus.¹⁷ From this treasury of the Torah comes wisdom. In the Valentinian System Wisdom (Sophia) is an aeon that can be traced back to Truth (Torah?).

In another prayer Marqah writes (C.p.49):-

"All the water-drawers have drawn from its wisdom, but have not come to the end of it, for it is tied to the void and waste."

Brown¹⁸ in a note on this verse takes this verse to mean that:-

"It draws its fulness from the depth of the Universe."

This reference to the Law drawing from the depth of the Universe is doubtful, for the Sam. generally were not inclined to be philosophical on essential points of dogma. That wisdom is mentioned in the same context as "The void and waste," tends to bring the expression very near to a Gnostic outlook. It is possible that Tohu-Wa-Bohu is a Sam. epithet descriptive of God Himself, for in another prayer (C.p.62)¹⁹ the nouns in apposition are:-

"Desolation and waste, God, the Sufficient One."

Grant²⁰, in examining the Gnostic System of the Ophites, says:-

"We may conjecture that Thauthabaoth is a variant form of Tohu and Bohu."

R. McL. Wilson²¹ also describes the System of the Ophites, but he uses the name Ialdabaoth, presumably for Thauthabaoth. In this System wisdom (Sophia) gives birth to Ialdabaoth. In other words wisdom, using the Sam. phraseology of Marqah, "was tied to the void and waste," (i.e. by the umbilical cord.) In the Ophite system Christ ascends and sits at the right hand of Ialdabaoth.

Montgomery²² counsels caution in this point of view for he says:-

"In fact in these developments of Samaritanism, appearing especially in Marqah, we have nothing else than a faint reflex of that process in Judaism, which is a form of Gnosticism, and to which the technical name of Kabbalism had best be given."

Marqah continues to use the Gnostic concept when he says, regarding the Scriptures:-

"For its foundation is from Everlasting life." (C.p.49),

and "Life from Everlasting Life is the great scripture which is among us (C.p.50).

In the Valentinian System "Life" was one of the eight aeons, and this word referring to the Law, is quite often interchanged by Marqah for "light." (cf. C.pp.49,50,51). Brown²³ makes mention of Sam. tradition that creation was an emanation of the Divine Will, which was wrought for the sake of seven things²⁴ which pre-existed; Light; The two tablets of stone; The great prophet Moses; Mount Gerizim; The Sabbath; Adam; and Israel.

"Life from Everlasting Life is the great scripture," (C.p.50)

recalls to mind the Gospel of St. John²⁵:-

"You search the scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life."

Marqah also writes anent the Law in the same prayer:-

"Every generation shall testify that it containeth not any heresies written, but only by God and Moses."

This may be a reminder to the Sam. that no notice is to be taken of what has been written since Moses. This may be an

allusion to the Jewish "Prophets" and "The Writings."

It might also be taken as a reference to what became known as Sam. "Oral Law," although the mention of "heresies" in this connection would be rather strong. However the Sam. would view with suspicion any tradition, written or oral, which might pretend to rival the Pentateuch. M.Gaster²⁶ says that under the beneficent and tolerant rule of the Persian kings the Sam. enjoyed three centuries of peace. Laws and ordinances were developed. About the beginning of the first century A.D. these became fossilized for the Sam. and were called the "Oral Law." Marqah, who with Amram Darah had been engaged by Baba Rabba, a strict legalist, to supply a synagogue liturgy²⁷ would be on the qui vive to maintain the integrity of the Torah. Indeed this appears to be the case, for Marqah (C.p.50) states that Moses expounded from "the five books," and

"From the top of Mount Gerizim were the
decrees and laws taught to Israel."

In the same prayer, the angels are but onlookers;²⁸ they do not handle the Law. God wrote and he gave to Moses. Marqah (C.p.51) writes:-

"O beautiful lamp that giveth light in
this book of the covenant."

The Sam. believed that God's bond with Israel had been concluded on seven occasions:-

1. With Noah in the Rainbow.
2. With Abraham in Circumcision.
3. With Moses in the Sabbath.
4. With the Two Tablets of the Ten Commandments.
5. With the Passover.
6. With the Covenant of Salt (Num.xviii,19).
7. With the Covenant of Priesthood with Phinehas (Num.xxv,12 ff.)

The Sam. at no time in their history, ever release a hold on this covenant concept, with its corollary of their relationship with Yahweh. A belief in the Torah was also a belief in the seven covenants which bound Israel to God as His chosen people. It was a symbol of Divine Favour, even when, as the Sam. believed, they lived in an era of disfavour.

Marqah, in the Defter, is the only writer who refers to God as Everlasting Life (C.pp.51,58,60), but so important is the Torah that he states (C.p.52):-

"Everlasting Life was seen descending, and the children of the city of above saw that it was written with the finger of Himself, and it was held out in the right hand of the Lord, and the prophet prostrated when he came from receiving it."

He has already (C.p.51) mentioned "the scriptures, gleamed from Everlasting Life; with great praise shall we praise them, for the host of heaven praised them when they came down from the midst of the abode of angels."

So Marqah, the only one to refer to God as Everlasting Life in the Defter, now uses it to describe the scriptures. How

does this situation feasibly arise? An analysis of this prayer (C.p.51) shows that Marqah has fused together two pictures, one from Gen. iii, and the other from Ex.xix (Moses receiving the Law on Mount Sinai). But where is the connection? Where is the common denominator that could bring together such seemingly disconnected incidents? Marqah is out to show that the Torah comes forth or emanates from God. An examination of the text would indicate that he is aware of the Ophite System of Gnosticism. He mentions that it comes down (emanates) from the midst of the abode of angels (abode of aeons?). The Supreme Being, Light, has his abode in the Bythos. The assembly (of aeons?) is full (Pleroma) of light. This light emanates from the light of Everlasting Life (i.e. the Supreme Being (Light). Lightning illumined as it came forth from the hidden to the seen, and dew-drops²⁹ of mercy (light?) broke into drops (sparks or pieces) and came down for the generations of Man. In the Ophite system the spirit illumines Man. "A garden in which no serpent entered," recalls the Ophites, who were so named from their devotion to the serpent in Gen.iii, whom they regarded as the first liberator of Man. Also in the Ophite System the overflow of light falls down as dew. On reaching the waters it assumes from it a body. "A seed brought down from His abode" (C.p.51) is a Gnostic concept. The Torah comes

"down to the children of mortals" (C.p.51), as does the Gnostic dew-drop of light become shrouded with matter that is mortal. In the Ophite System the consummation is effected when all the dew-drops of light are gathered, saved from the material world, and restored to the Incorruptible Aeon.

A prayer (C.p.55; writer unknown: ? Marqah) that is of considerable interest in regard to the Law, introduces the note of personification. The writer praises the Scriptures and objectifies them as is done with Wisdom³⁰, with such comments as :-

"Before thee we come and prostrate."

"With sincerity and reverence we stand before thee."

"Our maker and our possessor, teach us; we shall love thee."

However, in spite of referring to the Law in the 2nd person, the writer never loses sight that God is the giver, and Moses the receiver, for he writes:-

"We praise thy glory, for thou art written by the finger of God."

There is the question to be asked, and answered; would a Sam. writer, on his own initiative, personalize the Law? Or was he re-acting to influences from outside? Perhaps the most important document in the Kabbalistic tradition is the Zohar, a work which is attributed by some to have been written in the first half of the second century by Simeon b.

Yohai. In it are lengthy comments on the Torah, and its order follows the Pentateuch. The Zohar uses man as an analogy for the Torah. The Torah has a body made up of precepts. It has also a soul. The really wise, the servants of God, who stand on Mount Sinai penetrate right through to the soul of the real Torah. The prayer (C.p.55) says that,

"The Mountain trembled much when the prophet received thee,"

and those of the Israelites standing near the Mount penetrate right into the inner meaning of the Torah. The writer of this prayer (C.p.55) could have been aware of the concepts found in the Zohar.

It is said of the Torah that,

"All healing comes from thee" (C.p.55),

and that,

"It is the healer of life, it cleanseth spirits, it sanctifieth souls, it enlightens hearts."

While the Sam. knew that secret powers were hidden in the textual structure of the Law they did not believe in magic. They however maintained that the word of God, properly used might afford some protection both prophylactic and cathartic. As a prophylactic the word protected against disease. Catharsis would both cleanse and purge.

Marqah (C.p.59) states that:-

"This is the sacred scripture, which came down from the heaven of heavens."

While "the heaven of heavens" is found in the Pentateuch³¹ it could be that the concept borders on the Gnostic. In the System of Valentinus the basic principle is that of emanation of aeons. Although Valentinus lived about 140, his aeon-theory of the universe continued to dominate the minds of men in cent. following. In his System Truth (Torah?) is one of the aeons which emanates from the supreme abode above. Truth is one of the original aeons in the Ogdoad; then comes the Decad, and later the Dodecad. With two more aeons the Pleroma is complete. Yahweh (or the Demiurgos) reigned in a lower heaven from that of the Supreme Being. He was in the heaven of heavens. It is interesting to observe that in the System of Valentinus, he derives two aeons, "Word" and "Life" and from these two come the Decad (another ten aeons).

This is another prayer of Marqah (C.p.59) which could lend itself to Gnostic interpretation, showing how the Torah had acquired for the Sam. a mystical significance, especially with its association with Mount Sinai. While the Sam. are aware that the concepts of Justice and Righteousness form the basis of the Torah, there are occasions when the "form" of the Torah is more emphasized than the "content." The prayer states that when Moses received the Law from God he was,

"Clothed with the unseen and the seen."

The Valentinians make a point of saying that Man was clothed in a coat of skin³². When commentating on this text Origen stated that the coat had a certain and mysterious meaning. This idea could have been derived from the Gnostics or from the Zohar. The Torah was endowed with clothes.

"Thus had the Torah not clothed herself in garments of this world, the world could not endure it."

So with reference to Man;

"The garments worn by a man are the most visible part of him, and senseless people looking at the man do not seem to see more in him than the garments." 33

Moses in the prayer (C.p.59) was clothed with that which is "unseen," and the "seen," whether it be clothes or his body.

When Marqah writes (C.p.61):-

"From the unseen of His abode, the Ten Words of the covenant came forth,"

the Ten Words could be looked upon by a Gnostic as reflecting the Decad or Ten Aeons, while the other prayer (C.p.59) has a Gnostic echo when stating:-

"Happy are they who fulfil His words, for they are saved from all penalty."

Like other religious bodies the Gnostics emphasize the necessity for salvation, but it is rather a salvation based on knowledge (Gnosis); a salvation from ignorance through wisdom, and not from moral turpitude. The Zohar mentions that:-

"The really wise, the servants of the most high King, those who stood on Mount Sinai," are acquainted with the real Torah.³⁴ In the prayer the angels and mortals stand before Mount Sinai, and God is referred to as "Lord of prophets"; the preference of the Gnostics for describing God is the ascription of "Lord." Only once in the Defter is God alluded to as the "Illustrious One," and that is in this prayer by Marqah. In the Pleroma there is a fulness of light, but the void outside is darkness itself. The Supreme God is the source of all illumination. The prayer expresses Gnostic ideas when it says of the Torah:-

"It is light from the Glorious One, which lightens hearts, and brings salvation from eternity, and the world is in it (i.e. basks in it)"

The Torah also is alluded to as "His work." The Valentinians referred to God (i.e. Yahweh) as the Demiurgos or Workman. He was the Maker of the World. In the prayer Moses receives the Torah "From His Maker." The Defter refers to God as "The Maker of the World" (C.p.27; Marqah; ? Amram Darah). The last verse of the prayer (C.p.59) is Gnosticism par excellence. It states:-

"The depth of the unseen and seen is the Law that was given us from His wisdom. No man sees God but through wisdom."

In the Valentinian System Wisdom (Sophia) has a desire to see the Supreme Being. She is prevented from doing so by

Horus. However she bears one called Hachamoth, or "The Desire for Wisdom." The Valentinian Theory is Gnosticism at its prime. Both Clement of Alexandria and Origen made use of Gnostic ideas and concepts, yet both remained loyal to the Christian Creed. So also it is possible for Marqah to have held so high an opinion of the Torah as to see it through the eyes of others who were not Sam. If he used the Gnostic coinage, he does not necessarily subscribe to the economic system associated with that coinage. The Torah through the spread of Koine Greek became known as Nomos, and as such lent itself to an exegesis that was mystical. Marqah would not be unaware, nor un-influenced by such a trend.

This survey of the Defter has shown that the reverence they have for the Torah is in general alignment with orthodox Israel. Their attitude might be on a higher level in that their sole bible was the Torah with no additions. Yet it has not been easy to isolate any trait particularly Sam. The giving of the Law to Moses on Mount Sinai by God, in the presence of angels and mortals, of powers unseen and seen was an occasion never to be erased from the minds of Israel. Not only did they become a nation welded together from heterogenous clans by identifying themselves with the worship of the true God, Yahweh, but they became a religious group with the Law as its most distinctive feature.

2. THE CONCEPT OF THE TORAH IN THE 14th CENTURY.

If there is a change of emphasis by the Sam. of the 14th cent. it is in regard to the precepts of the law as distinct from the law as an instrument. The emphasis tends to veer away from objectivity to that of subjectivity. Faith in the law now seeks to translate itself more fully into works. This is not to say that the 14th cent. Sam. disregarded the application of the law in actual practice. Their veneration of the law arose from the cardinal fact that it was given by God to Moses rather than by the merits of intrinsic worth. Faith in the law was maintained at all times; the emphasis was from an attitude of objective value to that of subjective values.

An exponent of this matter of subjectivity is Aaron b. Manir in the Sam. Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy³⁵. The day of atonement lends itself to personal introspection, in spite of it being the occasion when the nation rather than the individual, seeks to identify itself with an act of repentance. Ben Manir lays special emphasis on lapses from the law and its consequences. To worship God "in truth" is to observe the Law of Moses, which Sam. themselves refer to as "The Truth" (Kushtah) and to keep its moral precepts.

Allied to the moral side of the Torah is the civil or judicial side. The law, however venerated in its abstractness, must be seen at work in the market places.

Not only must justice be done, it must be seen to be done. The motive in the Torah is the protection of personality. The Torah has no valid meaning apart from the sanctity of personality. Other ancient codes, such as that of Hammurabi existed primarily for the protection of property. Ben Manir, in the Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy (C.pp.677 and 679) draws up a formidable list of evil deeds. He tries to show that there is a design and purpose in the moral precepts by indicating the inevitability of the evils which have befallen them. He is a worthy devotee of Nemesis, the goddess of vengeance and recompense in Greek mythology. He is an advocate of the Teleological Argument in its moral setting. In a way he is like a second Amos coming to Northern Israel, advocating, as did his predecessor, a doctrine of social righteousness based on the Law. Teleology emphasises the concept of purpose, and usually presupposes the reality of Free-will. Aristotle was an outstanding teleologist and Maimonides follows him in this respect. It has been suggested in this thesis that Ben Manir may well have been aware of Maimonides work, and may even have read Maimonides book "The Guide to the Perplexed."³⁶

Ben Manir, like Amos, sees a casual relationship between evil deeds, and national adversity, and vice versa. Only when the people conform to the Torah will God's favour eventually return. God's favour will return when the

people are sufficiently righteous. Maimonides taught that there is a design (i.e. Teleological) in nature, in the law, in biblical narrative, and in moral precepts. The Sam. believed that they lived in the epoch of God's "disfavour," because in regard to the Law they were "Lapsi". There were occasions, however, when this view was not always apparent. After all the Yom Ha-Kippur only occurred once a year.

In these prayers (C.pp.677 and 679) Ben Manir speaks of the evil of past deeds. He refers to violence and lying, dealing treacherously; we extort and cheat and deal iniquitously in judgements; slander against persons; envy; words become blows; loving vanity and hating truth; lies and stealing and cheating; confine and rob; taking bribes; walking with harlots. He tries to show that there is design in moral precepts by indicating the inevitability of the evils that have befallen them, as when he writes:-

"We are smitten with every kind of plague"
"Our houses occupy desolate sites"
"The synagogue has departed from us"
"The Lord has done with us this, because of
the evil-doing of all the people"

The background of Samaria does not appear to have changed much since the days of Amos (760 - 750 B.C.) when "Bethel, Gilgal and Samaria, rather than Jerusalem, were the foci of religious and national interest."³⁷ Later Samaria fell and became a subject race (722 B.C.). When Ben Manir wrote,

the decline and fall of Samaria was becoming evident by their decrease in numbers.

In the Liturgy for the Feast of Weeks³⁸ special reference is made to the use of the Law in relation to this feast. In it the law is made use of both in extenso and in Qetaphim. Ben Manir however has relatively little to say about the Law. He does mention the Law but as

"The Scripture of Abisha." (C.pp.386,387,389).
"With the scripture of Abisha thou shalt be assembled" (C.p.389).

This is a reference to the Sam. legend that Abisha, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar wrote in Mount Gerizim the thirteenth year after Joshua and the Israelites had crossed over the Jordan into Canaan. In the Feast of Weeks, the scripture of Abisha is mentioned by Ben Manir (C.pp.386,387,389), Mattanah Ha-Mizri (C.p.737) and in a Rubric (C.p.423).

The reference to the "Holy Book of Abisha" in the Feast of Tabernacles³⁹ occurs once in a Rubric (C.p.737).

In the Sam. Liturgies for their Passover, and their Feast of Unleavened Bread⁴⁰, the "Scroll of Abisha" is mentioned by Abisha b. Phinehas (C.pp.249,253,254), and by the 16th cent. writer Abraham Ha-Qabazi (C.p.254).

It seems possible, therefore, for Ben Manir to have introduced this new description of the Law into Sam. literature. He may be attempting to associate more closely the idea of the Torah with Mount Gerizim; or else bringing

into greater prominence the important role that Joshua played in leading the Israelites into Canaan.

On the other hand Abisha b. Phinehas might be eulogising his namesake. This Abisha scroll of the Pentateuch is discussed fully by M. Gaster,⁴¹ pointing out that it was natural for the Sam. to preserve their ancient documents. Normally, however, the procedure was for the ancient Hebrew Scholars to copy from a Scroll and produce a new one, the old one being cremated with fire at a special service. The Abisha scroll does indicate the great importance that was attached to the possession of an authentic copy of the Law. For the Sam. to substantiate that they were truly keepers of the Law, dependence upon an unadulterated text of the Law would be a necessary sine qua non.

In another prayer Ben Manir (C.p.385) states:-

"He (i.e. Moses) brought the law to
illuminate our hearts,"

mentioning the expression that:-

"with the Scripture of Abisha (C.p.387) thou
shalt be assembled."

This prayer ends with the benediction of the "Hundred Years" occurring five times (C.p.388).

Illumination shall be considered a little later.

Abisha b. Phinehas tends to look upon the Law objectively. If Ben Manir is the counterpart of Amos,

then Abisha b. Phinehas is the counterpart of Hosea. To Amos Yahweh was primarily a God of Justice, to Hosea he was a God of Love. Ben Manir tends to see God as a God of Justice, therefore the Law is a criterion for measuring conduct. The Law for him is realized in its subjective application. For Abisha, the Law is objective; it is a symbol reflecting the Love of God for Man in achieving his redemption. Abisha always thinks in terms of the Trinity; God, The Law, and Moses. The Law would appear to take the place of the Holy Spirit. The Gospel of St. John⁴² says:-

"And He will give you another Counsellor to be with you for ever, even the spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him, nor knows him, for he dwells with you and will be in you."

and⁴³:-

"When the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth."

Omitting the word "spirit" would render the above two statements as almost being Sam..

When Abisha mentions the Law being received by Moses from God, the Angels are witnesses.⁴⁴ They in no way intrude to upset the sequence of God, the Law and Moses. This may explain, if Abisha has a trinity in mind, why he tends to hypostasize the Law. He writes (6.p.736):-

"Peace be to you, Moses, our prophet.
Peace be to you, the Book of Abisha's Law.
Peace be to you, holiest of our Mountains.
Peace be to you the saved people."

Hypostasization in this way was very common in ancient and medieval times, especially in the Middle East, and too much store cannot be laid on its use.

Abdullah b. Solomon in his great hymn "The Hymn of the Birth of Moses" (C.pp.746-753), by showing the greatness of Moses, brings out fully the uniqueness of the Law. Moses was great, not only because God revealed His name to Moses, but also because of God giving the Law to Moses. He points out that Moses,

"Came to reveal the Truth according to the word of the Lord," 45

meaning thereby that Moses brought the "Torah" which is quite often indicated by use of the word Truth (Kushtah) as a synonym. By referring to truth, and thereby the Commandments of God, Abdullah brings it within the orbit of St. John⁴⁶, for the question does arise as to whether Abdullah in saying "Moses came to reveal the truth according to the word of the Lord," is not contributing towards a Sam. doctrine of the Logos.

Abdullah tends to give the Law a unique place by saying that the perfect Law was written with the

"Finger of fire" (C.p.775).

Normally the expression is with or by the "Finger of God."

It may be a concession to the rampant mysticism of the Middle Ages, Jewish, Christian and Muslim (Sufism) that Abdullah has eliminated the Anthropomorphic vestige, and

writes "The Finger of Fire." Fire is a symbol of the Holy Spirit, and "the finger of fire" recalls to mind The Acts⁴⁷. Is Abdullah suggesting that the Perfect Law was written by "the finger of fire," having the Holy Spirit of God in mind? An attempt has been made to show that when writing, for example, "The Hymn of the Birth of Moses" (C.pp.746-753) Abdullah could have been aware of the Gospel of St. John⁴⁸. He may have also been aware of The Acts of the Apostles.⁴⁹

Abdullah mentions that God (C.p.310)

"Sent Moses, the Son of Amram unto whom
the Truth was entrusted, to bring forth
His people."

This statement of Abdullah's is retrospective for the Truth had not been entrusted to Moses before he brought forth the people out of Egypt. It shows however how the Law held such a predominant place in the minds of the Sem. that they can read back into the Exodus a facet which at the time of the Exodus did not exist. It has been said that such is the impression, that Moses and the Exodus made on the Semitic mind, that both must be historical facts, if ever there was any doubt.

Surely the Law is as much a reality as Moses or the Exodus!

Abdullah's suggestion that the Perfect Law was written with the "finger of fire" (C.p.775) is to show how close the

Law was to God. Crown⁵⁰ writes:-

"It is taught that the Law came from the very essence of God, and was detached from the fire of the Deity. There is an idea of emanation and no origin is too divine."

This emanation is hinted at by Marqah, for he referred to God as Everlasting Life, and later gives the same ascription to the Law itself. It is by virtue of the Law coming from the "fire of deity" that the figure of the "finger of fire" arises, and that illumination comes from the Law. The Law is the path of redemption for the Sam. Man must face trial by God before he may enter Paradise. The Hilukh, a late Sam. work claims that the Law alone distinguishes between good and evil. If the Sam. wishes for salvation he can reach it through the Law. The Sam. called themselves the keepers (Shomerim) of the Law, for salvation is achieved via the Law. It is likely therefore, that in the early days, the Law constituted the sole liturgy for the Sam. The 4th cent. saw the development of liturgical compositions. Baba Rabba had a high regard for the Law, but he encouraged Amram Darah and Marqah to write liturgical compositions. The increase in the number of those hymns, prayers and poems in the Liturgy would compel the reading of the Law to become more restricted.

Whereas once the Law was read in extenso, now the tendency was to have token readings; to resort to a

precis. This introduced the custom of abbreviations known as Qetaphim. These Qetaphim are really an attempt at compromise, a constriction of the presentation of the Law. The Qetaphim are virtually abstracts and sometimes have a common denominator, such as the theme of merit. There is a Qataph of the "Meritorious Ones." As the prayers and hymns of contemporary authors came to be added to the liturgy so references to the Law become briefer, but they are never omitted. Boys⁵¹ wrote his thesis, "with special reference to the use of the Law." With regard to the use of the Law it is possible to see an evolution in its development. Originally there would be the Law in toto or relevant parts of the Law. Then came the time when there would be inserted hymns and prayers in the Liturgy composed chiefly by the High Priests. This was the chief plank in the argument of Dr. J.H.Gaster in conversation, for maintaining orthodoxy in Sam. belief, and for militating against any oecumenical movement as may have occurred in the 14th cent. The high priests in a strict line of tradition would be out to maintain the status quo whether in the letter or in the spirit. A selection of long passages from the Law would be curtailed, and eventually a reduction of the Law to Qetaphim.

So highly is the Law held in veneration that they affirm (C.p.251):-

"For it the world was founded."

The Law is highly venerated as coming from God, and so embodying the supreme revelation of the Will of God, but also by virtue of the fact that they received it by the hand of Moses. There is the Godward side of the Law and there is the Moses side too. Moses "plucked from eternal life" the words of the Law.

The 14th cent. writers have brought into a very close relationship, God, The Law, and Moses. It is not outside the bounds of probability that this trio constituted the Sam. conception of the Trinity. As there is no mention of the Holy Spirit up to the 14th cent. in Sam. belief they may have developed the concept of the Law instead. Just as the Christian Church, as exemplified in the Creed, affirms that the Holy Spirit, "The Lord and giver of life, proceeds from the Father and the Son," so the Sam. believe that the Law, the giver of Life, proceeds from God and from Moses, the Son of His house. The Law is a greater reality to the Sam. and the Jew than the Holy Spirit is to the Christian. The Law achieved a greater pre-eminence in the minds of the Sam. than the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has ever done in the Christian Church.

3. ILLUMINATION AND THE DEFTER.

The 14th cent. in Sam. belief saw the development of a concept that is not peculiar to Samaritanism. They begin to stress more fully the principle of illumination. Just previously it had been stated in a prayer (C.p.385) by Ben Manir, that:-

"He (i.e. Moses) brought the Law to illuminate our hearts."

To illuminate means to bring light into a situation where before there was darkness. The locus classicus for theologians is in Genesis,⁵² when light was introduced into the physical world. But the word is used most often in a more abstract manner, meaning to enlighten mentally, morally or spiritually. It often means the reception of knowledge where before there was ignorance. Light has always been a favourite concept in religious thought, especially as opposed to darkness, and on occasion light and life have become synonymous expressions. Nations somehow had understood what is a sound scientific principle, that without light there is no life. The person who wrote Gen. stating that God said

"Let there be light,"

and placing the concept first in his description of creation must have been spiritually inspired. Since that day science has demonstrated the soundness of such a simple, yet profound statement.

One of the earliest of religions to develop the dialectical of light and darkness was Zoroastrianism. Zarathustra (Greek; Zoroaster) lived about 1000 B.C. He was a spiritual genius, who in an age of belief in many gods, held to the concept of the "One God." He spoke of the Wise God (Ahura Mazda) who dwells in light, and who "created light and darkness."⁵³ There was a time when darkness was not the antithesis to light that it eventually came to be. "One of the oldest pre-Christian Benedictions in the Jewish Liturgy, which was also said at dawn, begins with the words: 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who formest light and created darkness."⁵⁴ It is a moot point as to how much, if any, the Jews were influenced by the Persians. At least they must have been impressed by a religion that had aspects comparable with their own faith. The Persians believed in the pre-existence of the Divine Law which they personified. This is a view that the Sam. accepted. Later Iranian influences however saw a dualism of light and darkness, and the cleavage became deeper with the passing of time. This distinction becomes accentuated, finding its true milieu in the moral and spiritual realms.

In the Defter two strands of thought are to be discovered. Marqah (C.p.20) sees no dichotomy between light and darkness, when he writes:-

"Wheresoever He kindleth the light, He is
praised by every mouth,
And wheresoever He spreadeth forth darkness,
hearts thank Him."

Nana b. Marqah (C.p.15) supports this view, for he sees
light and darkness as being complementary, and are due to
God's goodness.

On the other hand there is the theme of stressing the
antithesis of light and darkness. Marqah (C.p.51)
referring to the Law says:-

"To them that obey it my Lord giveth light,
and darkness to those who do not obey it."

One of Ab-Gelugah's prayers (C.p.75) in the Defter refers
to:-

"The lights of Thy salvation shine into the
darkness of oppression."

Any doctrine of illumination must inevitably postulate
God as the source of all light, and indeed of all life.
This is no exception in the Defter. God is referred to
as (C.p.24):-

"The Brightest of all lights,"

and

"The God of light." (C.p.36)

God is designated as,

"A consuming fire." (C.p.50)

Marqah (C.p.59) refers to God as:-

"The Illustrious One."

Marqah (C.p.20) says of God:-

"O Light, whose brightness is the fulness of
the world,
O Light, all lights are derived from Thy
goodness."

This is one of the prayers of Marqah suggestive of Gnosticism. In the Ophite System the Supreme Being was designated as Light. The overflow of light falls to the waters below, and from them assumes a body. It is the mission of Christ to descend and gather together all the dew of light, and to restore it to the Incorruptible Aeon. In the Gnostic System of Valentinus the Pleroma is full of light, while the void outside is darkness. In this System "fire will eventually consume all matter, and itself be consumed, to exist no more."⁵⁵ Marqah's quotation (C.p.20) puts him very close to the Valentinian System.

The Mandaeans also look upon God as the source of light. In Hasting's Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics;⁵⁶

"It is conjectured that the primitive religious system of the Mandaeans was conjoined to a strictly monotheistic Gnosis by the writers of the 4th - 5th cent. A.D.; which is called the Doctrine of the King of Light."

While they believed that the Absolute Source was light, and that the earth lies solid in the black water, they did not believe in the dualism of the Manichaeans. The Mandaean Theology affirms that there is an original world of light, all splendid above the planets. There light dwells in the Supreme Deity. From this realm above Man derives his soul.

The Mandaeans are believed to have had associations with John the Baptist, who according to the Johannine Gospel came to bear testimony and,⁵⁷

"to bear witness to the light."

Mention is made also of⁵⁸

"The true light that enlightens every man was coming into the world."

The Mandaeans state that this earth is foreign to Man's true well-being, therefore Man must bathe in "Living Water." The Christian belief in a redemption from spiritual evil, from the dominion of Satan, and the power of sin is quite foreign to Mandaean thought. At the hour of death a divine being descends from the world of light, and as the "Liberator" takes the soul from the body, and bears it upwards through the celestial spheres to the world of light and of the Great Life.

The origin of the Mandaean doctrine is to be sought in the Northern part of Palestine, and still more accurately by the banks of the Jordan. It is supposed that the doctrines took their rise at the time of John the Baptist. There is however evidence for Gnostic influences.⁵⁹

Marqah (C.p.24) states:-

"Thy brightness spread forth the world at Thy will, Light of Lights, unto Thee praises are to be declared."

At the Council of Nicaea in 325 each word and sentence was contested vigorously. Eventually it was decided that

Jesus Christ was

"Light of Lights."⁶⁰

One could quite legitimately ask the question did Marqah write this prayer following on the Council of Nicaea? It is not without academic interest to read the Nicene Creed in conjunction with this prayer of Marqah (C.p.24).

Dr. T.H.Gaster, in conversation, stated that the Sam. refer to Moses as UR MIN UR, Light of (from) Light.

A Defter prayer (C.p.56) says of Moses:-

"The prophet was crowned with light which was the fulness of receiving Thee."

The Sam.⁶¹ believe that creation was an emanation of the Divine Will, which was wrought for the sake of seven things which pre-existed, namely Light, the great prophet Moses; the two tablets of stone, Mount Gerizim, the Sabbath, Adam, and Israel. On a Gnostic basis the light, Moses, and the Law would be part of the Pleroma or fulness, indicating thereby that Moses comes very near to the Supreme Being. As part of the Pleroma, and pre-existing, his very nature (the Crown or head) would be in close affinity with God. In a Gnostic sense it would not be too outrageous to say that Moses partakes of divinity, if not in essence, at least in function.

The Law also comes within the orbit of light, for Marqah writes (C.p.60):-

"The Great and Lofty Light stretched forth a torch of light to the prophet garbed with a ray of light, when he came down bearing the tablets, written by the finger of God, by the right hand of God, a consuming fire."

(cf. C.p.52 also).

To clinch the matter (C.p.59) it is stated regarding the Law:-

"It is a light from the Glorious One."

It is shown that in the 4th cent. there was a connection based on light bringing God, the Law, and Moses into a close relationship. And in the 4th cent. there is a clue of what was likely to occur later regarding illumination for the Defter (C.p.58) says:-

"Praised be the Great King, for He enlightens Hebrews with His writings, and all are light."

The Defter has laid the foundation, often seemingly with Gnostic innuendos and nuances, for erecting a doctrine of illumination. God is light; Moses is vested with light and the Law is the vehicle of light. Those who read the Law are illuminated and darkness disappears. This darkness can be mental or spiritual. The spreading of light cannot but be for the health of Man. "And we have done those things which we ought not to have done, and there is no health in us."⁶² The Law for the Sam. is both a prophylactic and cathartic, enabling them to turn "from the darkness of Penuthah to the light of faith." (C.p.289).

4. ILLUMINATION AND MEMAR MARQAH

M.M. has much to say about illumination, and the reason for this is not difficult to discover. If Book IV has an affinity with the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Book VI contains elements associated with Kabbalah, Book II certainly makes use of Gnostic coinage. An examination of this Book shows that some of its ideas can with reasonable certainty be traced back to Gnostics who made contributions to the heresy. These include Basilides of Alexandria (C.130); Saturninus of Antioch (C.125); Carpocrates (C.150); Valentinus (C.150); Marcion (C.160); and Tatian the Syrian (C.172). Indeed the epithet "Lord of the World" may very well be traced back to Marcion (C.160), who refers to the Kosmo-Krator. It is through the examination of Book II that it is seen that "illumination" is equivalent to Gnosis, and that the illuminati are akin in status to Gnostics. It may be that the Sam. insisted on faith, because the Gnostics held that one had to move forward from faith (Pistis) to that of knowledge (Gnosis). The Gnostics played down faith. Bowman⁶³ affirms that:-

"The Samaritans stress faith and knowledge as is done in the fourth Gospel."

He also stated that,⁶⁴

"Rabbin Judaism shifted the emphasis from faith to works."

Gnosticism brought to those initiated special illumination.

The writer of M.M.⁶⁵ says:-

"Thus Abraham truly ascribed greatness to our God, who implanted secrets into the hearts of good men, that He might illumine them, and that they might reveal them."

The writer claims illumination for Abraham and his successors, but instead of secrecy, which the Gnostics sought, Abraham was to reveal his secrets.

The six Books of M.M. are further evidence in support of the ideological background, from which the 14th cent. Sam. were motivated, if not directly influenced. They reveal a background containing elements from Jewish Kabbalah, the Christian Epistle to the Hebrews, and Gnostic systems. Robertson⁶⁶ has pointed out that in the long course of their history, the Sam. have clung fiercely and tenaciously to their Law, but have adopted and adapted means of widening its scope, without altering the letter. This is especially true of the Pentateuch in general. They cannot be accused of plagiarism, but they "rationalize" the material they have come across from sources that can be guessed at, if not proved in toto. There may be those who reject the method of analysis, which shows if not proves "rationalization." But quite often original material is so distorted in this game of mental gymnastics, that it is difficult to distinguish the confluence of ideas or terminology. The subject of illumination is a good example for demonstration. If Gnosticism originated in

Samaria, should one be surprised to find evidence of it in Sam. literature?

5. ILLUMINATION AND THE 14th CENT.
WRITERS.

Aaron b. Manir, in the main, keeps to the strict tradition of the Sam. when referring to the tenets of their teaching. Yet there are occasions when his hymns are rather obscure in allusions, and in meaning. Macdonald⁶⁷ has indicated how difficult some of these hymns are to translate. The difficulty is still there when an exegesis is attempted. Some of these compositions tend to be deliberately obscure, and it would seem that Ben Manir intended his mysterious allusions only for the enlightened of his Faith. One has to be a Sam. "Gnostic", and to be illumined with light, (MANIR means "Enlightening") in order to penetrate into the meaning Ben Manir implies. Although he is not a Gnostic, he tends to follow the gnostic pattern of mystical intuition, resorting at times to what could be called Kabbalistic concepts. Modern Kabbalah dates from about 1200. Indeed "the "Golden Age of Kabbalism" was at the turn from the thirteenth to the fourteenth centuries."⁶⁸ One of the chief works in the Kabbala tradition was the Zohar, which was made known by Moses de Leon at the end of the thirteenth cent. Its influence became widespread, and

concentrating generally on the Pentateuch, could quite easily have come within the orbit of Sam. writers.

Ben Manir (C.pp.676-678) attempts to show the need that Man has for illumination. He states that:-

"Our souls are stubborn and do evil works."

He asks:-

"What beauty can be found in us?"

On nine occasions occurs the repetitive sentence:-

"To him we were once good."

He then adds:-

"With a heart clear of evil let us praise the God of spirits, who illumines the mind, which can perceive Him, that it seek the good things which are seen."

This may be an allusion to the "evil imagination"

(The Yetzer Harah),⁶⁹ an expression which came to have a very important place in later Jewish theology. To this source was attributed the bias or the tendency to sin. Only by its subordination can Man be receptive of God's revelation, and his mind become illumined. The process of revelation leads to illumination. Revelation is initially the cause, of which illumination is the result. When God revealed himself to Man, illumination occurred pari passu. Something like this happened to the two men on the road to Emmaus,⁷⁰

"They said to each other, 'Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked to us on the road, while he opened to us the scriptures?'"

The verb "to burn" in the Greek (Kaiō) means "to cause to burn", or "to light", and when used in St. John⁷¹ it means "to consume with fire." The latter reference recalls to mind the Sam. description of God (C.p.60) as:-

"A consuming fire."

Illumination is an apprehension of truth which rests directly or indirectly on the activity of God. It is a communication of truth to which Man cannot attain by his own unaided endeavours. If the human spirit is related to the Divine, and there is an interaction between them, there is every possibility of God imparting knowledge to men. So that God by revelation may influence the minds of men by illumination. Maimonides⁷², by whom Ben Manir may have been influenced writes:-

"(Parts of the eye) are intended for the purpose of allowing the Spiritus Visus to pass, and to perceive certain objects,"

but this is only achieved, in the ideal sense, by illumination.

Ben Manir in an EQR'Ū (C.p.678) comes out clearly in support of reason aided by revelation. He speaks of God, "who illumines the mind, which can perceive Him," referring also to "the sight of intelligence." On the matter of intelligence, Maimonides⁷³ deals fully with the concept of God as the intellectus, the ens intelligens, and the ens intelligibile. The interaction between God and Man is

possible, for he writes:-⁷⁴

"We have thus shown that the identity of the intellect, the intelligens and the intelligible, is not only a fact as regards the Creator, but as regards all intellect when in action."

Ben Manir (C.p.679), like the Gospel of St. John, has a prominent place for the concept of light which illumines. In fact "the light which illumines" is a stock phrase of his. He writes:-

"In the light which illumines, radiates, makes intelligent everyone who perceives; See it come from his soul, seeking, seeking this light."

Is not "makes intelligent everyone who perceives" reminiscent of Maimonides? See above. Macdonald,⁷⁵ in a footnote indicates that, "The reference seems to be to Moses." The Gospel of St. John, where light is a major concept, refers to Moses on more occasions than do the other Gospels (i.e. eleven times). There does not appear to be any doubt but that Ben Manir is so close, on occasion, to the Johannine Gospel in thought as almost to suggest cognizance. Yet the close alignment of thought may be but a "coincidence of thought."

In the Pentecostal Series⁷⁶ Ben Manir writes:-

"He (i.e. Moses) brought the Law to illuminate our hearts,"

for God had,

"endued him with His light."

Previously Ben Manir (C.pp.676-678) was quoted as imputing evil to the heart, and that God,

"Illumines the mind."

But if the mind is illuminated, ipso facto, the heart would be free from evil. The mention of "heart" or "mind" usually suggests the whole of Man, his personality and his character, this being the implication behind the Shemah Israel.⁷⁷

Ben Manir clinches the matter regarding illumination when he states (C.p.385):-

"He (i.e. Moses) brought the Law to illuminate our hearts,"

for "He endued him with His light."

The Law is to become the vade mecum for every Sam. By means of the Law the hearts of men are to become illumined with light, which will dissipate that ignorance which causes men to sin, for sin is not only disobedience to God, but also to His Law. God will keep His covenants with them, embodied as the covenants are in the fabric of the Law, providing that they really keep the Law and become true Shomerim.

Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.507) writes:-

"My God illumine my mind and fill me with Thy lovingkindness, so that I may return to Thy hand and accept me, in the day of Judgement, my Lord."

Abisha pin-points the situation with regard to illumination

by mentioning the lovingkindness of God. The love of God is set forth more clearly in the Law than in Natural Religion. Natural Religion can tell much about God, at least to satisfy a Deist who relies upon reason as distinct from revelation, but cannot tell much about the love of God for Man. Man cannot by the light of nature know that he is a sinner. Knowledge from Nature must be supplemented by illumination. And illumination is only truly possible where love exists; love from God to Man, and from Man to God. This love of Man for God is evoked by God's love for Man. The Law helps Man to achieve this status. That is the first note of importance introduced by Abisha. The second is that he stresses individual response. This was not so with Ben Manir. Illumination cannot be obtained en masse. It comes to the individual soul. About the day of Judgement, Abisha states that they will be judged according to their attitude towards the Law. He writes:-

"How shall it be known except by the Law?"

Abisha gives much attention to the spiritual savoir faire. He believes that he has the spiritual "know-how." Knowledge of God, in the sense of awareness, is an essential requirement of any sincere believer. There is nothing really mystical about obtaining this knowledge. It is knowledge available to all by contemplation on the Law of God. Abisha therefore makes his contribution to the

doctrine of illumination by an examination and analysis of the psychology behind the doctrine.

On the other hand Gnostic redemption consisted in an illumination of the mind; a knowledge of the Secrets or Mysteries, whereby they attained to a perfect knowledge or Gnosis of God. Baynes⁷⁸ makes a reference to the Spinthēr, or Spark of Light which came forth from the Monad to invest Man. This Spark of Light stands for "Spiritual Illumination." In the Gnostic System knowledge of God is not for all people. Initiation is for the selected few. It is a Gnosis to be obtained by mechanical means, and for those who undergo a course of instruction. The emphasis was on exclusiveness - a Mayfair approach to a knowledge of God, or is it more correct to say, a knowledge about God? There is little room for intuition, the process being based on reason. The "Spiritual Illumination" of Abisha had nothing in common with that of the Gnostics.

But when Abisha wrote (C.p.507):-
"My Lord illumine my mind and fill me with
Thy lovingkindness,"

was he not resorting to polemics? The second hymn⁷⁹ in the Sam. Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy (C.pp.501-11) in themes and expressions, runs almost parallel with Bachya Paquda's book, "Duties of the Heart." Paquda wrote his classic in the 12th-13th cent. which achieved a wide circulation, being first written in Arabic, and translated into Hebrew.

Paquda does not commence with God's revelation to Man. He does not take God's existence for granted at all. He relies on the rational process based on observation of the material world, and utilises the Cosmological Argument. He resorts to reason before revelation, seeking to translate the moral law "in the light of pure reason." He submits to the test of reason the question, "Is there a Creator or not?" For him human reason is the ultimate test of conduct, of revelation and of faith. Faith without knowledge is wrong. A man must know the reasons and meaning of his belief; Paquda correctly interprets Shema Israel as "Hear O Israel, and understand." He affirmed that the right study of Nature leads to Nature's God. He mentions the "tenth gate" as being the "Lovingkindness of God." Indeed this is the coping-stone of the entire structure in his reasoning. Is it not likely that as Abisha has thoughts closely parallel to that of Paquda's, but quite often diametrically opposed, he may have been aware of Paquda's work? Paquda stressed reason, whereas Abisha relied on revelation and "illumination" but both eventually agree on the lovingkindness of God.

Jallaladdin⁸⁰ seeks a compromise with regard to reason and its empirical approach, and illumination based on intuition by stating:-

"'Tis God's light that illumines the senses' light;
That is the meaning of 'Light upon light.'"

This would seem to be another interpretation of the Nicene

phrase, "Light of Light." Jallaladdin⁸¹ states that the pure one is drowned in the light,

"That is not begotten."

This may be another allusion to the Nicene Creed, where the "True God" is

"Begotten not made."

Indeed Jallaladdin⁸² continues:-

"What begets not and is not begotten,"

is God.

On this very matter the Quran⁸³ states of God:-

"He begetteth not, neither is He begotten."

The Quran says:-⁸⁴

"God is the light of heaven and earth"

and continues:-

"This is light added unto light;
God will direct unto His light whom He
pleaseth."

A footnote to this comment interprets the light here as being the light revealed in the Quran, or God's enlightening grace in the heart of Man. "Enlightening Grace" in this sense is equivalent to Abisha's and Paquda's "Lovingkindness."

Abdullah b. Solomon does not lay much stress on illumination at all. He is more concerned with the objective side of the matter. Illumination is, after all, a subjective response. To be illuminated people must be

responsive, and 'act positively. Abdullah lays stress rather on the Law as the "Truth." His attitude is gauged by the words (C.p.336):-

"He sanctified us with the instruction of truth (i.e. Torah) by the hand of the prophet."

Instruction suggests that there is to be a reliance upon the process of reasoning, supported with tuition rather than illumination and intuition. Abdullah keeps referring to the Law as "Truth" (C.pp.310,336,412). His attitude seems clear when he adds (C.p.412):-

"This truth has no meaning unless the lords of wickedness, the enemies of the Law, such as the Jews, repent."

But Abdullah does not disregard the symbol of light. "The Hymn of the Birth of Moses" (C.p.746-753) not only has much to say about the "Word," but also about "Light." He refers to the Law as:-

"The light of the truth,"

and Moses as:-

"The light of the world."

He says that:-

"The light of the world was renewed."

He gets very close to illumination when he states:-

"Whom you see but with the eye of the mind."

Abdullah in his hymn makes reference to the

"Sons of man (men)",

while Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.378) alludes to Moses as:-

"One of the sons of man (men)."

It is possible that the implication is that they are,

"sons of light."

Baynes⁸⁵ refers to Adam as "the Man of light." In the Sam. tradition Adam is also "the Man of light." Baynes shows how this title may have arisen. In a book entitled "Authentic Memorandum concerning the Letter Omega," Zosimus, a Greek writer of the 4th cent., mentions that Adam's appellative name is called "Light" (Phōs), from whence it follows that men are spoken of as mortals (Phōtas: lights). The writer points out that there is a play on the words Phōs, a contraction of Phaos = light, and Phōs = a man, a mortal.

So that Moses, according to this explanation is one of the sons of light, and Abdullah's reference is to the sons of light. This, however, is mere conjecture, yet comes within the field of possibility. The light, after all, was renewed in Adam, so that sons of Adam are sons of light, which could suggest that the "Pure Chain" of the Sam. is a vestige or hangover from Gnosticism.

By the 14th cent. the doctrine of illumination became an established feature of Samaritanism. It may be because the Law as a vehicle had become so important in the matter of illumination, that a new respect for the language, in which it was originally written, arose. Or again the answer may be found via the Sephiroth of Kabbalah.

N O T E S

1. THE DOCTRINE OF THE TORAH IN THE
DEFTER.

1. Oesterley, W.O.E. and Robinson, T.H.
op.cit. p.310
2. Ottley, R.L. The Religion of Israel. p.130
3. Cowley, A.E. op.cit. Vol.II, p.xx
4. Bowman, J. L.U.O.S. Vol. I, p.48
5. Macdonald, J. Journal of Jewish Studies
Art: "Comprehensive and Thematic Reading of the Law
Among the Samaritans." June, 1960.
6. Deut. xxxii, 4.
7. II Sam. xxii, 31.
8. Bowman, J. L.U.O.S. Vol. I, p.48.
9. Black, Matthew. op.cit. p.63
10. Bowman, J. L.U.O.S. Vol.I, pp.49-50.
11. Trotter, R.J.F. L.U.O.S. Monograph Series No. I;
October, 1961. "Did the Samaritans of the Fourth
Century know the Epistle to the Hebrews?"
12. cf. The Defter; C.p.11 and C.p.83.
13. cf. M.M. Book IV, Par.5.
14. cf. Acts vii, 53.
15. Grobel, Kendrick, The Gospel of Truth.
16. D.S.S. Manual of Discipline, vii, 12-15.
17. Roget, Peter, Thesaurus; A Treasury of Words and
Phrases; D.C. Browning (Ed.)
18. Brown, S. op.cit. p.324
19. ibid. p.294
20. Grant, R.M. Gnosticism and Early Christianity. p.47
21. Wilson, McL. R. The Gnostic Problem. pp.117-118
22. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.268
23. Brown, S. op.cit. p.185
24. cf. M.M. Book II, Par.10.
25. St. John v, 39.
26. Gaster, Moses, The Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient
Traditions. Vol. I.
27. Bowman, J. L.U.O.S. Vol. I, p.48.

28. cf. Acts vii, 53.
29. cf. Isa. xxvi, 19.
30. Prov. viii, 12-30.
31. Deut. x, 14
32. Gen. iii, 21.
Bakan, David, Sigmund Freud and The Jewish Mystical Tradition.
33. p.247
34. ibid. p.247

2. THE CONCEPT OF THE TORAH IN THE 14th CENTURY.

35. Macdonald.J. Dissertation, Leeds, 1958.
36. Friedlander. M. op.cit.
37. Gore, Charles; Goudge, Henry Leighton; and Guillame, Alfred.
A New Commentary on Holy Scripture. including The Apocrypha. p.509
38. Boys, D.J. Dissertation, Leeds, 1956.
39. Green,L.C. Dissertation, Leeds, 1958.
40. Lerner.I. Dissertation, Leeds, 1956.
41. Gaster, Moses. The Samaritans. pp.107-112.
42. St. John,xiv, 16-17.
43. ibid. xvi, 13
44. cf. Acts vii, 53.
45. cf. John xvi, 13.
46. John xiv - xvi.
47. Acts ii, 1-4
48. John, Chaps. i - viii.
49. Acts Chap.ii.
50. Crown.A.D. op.cit. p.157
- 51 . Boys.D.J. op.cit.

3. ILLUMINATION AND THE DEFTER.

52. Gen. i, 3.

53. Oesterley, W.O.E. and Robinson, T.H.
op.cit. p.313
54. ibid. p.313
55. Wilson, R. McL. The Gnostic Problem, p.133
56. Hastings, J. (Ed). Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Art: The Mandaean.
Vol. VIII, pp.380 - 393.
57. St. John i, 7.
58. ibid. i, 9
59. Schonfield, Hugh J. The Lost "Book of the Nativity of John." p.37
60. Green, Samuel. op.cit. p.274
61. M.M. Book II, Par.10.
62. Book of Common Prayer; Morning and Evening Services;
C. of E.

4. ILLUMINATION AND MEMAR MARQAH.

63. Bowman, J. B.J.R.L. Vol.40, p.313.
Faith in Samaritan Thought.
64. ibid. p.314
65. M.M. Book II, Par.10.
66. Robertson, E. Judaism and Christianity. Vol.III. Law and Religion.
Essay: Law and Religion Amongst The Samaritans. p.87.

5. ILLUMINATION AND THE 14th CENTURY WRITERS.

67. Macdonald, J. Dissertation, Leeds, 1958.
68. Bakan, David. op.cit. p.75
69. Gen. vi, 8.
70. St. Luke xxiv, 32.
71. St. John xv, 6.
72. Friedlander, M. op.cit. pp.307 - 309
73. ibid. Chap. Lxviii.
74. ibid. p.102
75. Macdonald, J. op.cit.

76. Boys, D.J.
77. Deut. vi, 4.
78. Baynes, Charlotte Augusta, op.cit. p.42
79. Macdonald, J. op.cit. C.pp.501-511.
80. Whinfield, E.H. op.cit. p.78
- 81 . ibid. p.127
82. ditto
83. Sale, George. Chap. cxii.
84. ibid. Chap. xxiv
85. Baynes, Charlotte August, op.cit. p.60

P A R T I V

B E L I E F I N M O U N T G E R I Z I M

1. The Doctrine of Mount Gerizim in the Defter.

2. The Doctrine of Mount Gerizim as developed by,
 - (a) Aaron b. Manir.
 - (b) Abisha b. Phinehas.
 - (c) Abdullah b. Solomon.

1. THE DOCTRINE OF MOUNT GERIZIM IN THE
DEFTER.

Mount Gerizim has come to occupy a very important place in the mind of the Sam.; so much so that it is now one of the tenets of their Faith, following on a belief in God, in Moses and the Law (C.p.3). The etymology of the name appears to be in some doubt, but it is generally believed to denote that which is "bare" or "barren." Mount Gerizim is a mountain 2850 feet above sea level, south of the entrance of the valley of Shechem opposite Ebal. It was the scene of reading the blessings, and curses, when the Israelites entered Canaan.¹ It was the site of Jotham's parable to the men of Shechem.² The modern Nablus (once Flavia Neapolis, Neapolis, or Shechem) is at the foot of Mount Gerizim. Near it stood the Oak of Moreh³. As well as being the resting place of Abraham, the "parcel (piece) of ground" that Jacob bought from Hamor is near. Jacob's well is in the vicinity, and Joseph's tomb. On the precise position of Mount Gerizim J.M.Allegro⁴ makes an interesting observation, when he writes:-

"There was, in fact, another Mount Gerizim, for Jewish tradition, going back at least to the first Christian centuries maintained that the true site of Gerizim and Ebal was not in Samaritan territory at all, but near Jericho. The grounds for this anti-Samaritan (and historically quite erroneous) contention were found in DEUT.xi 29-30, where the mountains are apparently linked topographically with Gilgal which certainly lay near Jericho."

Commenting on the Copper Scroll, and the mention of "Mount Gerizim"⁵ Allegro thinks that "Mount Gerizim" is a pseudonym for a place near Qumran or Jerusalem, and adds:-

"The hiding of Jewish sacred treasure in a Samaritan holy place is just inconceivable."

The Sam. however believe that Mount Gerizim is in Samaria, and worship there up to this day, although much depleted in numbers. In the days of Jesus Christ the Mount was near to Jacob's well in Samaria⁶. It was the site of the Sam. Temple⁷. With reference to the site, Montgomery⁸ mentions the variant reading that occurs in the Sam. recension of Deut. xxvii 4. The text reads:-

"And it shall be when ye have passed over Jordan, that ye shall set up these stones, which I command you this day, in Mount Gerizim (in place of "Ebal"), and thou shalt plaister them with plaister."

The Sam. claim that Joshua's altar⁹ was on Gerizim. On the summit of Gerizim they show a flat rock, with a cup-hollow in it, and a cistern beside it, as the site where Joshua erected the tabernacle. On the N.W. slope was Luz, which is associated with Bethel, and where they celebrate the Passover. Indeed in the early Creed Bethel and Luz are mentioned together (C.p.3).

"Mount Gerizim, Bethel, Luz."¹⁰

The Sam. have always tried to celebrate the Passover on Mount Gerizim. On this point Lerner¹¹ writes:-

"Hence the Samaritans, in preserving the Passover sacrifice rite have ensured thereby their own survival."

In the light of the paucity of their numbers one wonders whether this statement is strictly accurate. The Sam. attitude to the Passover is made mention of by Andre Neher.¹² He states:-

"The Samaritans, who were heathens settled in Palestine by Nebuchad-nezzar in the sixth century B.C., adopted the Jewish cult without identifying themselves with Jewish history, without having their Temple destroyed, their land lost, their people exiled. They celebrate the Passover according to the precepts of Moses. Their fidelity is touching, but false. Only lately they were watched by astonished spectators at Nablus in 1948, when the two hundred Samaritans of the twentieth century were forced to disperse and emigrate. These spectators saw before their very eyes a Passover kept to the letter."

Gilgal they place about two miles East of the mountain. Joshua is held to be buried to the South of the mountain. The Samaritan Temple was built before 330 B.C., according to Josephus.¹³ It was destroyed by John Hyrcanus CA.129 B.C.

The Sam. believe that many of the principal events of scripture took place on Mount Gerizim. The "piece of land" was bought there. It encloses the graves of the Patriarchs (Cave of Machpelah). Abraham was about to sacrifice Isaac there. On that point Abel is held to have built the first altar. Noah built his altar on the spot after emerging from the Ark. It is also for them the Mount of the inheritance.¹⁴ It was the only mountain

believed not to be covered by the flood. God's name is to dwell there. It is also to be the place of the Garden of Eden. The Sam. associate Deut.xxvii 2-8 with Deut.xi. 30, and place the establishment of the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim.

It is the place where the Shekhinah of God is to be found; it is,

"The mount of rest, inheritance and the divine presence." (C.p.3).

Such a close relationship can only mean that Mount Gerizim is to be associated if not identified with the divine presence. As used by the Sam. Shekhinah scarcely means the transfigured essence of God. Therefore it is not to be compared too closely with the Jewish meaning of the word. The Shekhinah, for the Sam. is rather the place where God has located His name. It is not the equivalent of the Holy Spirit. The Sam.¹⁵ tell the same legends about Mount Gerizim that the Jews do about Mount Zion. Even the streams flow from Mount Gerizim, for it is the "navel" of the earth. The same idea prevails about Zion. The Greeks too had similar ideas about Delphi.

In the Service for the Eve of the Sabbath in the Defter (C.p.84) there is an affirmation of belief, but it may well be that the Sam. Creed as is now known, had not yet become fully crystallized. This attenuated form declares:-

"We believe in Thee, O Yahweh,
And in Moses, the Son of Amram, Thy Servant,
And in the Holy Torah,
And in Mount Gerizim, Bethel, the chosen
and sacred (place), the choicest in all
the earth. There is only one God."

Indeed this may have been very close to the original Creed, when it possessed but four tenets, thereby showing how important Mount Gerizim was in the eyes of the Sam. It is with the tenet of Mount Gerizim that the Sam. comes to the parting of the ways with the Jew. They both believed in Yahweh, and in Moses, the servant of God; both accepted the Torah. But while the Jew looked towards Mount Zion as the true Qiblah, the Sam. turned towards Mount Gerizim, thus actually, and symbolically turning their backs on each other. For the Sam. to have weakened in his attitude towards Mount Gerizim would certainly have meant eventual capitulation. When the Sam. eventually seceded from Jerusalem they looked upon Mount Gerizim to be the holy mount of God. The Service for Sabbath Morning gives a much fuller statement of Sam. belief, for the Sam. prays (C.p.3):-

"And turn my face towards the chosen place,
Mount Gerizim, the house of God, towards
Luz, the Mount of Thine inheritance and
of Thy presence, the place which Thou hast
made Thy dwelling, Yahweh, the sanctuary,
Yahweh, which Thy hand has fashioned."

The Sam. is convinced that there is no true worship:-

"But to Yahweh, before Mount Gerizim." (C.p.84).

This emphasis, "before Mount Gerizim" may be a sign of an "inferiority complex," conditioned by the existence of Jerusalem. There is the impression, rightly or wrongly, that the Sam. is continually looking back with Jerusalem in mind, and that no shrug of the shoulder can relieve him of this psychological burden; a Pavlov reflex, for in the 4th cent. Jerusalem was not the citadel of Israel, and Jewry, for the greater part was widely scattered, a far flung Diaspora.

On one of the four occasions when the Taheb is mentioned in the Defter (C.p.45) he not only brings peace with him, and reveals the Divine Favour, but he:-

"Purifies Mount Gerizim, the house of God,
and removes trouble from Israel."

That Mount Gerizim needs purifying suggests that it had been contaminated by outsiders. From time to time the Mount was taken from the Sam. by foreign soldiers such as the Romans, for, strategical purposes. This seems to be implied for God will give the Taheb (C.p.45):-

"Great victory, overcoming therewith the
whole world."

The Taheb would have to have complete victory to remove the enemy from the Mount and to purify it.

The prayer of Joshua (C.p.4) says:-

"We turn our faces to no place but towards
Thy kingdom,"

and may have been composed at a time when the Sam. were

without Mount Gerizim, and could not conveniently turn their faces "towards the chosen place," (cf. C.p.3). That the Sam. had to develop their form of worship devoid of Mount Gerizim, and even devoid of their centre of worship is exemplified in a qadishah (C.p.11) where it is besought:-

"God the merciful restore our temple."

The fact that the Sam. were often without Mount Gerizim paradoxically led to a deepening of the spiritual side of their faith.

The true Israel is shown by the attitude adopted towards Mount Gerizim, as indicated by Brown¹⁶:-

"Yahweh, Yahweh, merciful and gracious God, forgive Thy people Israel who prostrate themselves towards Mount Gerizim, and whom Thou hast redeemed, O Yahweh; There is none like Yahweh our God."

Brown¹⁷ quoting the Jaffa Ms. (C.p.240) refers to Mount Gerizim as the

"Holiest of hills,"

indicating a new concept in the Defter that Mount Gerizim is set aside as dedicated like angels or men.

Although Mount Gerizim figures so prominently in the Sam. Creed it does not pass unnoticed that it is not mentioned in the prayers of Joshua (C.p.4); of the Angels (C.p.9), and of Moses (C.p.45). As Cowley¹⁸ is inclined to lean towards an early date for these prayers,

as they are anonymous compositions, it may occasion no surprise if a belief in Mount Gerizim is not mentioned. It is likely that the tenets of the Sam. Creed were added to as the exigencies of the day demanded. One would imagine however that an insistence upon Mount Gerizim would come rather early, especially about the time that the Sam. Temple was built (c.330 B.C.).

In the service for Sabbath Morning, there is recited every Sabbath (C.p.15) a prayer in which help is sought from God "by the merit of-----, Mount Gerizim, hill of ages."

That Mount Gerizim is endowed with antiquity is an essential facet of the Sam. belief in this holy Mount. Behind their attitude was the evidence afforded by the Pentateuch. They maintained that they had the true scripture, while they accused the Jews of having altered the text to suit their particular view-point. This argument was reciprocated by the Jew accusing the Sam. of a similar practice. On this point the LXX sides with the M.T. against the Sam. recension.

Of the 4th cent. writings in the Defter, it is in that part of it called the Durran (ascribed to Amram Darah) that mention is made of Mount Gerizim (cf. C.p.40). One such reference (C.p.39) states that:-

"The Children of Thy loved ones have established impurity upon the top of the sanctuary, and all that great holiness is departed from them by reason of wickedness."

Brown¹⁹ in a footnote states:-

"This might refer to the acceptance, by some Samaritans, of the Samaritan Temple under Zeus Olympus in the time of Hadrian."

There appears to be some confusion here on this matter. Antichus Epiphanes iv (175-164 B.C.) sought to Hellenize every country he conquered including Judea. So it was that the Temple at Jerusalem was converted to the worship of the Olympian Zeus²⁰. M. Gaster²¹ states:-

"And Josephus does not lose an opportunity of asserting that the Samaritans offered less resistance than the Jews, and allowed their temple on Mount Gerizim to be dedicated to the heathen God."

Marinus the philosopher who succeeded the Neo-Platonist Proclus at Athens in 485, and who was a convert from Samaritanism to heathenism, refers to Argarizim as the most holy temple of the supreme Zeus.²²

An examination, however, of II Maccabees²³ shows that not only did Antiochus establish the cult of Jupiter Olympius in Jerusalem, but also that of Jupiter the Defender of strangers (XENIOS) on Mount Gerizim.

After the rebellion of Bar Cochab in 131-135 Hadrian seized the city of Jerusalem and razed it to the ground. A temple was erected to Jupiter on the site of the Jewish

Temple in 135. Whitham²⁴ indicates that this temple was erected after the rebellion. Epstein²⁵ gives the erection of the temple as one of the causes of the rebellion. It seems probable that Hadrian also erected a temple to Zeus Olympius on Mount Gerizim, but because of the neutrality of the Sam. like the Christians during the rebellion, he allowed the Sam. the opportunity to rededicate their own temple to God. If one takes cognizance of what Marinus says, it seems likely that the Sam. Temple was dedicated to Zeus during the reign of Zeno, the Isaurian (475-491), who also persecuted the Sam. Therefore one cannot be certain as to which occasion of pollution the Durran (C.p.39) refers to.

One prayer of Marqah in the Defter is interesting (C.p.50). He mentions Mount Sinai eleven times and Mount Gerizim twice. In the first instance when Mount Gerizim is mentioned it is almost synonymous with Mount Sinai:-

"From His habitation on high was given and upon Mount Sinai was heard of His intelligence, which Moses the prophet expounded from the sections of the five books; from the top of Mount Gerizim were the decrees and law taught to Israel."

Yet in the same prayer at the end he writes:-

"Pleasant things did the congregation of Israel see twice, God commanded them to remember the three days until they were prepared for Mount Gerizim."

as if a spiritual movement is implied from the time when

they receive the Law on Mount Sinai, to the time when they approach Mount Gerizim after being acquainted with the Law.

Ab-Gelugah (1 2th cent.; C.p.77) has a prayer in the Defter which ends:-

"My Lord, unite me with Mount Gerizim;
the choicest of dry land; My Lord, unite
me with the abode of angels; My Lord
unite me with the place whereon Isaac was
bound; My Lord, unite me with the place
whereon Jacob slept; My Lord unite me with
the place which Moses desired."

The Sam. believed that Mount Gerizim was the only mountain not to be covered during the flood. This idea is also found in a Jewish midrashic passage²⁶. Mount Gerizim comes to be looked upon in later Samaritanism as the focal point upon which all the historical figures have some connection. This shows the veneration which the Sam. hold for Mount Gerizim. But there is no evidence in the Defter to indicate how the Holy Mount came to be the Qiblah for the Sam. The importance of the Holy Mount becomes so accentuated on occasion that it precedes the Torah, as in the Credal expression mentioned by Brown²⁷:-

"My faith is in Thee, O Yahweh,
And in Moses the son of Amram Thy servant,
And in Mount Gerizim,
And in the Torah."

The vicissitudes attending upon Jerusalem over the cent. from 70 A.D. onwards would serve to confirm the Sam. in their belief that Mount Gerizim was indeed the Holy Mount.

2. THE DOCTRINE OF MOUNT GERIZIM AS DEVELOPED BY (A) AARON b. MANIR.

Aaron b. Manir states (C.p,184):-

"The habitation of the Divine Presence (SHEKHINAH) of the Lord,"

is to be "upon Mount Gerizim."

It may well be that Ben Manir is here taking refuge in a periphrasis, and avoiding the suggestion that God Himself will dwell there, for he has already stated (C.p.182):-

"He has no dwelling places,"

and "He has no dwelling in earth or in heaven."

Yet Ben Manir conforms to pattern for he believes in God's Immanence when he says (C.p.184):-

"O Nearest One, draw near our spirit,"

and Transcendence when he writes:-

"Look down from Thy holy habitation" (C.p.184).

If God "has no dwelling place in heaven or earth," it is hard to reconcile this statement with, "Look down from thy holy habitation." It may be that Ben Manir held to the Aristotelian concept recognized by Maimonides that the "Primal Cause" or "Unmoved Mover" could exist outside of time and "The spheres" (i.e. heavens). The tradition of Maimonides became strong at Damascus, where his works were read in the three synagogues of the Jews. The only concept that Maimonides would not accept from Aristotle and the Peripatetics was that the world was eternal.

Ben Manir could not have been unaware of the great impact that the teaching of Maimonides began to make in the Jewish, Christian, and Arab worlds after his death in 1204. Indeed, as Epstein²⁸ remarks:-

"Fierce and prolonged controversy raged about Maimonides work throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries."

As the Sam. had associations with Damascus, they would want to know what it was all about.

It may also be that Ben Manir is influenced by the Zohar, in which "the Shekhinah is also identified as the Community of Israel."²⁹ The Zohar is one of the most important documents in the Kabbalistic tradition. The work was brought into full prominence by Moses de Leon in the latter years of the 13th cent., although it is usually attributed to Simeon b. Yohai in the first half of the second cent. The Zohar is virtually a commentary on the Torah, and its order follows that of the Pentateuch, first citing the text and then interpreting it. In Kabbalah the Shekhinah tends to become "highly feminized, the female part of God, and part of God Himself."³⁰

If Ben Manir has read the Zohar, he could have been influenced by its ideas, especially as it was a commentary on the Pentateuch, the only part of the T'nach acceptable to the Sam. It was believed by the Sam. that the Divine Favour was to return, and that the true Israel was to

gather on Mount Gerizim, so that if Ben Manir was aware of the basic concepts in the Zohar, he could have mentioned the Shekhinah, with Israel in mind.

Mount Gerizim is important in the thought of Ben Manir, for the Passover is always to be celebrated there, and nowhere else.

"For there you will get blessings,
and will attain forgiveness."

They will continue to do this in the days of Favour
(cf. C.p.182). It is there that:-

"We will see the sanctuary of the holy
place and the Ark. The table and the
candlestick and its lamps will give light."

The Sam. held the Ark, and the holy vessels to be hidden on Mount Gerizim. These would be discovered and restored in the days of Favour. This association of God with one place - Mount Gerizim - a theme found with other writers, may be a "recollection of childhood" in a psychological sense; a reversion to a type of thought prominent in the O.T. of God being a "local Baal." Such an infantile fantasy would tend to persist psychologically, even in the adult stage of the Nation. The process of sublimation would change the details, while the basic idea remained the same. This Sam. trait was exemplified in the incident of the woman of Samaria.³¹

(B) ABISHA b. PHINEHAS

When Abisha b. Phinehas speaks of Mount Gerizim, it is to associate it with the concept of the Garden of Eden, although there are occasions when he only refers to the Mountain itself. His descriptions include (C.p.499):-

"The pilgrimage to the eternal mountain, the power of which is designated by the priest with the great blessing on the head of the Israelites."

"The centre (of four places mentioned) is the eternal mountain, the holy habitation." (C.p.512).

To indicate how exclusive is the place, he says (C.p.514):-

"Mount Gerizim is holy, and there is no other mountain like it."

no doubt having Mount Zion in mind. This habitation appears to be the same as Adam and Eve dwelt in - "A paradise called the Garden of Eden" (C.p.697). By the 14th cent. the Garden of Eden was not only the paradise from whence Adam and Eve were ejected through disobedience (C.p.697), but it was to be the place of return in the days of Favour. The Garden is the terminus a quo, and the terminus ad quem, for Abisha is able to say (C.p.496):-

"All His waters are living waters, and all who pray to Him, the Living One, and eat of His fruit, shall enter the Garden of Eden."

Through the eating of fruit Adam and Eve forfeited their place in the Garden,³² now by the eating of God's fruit, it is possible to enter the Garden. This privilege would

appear to be reserved for Israel for Abisha writes

(C.p.503):-

"Run and stand in the Garden of Eden.
Go over to the Garden of Eden! See
what is in the midst of it! Behold
what resides therein! Let Israel
dwell securely in settled isolation
from all they fear."

Abisha would therefore appear to be a particularist, being
mainly concerned with the Israelites. He is not actuated
by the vision of a Deutero-Isaiah. He points out

(C.p.512) that:-

"The Garden of Eden is set on the holy
mountain Gerizim, Bethel."

He specifically locates the place as with four points

(C.p.512):-

The village of "ABURTA,"
"The altar of Abraham,"
"The cave of Joseph,"
and "The piece of land."

"The centre (of them) is the eternal
mountain, the holy habitation."

Abisha, therefore is one of those Sam. writers who believes
that the Garden of Eden is on earth; it is a definite
locality, and is only for Israel. On the Day of Vengeance

(C.p.515):-

"There remains only the everlasting
mountain in the midst of the garden for
good tidings."

The "Rock of Salvation" (C.p.253) is an expression
used by Abisha when referring to Mount Gerizim. This

expression, however, is also used as an epithet applied to God, by an anonymous writer (C.p.272). Normally "Rock"³³ is an epithet for God. In the N.T. St. Paul alludes to the:-

"Spiritual rock that followed them: and the rock was Christ." 34

In one of his four hymns in the Pentecostal Series³⁵ Abisha dreams that he is standing before Mount Gerizim, the Everlasting Hill. When he asks the man at the gate, "what is this place?" he is informed that it is "The Garden of Eden." In the midst of the Garden is Moses.

(C) ABDULLAH b. SOLOMON

Abdullah b. Solomon has occasional references to Mount Gerizim. He writes (C.p.310):-

"May you see the habitation revealed upon the top of Mount Gerizim."

He also adds a topical note:-

"May the plague be caused to depart."

This could be an allusion to the Bubonic plague, or Black Death of 1348. Another plague of a virulent type broke out in 1360. Such occurrences would make the return of Divine Favour an anxiously looked-for possibility.

Abdullah's benediction (C.p.384),

"May we stand on Mount Gerizim,"

is in the same context as, the "Hundred Years," a kind of

Messianic Era when all enemies shall be subdued. And it concludes;

"Blessed is he (i.e. The Taheb), who brings peace upon us who pass over into the Garden of Eden."

It seems therefore, in spite of the vagueness of the verb, "pass over," that the Garden of Eden is localized on Mount Gerizim. Mount Gerizim is the "Holiest of the mountains" (C.p.408). Abdullah's vision of the Divine Favour occurs when there is the respite of the "Hundred Years," in which the Taheb brings peace by defeating the enemy, and the Israelites pass over into the Garden of Eden situated on Mount Gerizim.

Abdullah believes that in the Day of Vengeance God,

"Will fight, and in His fight will fire consume."

(C.p.238). In this matter,

"He sanctified the Everlasting Hill, from amongst the mountains, whereon He will judge in the day of vengeance, the angels will be His witnesses."

The word Colam indicates that this hill will remain "for ever," for it is the same word used by Marqah, when he speaks of "Everlasting Life" with reference to God, in the Defter. If this hill is eternal, it would imply that part of the material world, at least, will continue. Neither Jew nor Sam. would agree that the world is eternal. It was on this one point that Maimonides disagreed with the

teaching of Aristotle. The Sam. did believe that in the great conflagration the Mount would escape. The reference to God as judge on the "Everlasting Hill" on the Day of Vengeance may be a possible allusion to the hope entertained by the Sam. for the final repudiation of Jerusalem, of Mount Zion, "and the Jewish Sect which is centred around it."³⁶

Other 14th cent. writers, such as Phinehas, hold opinions similar to that of Ben Manir, Abisha b. Phinehas, and Abdullah b. Solomon. Phinehas himself writes (C.p.347):-

"And in Mount Gerizim, the holiest of our mountains, may Yahweh come near unto thee again, and mayest thou return unto His favour, and mayest thou raise up this altar in the days of the Taheb, even in his time."

Then the benediction of the "Hundred Years" occurs. This is an indication that the Sam. writers are prone to imitate each other, and to accept almost without question, any new idea brought into existence, such as the "Hundred Years."

It is in the 14th cent. that Mount Gerizim begins to be called Mount Saffron. Gesenius³⁷ makes mention of,

"Hominem pro coronide rerum creaturum,
Qui creatus est a pulvere Safræe Montis."

This may refer to a tradition which stated that Man was created from a special kind of earth or dust. Nutt³⁸ referring to Sam. doctrines states that:-

"Man was formed from the dust of Mount Safra, that is Gerizim, in the image of the angels, not of God."

Sale³⁹ quotes from Jallaladdin and his description of Paradise. Referring to the earth he says they,

"Tell us that the earth of it (i.e. Paradise) is of the finest wheat flour, or of the purest musk, or as others will have it, of Saffron."

As the word may be derived from the Arabic Za'faran, it probably emanated from that quarter. But the idea that Man was made of special kind of dust may have come originally from a Gnostic source. Philo, the Gnostic Justin, and the Valentinians all emphasized that "the dust of the earth" from which Man was created was the best and finest kind of dust. Jallaladdin in the Masnavi⁴⁰ makes mention of Adam's creation when he writes:-

"O Adam! that friendship arose from the scent of thee. Because the earth is the warp and weft of thy body. Thy earthly part was taken from there. Thy pure spirit of light was shed from here!"

Jallaladdin⁴¹ mentions that Gabriel was sent to the earth to bring back a handful of earth or dust for the purpose of forming Adam's body. He was refused. Michael goes and he returns empty-handed. Then God sends Izrail, the angel of death, and he brings back the required handful of earth.

Montgomery⁴² mentions that Adam was

"Created out of the dust of Mount Safra."

He adds that the latter name for Mount Gerizim is very

common. It is to be noted that Islam has a Mount Safra in the neighbourhood of Mecca. Mention is made that:- "Safa (Sic) and Merwah are two of the mountains of God."⁴³ Sale in a footnote to Chap.ii gives the comment of Jallaladdin on the passage. If as Montgomery states⁴⁴ Adam was created out of a special kind of dust from Mount Safra, then it is possible to read Gen.iii.19 in the Sam. recension in a new light. M. Gaster⁴⁵ states that "the Resurrection is proved from the reading in Gen.iii.19." The text is:-

"For dust thou art, and unto thy dust
shalt thou return,"

implying that Man shall return to the special kind of dust from which he was made.

In such an atmosphere the Sam. probably came to believe that the earth of Mount Saffron (Gerizim) was different from ordinary earth, which would tend to give an added significance to the Mount being unique, so that for uniqueness there was only one God, one Moses, one Torah and one Mount.

The position in the 14th cent. regarding Mount Gerizim is identical with that of the 4th cent. regarding belief in Mount Gerizim, but the picture has been filled in. The Mount has been brought more fully into the stream of development, and with the passage of time has collected other accretions. The belief in the Mount has been

amplified.

So important is Mount Gerizim to the Sam. that reference is made to it at the end of the Commandments in the Sam. Pentateuch. M. Gaster⁴⁶ gives the text of the Sam. Tenth Commandment and its translation, in which the Sam. are to erect large stones, covered with lime, upon which all the words of the Law are to be written. These stones are to be erected on Mount Gerizim. There an altar of perfect stones is to be erected to God and sacrifices made. The Commandment ends,

"That mountain is on the other side of the Jordan at the end of the road towards the going down of the sun in the land of the Canaanites, who dwell in the Arabah facing Gilgal close to Elon Moreh facing Sichein."

For the Sam. Mount Gerizim is "the end of the road;" for them it is the terminus ad quem; there they believe, from the 14th cent. onwards, that the Garden of Eden will be found, when the Divine Favour will return. It is the place where they are to enjoy the "Hundred years" peace during which they will have the presence of the Taheb.

N O T E S

1. Deut. xi, 29; xxvii, 12.
2. Judges ix, 7.
3. Gen. xii, 6.
4. Allegro, J.M. The Treasure of the Copper Scroll, p.75.
5. op.cit. p.75
6. John iv.
7. John iv, 20.
8. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.235
9. Josh. viii, 30-35.
10. cf. Gen. xxviii, 19; Judges i, 2,3.
11. Lerner, I, Dissertation, Leeds, 1956. p.iv.
12. Neher, Andre. Moses and the Vocation of the Jewish People, p.128
13. Josephus, Flavius, 11 Ant. viii, 2,6,7; 13 Ant.ix,1.
14. Ex. xv, 17.
15. Gaster, Moses. The Asatir, pp.123-124; "The Holy Mountain" Legend.
16. Brown, S. op.cit. p.139 quoting G.p.290.
cf. Quran. Chap.ii re Mecca.
17. op.cit. p.144
18. Cowley. op.cit. p.xxii
19. Brown, S. op.cit. p.268 (Note).
20. Epstein, Isidore. Judaism, p.91
21. Gaster, Moses. p.35. The Sam.
22. Nutt, J.W. The Samaritan Targum. p.83 (Note).
23. II Maccabees vi, 2.
24. Whitham, A.R. op.cit. p.75
25. Epstein, Isidore. op.cit. p.117
26. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.238
27. Brown, S. op.cit. p.228
28. op.cit. p.216
29. Bakan, David. Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition. p.273
30. Bakan, David op.cit. p.273
31. John iv, 20-21.

32. Gen. iii, 3.
33. Deut. xxxii, 4.
34. I Cor. x, 4.
35. Boys, D.J. op.cit. (C.p.366)
36. cf. Lerner, I. op.cit. p.Lxxxvi
37. Gesenius, Guil. op.cit. Hymn No.xii (v.18)
38. Nutt, J.W. op.cit. p.68
39. op.cit.; The Preliminary Discourse, p.75.
40. Whinfield, E.H. The Masnavi, p.41
41. Whinfield, E.H. op.cit. p.241
42. op.cit. p.234
43. Sale, George, The Quran. Cnap.ii, p.17
44. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.234
45. Gaster, Moses. The Sam., p.88
46. Gaster, Moses. The Sam., pp.185-190

PART V: ESCHATOLOGY.

1. Eschatological Trends found in the Samaritan Defter.
2. The Resurrection.
3. The Day of Vengeance and Recompense.
4. The Taheb.
5. The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.
6. Has the Expression, The Hundred Years, any Eschatological Significance?

1. ESCHATOLOGICAL TRENDS FOUND IN THE SAM. "DEFTER" OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

One would imagine, especially in the light of developed eschatological trends, both in the Jewish and Christian spheres, that by the 4th cent. the Sam. would have developed an eschatology, in line with, if not quite parallel to, that of the Jew and the Christian. Indeed, this has been the assumption held by not a few, yet a careful examination of the Defter (C.pp.1-92) does not appear to afford that kind of evidence, for such a confident assumption. Cowley¹ states:-

"It will be seen that the liturgies are not very ancient, nor have they great literary merit; but they offer the most trustworthy means at our disposal for arriving at a correct understanding of Samaritan Theology."

He continues² :-

"Even so early as St. John's Gospel, the belief in a Messiah was generally accepted, while in the writings of Marqah the belief e.g. in a future life, in angels, and in the supreme position of Moses, is taken for granted."

Evidence for a belief in angels, and in Moses, can readily be adduced from the Defter, but what evidence is there for a belief in "The future life?"

M. Gaster³ draws attention to the eschatological doctrines of the Sam.. Unfortunately he disregards the factor of time. He makes a general assessment when he says:-

"Thus the Resurrection is proved from the reading in Gen.iii.19. The Massoretic Text reads: "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." The Samaritan text reads: "For dust thou art and unto thy dust shalt thou return," and they interpret this to mean that Adam and of course every human being - for the words apply to the whole of the human race - will return again to live in the same material form in which he was when he died: man will return to his own dust."

Yet nowhere in the 4th cent. Defter is the text Gen.iii,19 ever mentioned! In the matter of assessing what was Sam. teaching, cognizance must be made of the time factor.

It can be readily conceded that God is recognized by the 4th cent. Sam. as a Judge. Marqah (C.p.25) refers to God as:-

"Judge of all the earth, true and faithful."

The Defter (C.p.4) speaks of God as:-

"God of the creation, and judge on the day of vengeance."

Apart from the ascription of God as judge there is no development of the concept. The impression is that God punishes those who sin, and rewards those who do good, or conform to the law. If there is to be a Day of Vengeance it is to be for those other than the faithful Israelites. There is nothing prospective about God's judgement. There is, at least, no final divorce between good and evil; Heaven and Hell never come into clear perspective in the

Defter. M.M. however differs on this point. There is no mention of Sheol in the Defter, and Heaven is God's abode. M. Gaster⁴ states that, "Deut.xxxii has become the very basis of all the eschatological theories of the Samaritans." If the Defter as derived from Cowley (C.pp.1-92) is adhered to then the only verses from Deut.xxxii are 3,4 and 17. It would seem that Deut.xxxii is not overstressed in the Defter. Brown⁵ however, in his Thesis on the Defter combines the Jaffa Ms. with Cowley's and quotes the following verses from Deut.xxxii - 3,2-4, 4, 9,17,36,39,43,47. The verse which mentions Sheol is not mentioned; Deut.xxxii.22 :-

"For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and burneth unto the lowest pit (SHEOL)."

There is evidence in the Pentateuch for the existence of Sheol but no explanation about it⁶. Is there any further evidence of an After-life? Of Abraham it is said⁷ that he was "Gathered to his people." Jacob⁸ says, "Let me lie with my fathers." Jacob⁹ said also, "Bury me with my fathers in the cave." Oesterley and Robinson¹⁰ say:-

"This is clear evidence of the belief that the departed recognized one another and enjoyed one another's companionship in the After-life."

To all of which there is but one comment: Non sequitur. At best it is only a trend in the cult of ancestor worship.

The next point for consideration is the relationship between the "unseen and seen" worlds, and the meaning to be

attached to them. This phrase of the "unseen and seen" is a recurring expression in the Defter, and especially so in the prayers of Marqah (C.pp.16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24, 25). In one prayer (C.p.23) Marqah uses the word "unseen" four times and the word "seen" three times. But while Marqah is cognizant of both the "seen and unseen" worlds, he never develops the theme. He tends rather to toy with it as a talisman, or a mystical symbol. The use of the expression the "seen" and "unseen" comes into fuller prominence at a time when the Neo-Platonists, and Gnostics were speculating about the problem of dualism. The use of the terms "seen" (revealed) and "unseen" (concealed) was an attempt to explain "the old, old, difficulty as to the way in which God or the soul can have any relation with matter."¹¹ Marqah has the same dualism in mind when he uses the cliché "above and below" (C.pp.16,18,20,21,22,25,26). The problem occurs in philosophy when reference is made to the relationship between the ideal and the real; between universals and particulars. The theme is developed in Plato's Theory of Ideas.¹² It also occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹³ The complementary aspects of the "seen and unseen" were not unnoticed in the development of Alexandrine philosophy, and later became associated with the Kabbalah. Marqah, somewhat studiously perhaps, never draws any conclusions from the premises he uses so freely.

For him the "unseen" is the other or hidden world of God, and the "seen" the world of the senses. Thus is exemplified, once again, that tardiness and reticence on the part of Sam. to speculate. In this respect Marqah does not appear to have been a Philo. The use of the terms by Marqah does not suggest another world of being for Man after death. Marqah, in the Defter, avoids such speculation.

The Sam. of the 4th cent. make use of the concept of salvation, but it never attained to the developed definition that it possesses to-day. In fact, as used by the Sam. of those days, it retains its original and primitive meaning; that of safety and deliverance from one's enemies. In the Defter in general, and in Marqah and Amram Darah in particular, God is "the Saviour of our fathers," in the way in which Marqah exploits the term (C.p.26):-

"A near deliverer is He to him that seeks him;
Saviour of our fathers, from the hands of
their enemies."

It meant to be saved from hostile elements and adverse conditions, which had a direct bearing on material well-being. Salvation never attains to that stage of evolutionary thought when it embraces the finer distinctions of moral and spiritual assurance.

Marqah (C.p.17) says:-

"Thou art our God, and the God of our fathers,
the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob."

but he does not proceed to draw the conclusion that Jesus Christ does in the N.T.¹⁴

"I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, He is not the God of the dead but of the living."

These words were uttered when the "Sadducees came to him, who say that there is no resurrection"¹⁵ and asked Him a question on this matter. Jesus Christ discusses with the Sadducees the resurrection and the future life, quoting the text above and drawing the inference as seen by Him. Marqah, in the Defter, does not mention the future life, nor does he speak of a resurrection. There is no speculation on either the resurrection of the body, or immortality of the soul.

In the Sam. Creed (C.p.3) there is no mention of the resurrection of the dead, or of the body, and no reference to the soul or spirit of Man. Dr. J. Bowman¹⁶, writing of the resurrection states:-

"There is nothing about it or the Taheb or the doctrine of the End (all of which are found in Marqah of the 4th century) in the 11th century priestly writers Abul Hasan and Yūsuf b. Salama."

There appears to be very little in the Defter appertaining to Ta Eschata. In the Defter Marqah does not mention the resurrection or the Taheb.

In what way then does Marqah conceive of human nature? Nowhere in the Defter do we have an anthropology, where

Man is conceived of as a trichotomy of body, soul and spirit. There is a dichotomy of body and soul. Although God is referred to as "God of Spirits,"¹⁷ the word spirit does not occur in the 4th cent. Defter. There is no mention of the Holy Spirit of God, nor of the spirit of Man. "God of spirits"(C.p.288) eventually does become "King of our spirits" (C.p.30) but this development, in a personal sense, occurs with Amram the H.P. (1255-1269), and with Ab-Hisdah (Abul-Hasan) of Tyre (11th cent.) who alludes to "our spirits," "our souls," and "our bodies." (C.p.70). It is safe to conclude here also that a dichotomy is implied. In the 4th cent. Defter, Man is a dichotomy of body and soul, as in Marqah (C.p.16):-

"Happy are our souls in that they worship
Thee, happy are our bodies in that they
bear Thy fear."

yet personal (our) souls and personal (our) bodies do not lead to speculation, as did obtain in Gnostic fields where a sharp line of demarcation was drawn between a material body and an incorporeal soul. The concept of soul is not enlarged upon, except that it is consonant with a body that possesses life. What then does Marqah think of Man? He says in his various prayers:-

"All tremble before Him, can dust (therefore)
rebel against Him? " (C.p.19).

"Everlasting life is Thine, that requires no fulness: Thou deignest to receive praise from transient mouths." (C.p.20)

"A created thing of dust" (C.p.24).

" Eternal life is His, and all other life He maketh perish." (C.p.26)

"He endureth to eternity, continuing for Himself; The living and the dead are under His dominion." (C.p.26)

"As for all mortal lamps, there is an end to their fulness, and to their light." (C.p.51).

An unknown author (C.p.56) in the Defter is a little more specific and venturesome for he says:-

"On high shall they ascend thereby to their God, the heaven and the earth are His witnesses."

But this is an isolated test on the "Ascension," the evidence of which is somewhat invalidated by being written by an unknown author in an unknown cent. At best it is but a straw in the wind. Marqah is the only writer in the Defter to mention Everlasting Life, and when he does so he contrasts the eternity of God with the transitory life of Man. This is emphasized in two prayers of Marqah (C.pp.25,26) where the same text is used:-

"Eternal life is His and all other life He maketh perish."

This brings out specifically the eternity of God's nature in comparison with the transitory life of Man. Marqah does not mention the resurrection of Man. Man is but "a created

thing of dust." (C.p.24).

An eschatological term that is mentioned in the Defter is "The Day of Vengeance." On three occasions it is in credal form and possesses the full Sam. title, "the Day of Vengeance and Recompense." Moses is mentioned also in the creed (C.p.3, 208). The Defter states that Moses was "raised up for the creation, and for the Day of Vengeance" (C.p.84). "The Day of Vengeance" is mentioned seven times in the Defter: once by Marqah (C.p.21). It is not mentioned by the other 4th cent. writers Anram Darah and Nana. God is referred to as "Judge on the Day of Vengeance" (C.p.4). No 4th cent. writer refers to "The Day of Vengeance and Recompense," as a full phrase. One is left in doubt as to whether the full credal form is the older, when compared with the attenuated form. As "The Day of Vengeance" is often used to designate a period in time, the shortened form probably became the more fashionable. There does not appear to be any theological significance in the use of either form. "The Day of Vengeance" does not suggest the end of the world. One would imagine that as "The Day of Vengeance and Recompense" is one of the six tenets of the Sam. Creed the concept would have been more fully expressed and developed. It could well be that the credal form is later than the 4th cent.

Marqah (C.p.85; The Jaffa Ms. ascribes this prayer to Nana b. Marqah), refers to "The Day of Vengeance" as "The Day of Great Judgement," and continues:-

"Reward me not according to the wickedness of my deserts, for Thou art Yahweh, a merciful and gracious God, to all eternity, who perishest not."

It may however be that "The Day of Great Judgement" may not be "The Day of Vengeance," but a day coinciding with the end of the world. Ab-Gelugah (C.p.75; 12th cent) is thinking along similar lines when he writes:-

"And the day of judgement is before me:
fill me with repentance before the day
of my end."

M. Gaster¹⁸ refers to events which are to happen at the "End of Days." There is no mention of the Day of Judgement, and no mention of resurrection. A man chosen by God will return, and inaugurate an end of happiness and prosperity. That there is no mention of the Day of Judgement is a fact hard to account for, as generally speaking all religious sects provide for such a day. Jallaladdin in the Masnavi¹⁹ says that the Day of Judgement is the day of the great review.

T.H.Gaster²⁰ draws attention to the fact that "The Manual of Discipline (ix 21-26) speaks of "The Day of Requital." Cecil Roth²¹ in his reference to The Manual of Discipline (ix 23-4) translates:-

"That every man should be zealous for the statute, and for its time for the day of vengeance, to execute the Will, in all errands of the hands and in every rule."

Both estimate that the date of the Manual of Discipline is 100 B.C. to 70 A.D. The expression, the "Day of Vengeance" appears to have been in current use long before the 4th cent. As distinct from the M.T., the Sam. and Greek LXX recensions (Deut.xxxii 35) mention "The Day of Vengeance." The "Day of Vengeance" becomes a Sam. technical term. It is found in the O.T.²² Of this "Day of Vengeance," Moses Gaster²³ states that "The Day of Vengeance and Recompense" is expressed for the first time in the Oration of Moses (Deut.xxxii). This day is to be against the enemies of Israel. It is imminent, and not in the distant future. He points out²⁴ that it had not yet received that eschatological significance it was to receive later on. Bowman²⁵ states that the Sam. belief in "The Day of Vengeance" is based on Deut.xxxii.35. He also points out that the Taheb or Sam. "Messiah" is connected with "The Day of Vengeance." This statement however cannot be supported by evidence from the Deftter.

From the evidence of the Deftter it would appear that the 4th cent. theologians are reticent in formulating ideas about the future life, and all that the concept entails. On this point it may be that the sparsity of evidence was due to the troubles that arose later under Zeno (474) and

Justinian (527). The "nation never recovered from the severe treatment" meted out to them in 529 by Justinian²⁶. Neither can much store be laid on the argument from silence. It can be applied both ways.

It is known that the Sam. believed in a Messiah²⁷. The reading of this chapter gives the impression that the Samaritans generally were expecting the coming of the Messiah, or at least, the laity did. The Sam. woman spoke very confidently about him. The intellectual basis of their belief is strongly marked. The woman²⁸ said:-

"I know that the Messias cometh."

The Taheb is mentioned four times in the Defter (C.pp.4,42, 45,56). Marqah does not mention the Taheb in the Defter. In no instance is the Taheb associated with "The Day of Vengeance." In the Defter he is associated with the Divine Favour, and with happiness. He brings peace on earth to Israel. By victory he overcomes the world (C.p.45) It is an earthly kingdom, and therefore no mention of a future state elsewhere. He is a restorer and not a redeemer, although Taheb really means "The returning one"²⁹. Gesenius³⁰ has it as:-

"Conversor nobis instat et condonabis
secundum misericordiam tuam, tu enim potes."

("The Taheb is present with us, and you will forgive according to your mercy, for you are able.")

Gesenius therefore understands "Taheb" to mean one who turns

around, or the Returning One.

In the Defter the Taheb (C.p.45) brings peace and happiness with him. He reveals Divine Favour and purifies Mount Gerizim. He removes trouble from Israel and overcomes the world. The earliest mention of the Taheb is in "The Prayer of Joshua" (C.p.4) stating that God is

"merciful to the penitent in bringing
the Taheb."

The Durran (presumably written by Amram Darah; C.p.42) associates the Taheb with peace and happiness. Misfortune is removed. An anonymous writer (C.p.56) points out that three things bring deliverance, when one sits "at the hand of the scripture; covenant, ancestors and Taheb." So the Defter teaching on the Taheb is simple. It is associated with Divine Favour and Mount Gerizim. At his coming victory is assured; peace and happiness are the fruits.

The Defter never states that God in judgement will separate the good from the evil. No metaphors are used like wheat and chaff; sheep and goats. There is no mention of any place connected with ultimate destiny. Sheol is not alluded to once. Ab-Gelugah (C.p.75; 12th cent) prays that

"on the morrow whereon my spirit shall go
about unite my bones with the bones of
my fathers,"

a point of view in strict keeping with the teaching of the

O.T.

Belial is only mentioned once by a 4th cent. writer (C.p.45), but not in connection with evil.

Although "Kingdom" is mentioned rarely (C.p.4) there is no developed doctrine of the Kingdom of God as is found in the N.T.

The concept of Paradise, or Garden of Eden, which, in later cent. came in for fuller definition and treatment, does not occupy too prominent a position in the Deifter. Amram Darah (C.p.44) says:-

"For the boundary of the Sabbath is an eternal Eden."

Marqah (C.p.23) refers to the "two tablets" as:-

"An Eden bringing on life for him that drinks thereof; An Eden whose source is of eternal life."

In both the above references Eden is used as a metaphor.

Neither can the expression "The chosen (elect) ones" be emphasized too much in an eschatological sense. They are the chosen ones, in that God has revealed Himself to Israel (C.p.11) and not to others. The expression does not have the significance and meaning that the use of the term Eklektoi came to have for the Christian. For the Sam. "The elect of God" has no reference whatever to a future status. They are the chosen in that they have a covenant relationship with God.

A doubt does arise as to what the Sam. mean by the

word "glorify" (root: rby). The word really means "to make great" or "to multiply" and is used principally rather in a physical or numerical sense than that of anything that may be "spiritual"; or appertain to a change from an earthly status. The Defter for the Conjunction of Passover (C.p.47) states:-

"And those that came out forgot nothing of that which their God reminded them, concerning the bones of Joseph; His reminding them to take them, for Joseph was great but dead and after his death he was glorified, for his bones were taken by the hand of the great prophet."

In a prayer of Amram Darah (C.p.290) it almost seems that for a moment he is cogitating on the mystery of life and death, when he writes:-

"Forgive us my Lord, for we live like the dead, and remember unto us the covenant of the dead, who are as alive."

Also in the same prayer:-

"We have need of Thy mercies after our affliction; When in death we have need of Thee, in life even more so."

Even Ab-Hisdah (Abul-Hasan) of Tyre (11th cent; C.p.70) is not over optimistic when he writes:-

"For we pass over and away and leave, but Thou ever endurest in thy greatness."

Amram the H.P. (13th cent.; C.p.30) seems also depressed when writing:-

"Comfort and deliver us for we exist like the dead."

Ed-Dustan (11th cent.; C.p.69) seems to be non-committal when saying:-

"God created the heaven and the earth, enduring are they for ever, one for the use of angels, the other for the use of mortals."

The Sam. do not believe that the material world will last for ever. Maimonides³¹ agreed with much that Aristotle wrote, but when Aristotle affirmed that Materia Prima was eternal Maimonides did not concur. However Ed-Dustan is of the opinion that created angels inhabit heaven, and created mortals inhabit the earth, and a gulf appears to remain. But Ab-Gelugah (12th cent.; C.p.75) asks God to forgive his sins,

"And have compassion upon me in both worlds."

and prays that when,

"The day of judgement is before me, fill me with repentance before the day of my end."

The above evidence may imply a genesis of a doctrine of life after death, but there is no concrete evidence of a resurrection of the body. There is no evidence to show that the Sam. 4th cent. teaching about life and death is any different from that of Ecclesiastes³²:-

"And the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it,"

with the marked exception that the Sam. prefer "soul" to

"spirit." They have not attained to that spiritual intuition as was achieved by the writer of Daniel³³, incidentally the only specific reference in the O.T. to a resurrection.

Everlasting life, in the Defter, is associated with God (C.pp.20,25,26), and with the Scriptures (C.p.51); it is never mentioned in connection with transient beings. Is this surprising? The O.T. mentions everlasting (eternal) life once.³⁵ In the N.T. outside of the Johannine Gospel the expression is used forty-three times. Everlasting (eternal) life is found in the Johannine Gospel sixteen times. In Daniel and the N.T. it applies to human beings.

There are no definite eschatological data to be found in the Defter. The era of the return of Divine Favour is mentioned, but is a thought never developed. There is no mention of a Millenium. There is no evidence of a pending conflagration, nor of eternal fire. These are but four casual references to the Taheb (C.pp.4,42,45,56). Opinions are held but no evidence of developed eschatological teaching.

From the evidence submitted, the Defter would appear to be deficient in many aspects, which in later cent. became more prominent in Sam. doctrine and teaching. If the Sam.

thinks of a future it is either in regard to easement of his daily problems, or for the return of the Divine Favour, with the shadowy Taheb as a leader. The future definitely refers to this world of transient beings. There does not appear to be any definite evidence for an antithesis of rewards and punishments that eventually resolved itself into the tenet of "The Day of Vengeance and Recompense." The Sam. do not appear to have crystallized their thought doctrinally at this stage of the 4th cent. It seems therefore that apart from a few tentative gestures by a few Sam. during those cent. succeeding the 4th, it is the 14th cent. that developed, and set the seal, on what to-day is regarded as full Sam. doctrine and teaching. The Defter affords some evidence of part of the ideological background which later 14th cent. writers were to utilize and develop. The above survey of the Defter tends to support the opinion of early church fathers that the Sam., like the Sadducees, did not believe in the resurrection, which leads one to ponder on what Cowley³⁶ really meant to imply when he said:-

"While in the writings of Marqah, the belief e.g. in a future life, in angels, and in the supreme position of Moses is taken for granted."

It may well be that, once more, there does arise a situation, in which too much has been taken for granted.

As the Sam., in time, came to attach so much importance to the eschatological contents of Deut.xxxii, it is natural and logical to assume that evidence for this trend would be forthcoming in the Defter, especially in the Qetaphim of Deuteronomy. Brown,³⁷ in order to give a fuller picture of the Defter, where omissions occur in Cowley, has resorted to the Jaffa Ms.. In considering evidence, however, from this source, it must be borne in mind that it is late (1947), so that interpolations and emendations have become the prerogative of the copyist and redactor. Moore³⁸ states that Deut. xi.9 figured in a controversy with the Sam. "who denied that the resurrection of the dead was to be found in the Law." He quotes Rabbi Eliezer ben Jose who "charges them with mutilating their scriptures" by leaving out "to them" in this verse to maintain their attitude regarding the resurrection. Eliezer ben Jose came in the 4th generation of the Tannaim, and comes towards the end of the 2nd cent. Even the locus classicus of Deut. xxxii, 39,

"I kill, and I make alive, I wound and I heal," is not found in the 4th cent. writings in the Defter.

M.M.³⁹ however quotes Deut. xxxii, 39, making the comment:-

"I am that I am delivered and punished,
I am that I am slew and made alive,
I am that I am, I gave relief and I troubled,
I am He, I saved and I destroyed."

On this verse Moore⁴⁰ has a note stating that it "furnishes an answer to those who say that the revivification of the dead is not in the Torah." The verse is more prominent when the Sam. writers of the 14th cent. are reached. But what is the precise evidence in the Defter regarding Deut.xxxii? The only writer to allude to Deut.xxxii.39 is Eleazar b. Phinehas the H.P. (C.p.36; 1363 - 1387) when he writes:-

"He was, and will be, He is, I am that I am,
The great God who kills and who makes alive."

The Qetaphim from Deut.xxxii quoted from Cowley include references to verses 3,4 and 17, and these all refer to God Himself. Where Deut.xxxii.39 is mentioned in the Jaffa Ms.⁴¹ it only says:-

"See now that I, even I, am He,"

the eschatological part of the sentence being omitted. It is seen therefore that there is no 4th cent. evidence in the Defter supporting Deut.xxxii as the basis of Sam. eschatology. As the chapter is hardly mentioned, the conclusion would appear to be that no great stress was laid in the 4th cent. on the resurrection.

Judaism had come to accept the concept of the resurrection most certainly from the time of the Book of Daniel. There was to be a resurrection of the righteous dead.⁴² II Maccabees xii.43-45 makes specific reference to the resurrection. Indeed Jewish eschatology came to be the

inevitable result in the individualizing of religion. Every man was to be finally judged individually. This concept of the resurrection in Judaism came to be associated with the coming of the Messianic Age. The dissension that arose between the Pharisees and the Sadducees on the resurrection only serves to pin-point the concept. The Sadducees were not satisfied that the resurrection could be supported with evidence from the Torah. This might have been the true position also with the Sam.. After 70 A.D. the opinions of the Pharisees continued to prevail with increasing strength, so that the resurrection became the accepted Jewish dogma.

2. THE RESURRECTION.

While the Sam. in every age believe in a dichotomy of body and soul, it is difficult to discover whether they believed in the immortality of the soul, or resurrection of the body in the early cent. of the Christian Era. Yet authors confidently affirm their belief either in one or the other or both. The issue is confused because in examining the Sam. strata of belief they omit the time factor. No religion ever remains static in regard to belief and dogma. But statements are made about Sam. beliefs without substantiating them with evidence. What the Sam. believe to be true to-day is not necessarily what

they held to be true yesterday. Thomson⁴³ states:-

"According to Dr. Mills the Samaritans believe firmly in the immortality of Man. They hold that the soul at death leaves the body and enters another world and a different state of existence. Strikingly they ground their faith in this on Exod.iii.6 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,' the passage which our Lord quoted against the Sadducees."

While in the Defter, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is mentioned (C.pp.4,16,40) the conclusion as deduced by Jesus Christ is never arrived at. Also in the Defter allusions to the next world are rather vague; indeed while it is assumed that the Sam. accept the orthodox teaching about Sheol, it is not mentioned in the Defter. The text of Exod.iii.6 is not quoted as a text in the Defter in the QETAPHIM. Sheol is mentioned in the Pentateuch (Deut.xxxii.22) but no doctrine of the immortality of the soul is built upon it. Immortality and resurrection tend to become prominent as themes when individuality, and personal responsibility take the place of the concept of Corporate Personality. The doctrine of Sheol never loses its social aspect, even in Deut.xxxii.21-22.

Moses Gaster⁴⁴ writes:-

"Thus the Resurrection is proved from the reading in Gen.iii.19. The N.T. reads: 'Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.' The Sam. Text reads: 'For dust thou art and unto thy dust shalt thou return,' and they interpret this to mean that Adam and of course every human being - for the words apply to the whole of the human race - will return again to live in the same material form in which he was when he died: man will return to his own dust."

The text of Gen.iii.19 is not found in the Defter, nor the inference that M. Gaster draws from it. Of course the argument from silence proves nothing. One would assume however that the positive Sam. beliefs would be in evidence, and proof texts quoted.

An examination of the Asatir⁴⁵ shows that there is no evidence for eschatological teaching about the Day of Judgement or of the Resurrection. Here again the argument from silence may be used. However the continuous introduction of this proviso would lead one to believe that there was no positive evidence for a Resurrection.

Moses Gaster⁴⁶ points out that the Jewish Philosopher, SAADYA (960) in his work "Faith and Principles" tries to prove from the Bible and from Jewish Tradition the belief in the immortality of the soul, the Resurrection, a future life, and a Messianic period. Gaster states that Saadya makes use of the Oration of Moses (Deut.xxxii); that he makes a case for the Resurrection on the basis of Deut.xxxii.39:-

"See now that I, even I, am He, and there
is no god beside me:
I kill and I make alive."

But this can only be a case of special pleading on the part of Saadya. Only the Book of Daniel⁴⁷ specifically refers to a Resurrection.

In the Apocrypha, specific reference to the

Resurrection is found in II Maccabees⁴⁸ where Judas made a collection and:-

"Sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin offering, doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the Resurrection; for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have arisen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead."

Both books, Daniel (165 B.C.) and II Maccabees (130 B.C.) are evidence to show, outside of the N.T. that the concept of the Resurrection was known. From the oldest Gospel, St. Mark⁴⁹ it is stated that the Sadducees said "That there is no Resurrection." At that time many Israelites believed in the Resurrection, but it was not universal. St. Paul makes a case for it in I Corinthians (XV). Evidence for it is found everywhere in the N.T. With regard to the Sadducees it has been argued that they did not deny the Resurrection, but that they could find no evidence for its acceptance in the Scriptures. Of the Sadducees Epstein⁵⁰ writes:-

"Whereas the Sadducees, with their nationalistic conception of religion, rejected all these essentially individualistic and eschatological notions as mere fantasies of the Pharisees."

In the Samaritan Oral Law⁵¹ M. Gaster draws attention to a 10th cent. Sam. work called the Tabbah. It states that the Day of Vengeance is near. The dead shall come back to life. An examination of the Tabbah shows that

there is a similarity and presentation of ideas as found in chapter xxxiv of the Qu'ran. The writer of the Tabbah, Abul Hasan Al Suri (11th cent.) clearly thereby expresses a doctrine of the Resurrection and the Future Life. This attitude is consonant with the beliefs of Islam. Bowman⁵² however states that:-

"There is nothing about it (i.e. The Resurrection) or the Taheb or the doctrine of the End-----in the 11th century priestly writers Abul Hasan and Yusaf b. Salama."

If Abul Hasan read the Qu'ran he must have been aware that it is really a Book dealing with Eschatology, touching upon Ta Eschata as seen from the eyes of Muhammad. The Qu'ran deals with the recurring themes of Judgement, Recompense, Reward, Resurrection and Immortality, and the alternatives of Hell and Heaven (Paradise). The Muslim Religion is similar to Samaritanism in that it upholds a belief in One God; One Prophet; One Book; One Place (Mecca); A Day of Judgement and Recompense, and a Mahdi (Messiah?).

M. Gaster⁵³ gives a survey of The Birth of Moses (Moled Mosheh) by Ghazal (Tabia) Al-Doweik, who lived about the end of the 13th cent. or beginning of the 14th. In it is a hymn which associates Moses with the Resurrection. The hymn has a response which runs as follows:-

"O our Master Moses, thou wilt be unto us the helper on the Day of Vengeance and Reward;

O Moses, the message of truth, through thy wonderful prayers and intercession, be unto us a saviour, from the burning fire, and our redeemer;

O Moses, master of the word of God, be unto us he who will save us from destruction and perdition by the consuming fire;

O Moses, prophet of the whole world, help us to pass into the exalted Garden;

O Moses, perfect priest, master of the fast, be thou unto us a helper at the Resurrection."

This response seems to be based on a pattern not dissimilar to that of the hymn, Gloria in Excelsis Deo⁵⁴ in the Christian Church. It was well known in the Eastern Church. "After thirteen Canticles of the Eastern Church, all save one in the words of Holy Scripture, there comes in Greek the Great Doxology, or as it is in Latin, the Gloria in Excelsis."⁵⁵

The Gloria in Excelsis was found as far back as the 4th cent., and is in the great Codex A, the Alexandrian Ms. of the Bible.⁵⁶ It was originally called "The Hymn of the Dawn," or "The hymn of the Angels." It bears comparison with the Sam. "The Prayer of the Angels" (C.p.9) used in "The Service for Morning Prayer," as found in the Defter.

When M. Gaster⁵⁷ refers to the Shirah Yetimah written by Abisha b. Phinehas he states that Abisha "depends on the treatises of Ghazal Al-Doweik."

It has however been shown⁵⁸ that Abisha's hymn (C.pp.511-519), in the presentation of ideas, keeps fairly

close to the Book of Revelation (xx-xxi). Ghazal Al-Doweik himself might have also been influenced by the same chapters, when referring to the Resurrection. At least M. Gaster and the present writer are agreed on one point, that Abisha appears to have been influenced by another source, whether Sam. or Christian, when he writes about the Resurrection, Fire, Sheol and the Messiah in the Shirah Yetimah.⁵⁹

That Abisha appears to have been influenced by the Book of Revelation (xx-xxi), as well as other Christian documents bring one to the observations made by Moses Gaster in The Samaritans.⁶⁰ He writes:-

"Some scholars have noticed some similarities between Samaritans and Jews, and even Samaritans and Karaites. Without investigating the matter deeper, and without going to the original source of information, they hastily assumed that the Samaritans were always the borrowers. According to them, whatever is found among the Samaritans resembling Jewish, Christian, Mohammedan, Karaite, or other sectarian practices, it must have been borrowed by the Samaritans."

He continues:-⁶¹

"None of these forces acted upon the Samaritans, and if anything, they are the only people who have had neither reason nor occasion to change."

This thesis attempts to show that with the Sam. assimilation of ideas and idioms has occurred. In the matter of the Resurrection there has been a change of viewpoint. There is no mention of the Resurrection of the

body, as distinct from the immortality of the soul in the Defter. Evolution permeates all departments of life, and there is always the cardinal necessity to adapt oneself to the pressing emergencies of environment, whether that environment be material, ideal, spiritual or moral. If, as Gaster says, the Samaritans did not imbibe new trends of thought, and did not borrow, at least they were not entirely unaware of their presence. An examination of the ideological background does show that the possibility of the 14th cent. Sam. having been influenced, especially by the Christian Church in Samaria, is obvious.

In spite of what Gaster says above, he states⁶²:-

"But neither Jews nor Samaritans were entirely impermeable to the new influences."

Also⁶³:-

"The Jews were less exposed than the Samaritans to this speculative activity, as they had a larger basis upon which to rest their doctrine."

The Samaritans had to find an answer to the yearnings of the people about the Beginning and the End of things, and yet keep within the province of the Pentateuch. If one does not pay heed to a call directly, it however does happen that one is cognizant of the echo, so that the Sam. were aware of what others said and did. Yet with regard to the subject matter of the hymns, poems and prayers used by the Sam. Moses Gaster⁶⁴says:-

"It must be repeated, however, that though the whole is of a stereotyped character, it shows no trace of any outside influence, neither Christian, Mohammedan, nor any other."

It is the object of this thesis to show that there is an ideological background to the theology and philosophy of the Sam.. This background would appear to contain elements that are not strictly peculiar to Samaritanism.

Moses Gaster⁶⁵ has examined another Sam. work entitled Al-Kafi (c.1042), and affirms that it does not contain any eschatology. He also has examined another Sam. composition called the Hillukh (16th-17th cent.) and states that "the book finishes with a long chapter on death, punishment and Resurrection."⁶⁶

The evidence so far sifted and assessed suggests that the first specific reference to the Resurrection - "The dead shall come back to life" - is to be found in the Tabbah (10th cent.) Up to now that is the terminus a quo. Cognizance however must be taken of the recently translated Sam. work called Memar Marqah,⁶⁷ where Book IV mentions the conditions obtaining during the Resurrection. While the attractiveness of an early date would lead to an intriguing situation by virtue of Book IV appearing, to have an affinity with the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is perhaps better to leave the dating in abeyance at this stage, but to enter a cautionary note that the Resurrection is mentioned. It is known that a sharp division of opinion existed in the

ranks of the Sam. especially about the Resurrection. Montgomery⁶⁸ refers to two distinct schools of thought.

Montgomery⁶⁹ states that the eschatological tenets of the Sam. faith are later and of secondary origin. The Elder Sam. doubtless held to the primitive belief that the dead went to Sheol, herein agreeing with the Sadducees as against the Pharisees. He goes on to say that the dogma of the Resurrection appears already in full bloom in Marqah in the 4th cent. The hymns and prayers of Marqah in the Defter have been examined, but no concrete evidence for the Resurrection of the body as distinct from immortality of the soul has been ascertained. M.M. however presents a different picture. Montgomery⁷⁰ states that the doctrine of the Day of Vengeance and Recompense was anterior to that of the Resurrection. According to earlier thought the Community was to be vindicated, not the individual. That the doctrine of the Day of Vengeance and Recompense was anterior to that of the Resurrection is not doubted. But the danger is to assume that the Resurrection is a necessary corollary of the Day of Vengeance. It does not necessarily follow. So long as the thought persists that the Community is to be either punished or vindicated, then the concept of personal survival after death does not arise. It is when the sanctity of the individual is stressed, and God is conceived

of as a moral God, that the idea of survival after death makes its appearance. Jeremiah and Ezekiel initiated the movement inside Judaism with the moral stress on the individual. Individual religion and individual responsibility are factors leading to a belief in the Resurrection. So long as the concept of Corporate Personality persists, there is no occasion for a Resurrection. In the Defter the moral lapses of the Community are stressed. This may be because it is the Sam. Book of Common Prayer.

Montgomery⁷¹ mentioned a Dositheus, an early Sam. heresiarch, who according to Philaster, was "a Jew who denied the Resurrection." Origen of Alexandria assigns Dositheus to the 1st cent. Eulogius, B. of Alexandria (reign of Mauricius, 582-603) speaks of the existence of two sects. One was led by a Dosthes or Dositheos who claimed he was the prophet foretold by Moses and who denied the Resurrection. The other party believed in Joshua as the prophet. It may be inferred, says Montgomery, that they accepted the Resurrection. Montgomery⁷² in this chapter, points out that from the beginning of the Arabic period down to the middle of the 9th cent. there were differences between Dositheans and orthodox Samaritans. Shahrastani (1153) declared that "the Dustaniya deny a future life, and that recompense is in this world."

M. Gaster⁷³ also states:-

"There a man obtains his reward for all his deeds in this world."

when making reference to the Hillukh.

Montgomery⁷⁴ quotes from the last Halakah of Masseket Kutim (2nd cent.). In this Talmudic tract, R. Ishmael says:-

"When shall we take them back? When they renounce Mount Gerizim, and confess Jerusalem, and the Resurrection of the dead."

This must be a reference to the orthodox Sam., for they upheld Mount Gerizim. It must also have been well known that they did not believe in the Resurrection.

Montgomery⁷⁵ mentions the close relationship between Sadducees and Sam. and that both denied the Resurrection of the dead.⁷⁶

Heidenheim is the chief advocate of an extensive Gnosticism⁷⁷ existing in Sam. literature. On examination there would appear to be incipient traces of Gnostic terminology in the Defter. The Gnostics conceived of finite matter being evil, and that the soul of Man was seeking to escape from the body. They therefore denied the Resurrection of the body, but upheld the immortality of the soul. As Gnosticism had its roots in Samaria, it is not unlikely that Gnosticism reflected a belief fairly widely held at the time.

Thomson⁷⁸ quotes Dr. Mills as saying that the doctrines

of Angels, of Immortality and the Last Judgement came later. The Sam. have believed in Angels from earliest times, so that the above statement is not strictly correct. But what of Immortality? The early Sam. accepted the current conception of Sheol, but they never gave expression to it in words. It is possible however for Dr. Mills to have confused the issue as he does not differentiate between a Resurrection of the Body, and the Immortality of the Soul.

The Early Church Fathers sometimes made observations about the Sam.. Origen (185-254) in his Commentary on Matt.xxii.23-33 assumes that, like the Sadducees the Samaritans deny the Resurrection. So Epiphanius (310-403), speaking of the Sadducees, says: "They reject the Resurrection of the dead, thinking like the Samaritans."⁷⁹

On the other hand the Sam. must have been aware that the Christians believed in the Resurrection of the Dead. It is known that there was a Christian Bishop of Sebaste⁸⁰ (Samaria), for he was present at the Council of Nicaea, 325. This creed affirms that Jesus rose from the dead. Another Bishop was present at the Synod of Jerusalem in 536. And there was a Latin Bishopric in Samaria right up to the 14th cent. Neopolis (Nablus) also had a Bishop. So Samaria was aware of the teaching by the Christian Church of the Resurrection of the dead.

An examination of the Defter hymns, prayers and poems

does not reveal a Resurrection. Heidenheim⁸¹ is mentioned as

"The chief advocate of an extensive gnosticism existing in Samaritan Literature."

An examination of Marqah (cf.C.p.19,21) in the Defter indicates that he made tentative excursions in that direction. When Marqah refers to God as the "Bestower of gifts" (C.p.17) he may be making use of the ideas embodied in the name of Dositheus (Dos, a gift; Theos, God). The Gnostics did not believe in the Resurrection of the body.⁸² If Marqah was aware of Gnostic terminology, he might be aware also of Gnostic Theology. Bowman⁸³, speaking of one who brought about the Sam. revival in the 4th cent. says that:-

"Baba Raba, the high priest of Shechem, became Dosithean."

He also states⁸⁴ that:-

"The use of compositions of Marqah and Amram Darah was continued only by the Dosithean heretics."

He also specifically refers to the work of Marqah as Dosithean.⁸⁵ Montgomery⁸⁶ states that Dositheus was an early Samaritan heresiarch and quotes Philaster as saying of Dositheus that:-

"He was a Jew who denied the Resurrection."

According to Montgomery⁸⁷ some connect Dositheus with Simon Magus. Marqah (C.p.16) alludes to God as "The Great Power,"

recalling to mind the incident of Peter and John in Samaria with Simon,⁸⁸ when Simon was referred to as:-

"This man is that power of God which is called Great."

If it can be substantiated that Marqah was a Dosithean, then he would not believe in the Resurrection of the body. Dositheus had claimed that he was the prophet foretold by Moses. The Dositheans continued to adhere to their beliefs through the succeeding cent. according to authorities like Philaster, Origen, Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria (C.600) and an Arab writer Shahrastani (D.1153) who referred to the Dustaniya as denying a future life, and that recompense comes in this world. It was noticed in the Defter that neither Amram Darah nor Marqah ascribes Everlasting Life to human beings. Indeed Marqah is the only writer in the Defter who ascribes Everlasting Life to God.

In the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (xv) Gibbon, when speaking of the five reasons which he assigns for the triumph of Christianity, states that the second reason is that of "The doctrine of a Future Life." From 313 onwards the Roman Empire was officially to subscribe to the doctrine of the Resurrection. This teaching must inevitably have had repercussions throughout the Empire, and one cannot doubt but that the Sam. were aware also of its potency, with the corollary of a resurrected Messiah.

One of the outstanding scholars of the 2nd cent. was Tatian the Assyrian, (c.172) the composer of the Diatessaron, who for a time was associated with Justin Martyr (d.167) a native of Nablus. After his connection with Justin, Tatian was led away by the speculations of Saturninus, a Gnostic of Antioch. Tatian also denied the Resurrection of the dead.⁸⁹

A number of scholars, like Thomson⁹⁰ have claimed that the Sam. subscribed to the doctrine of the Resurrection because it is implicit in their belief "In the Day of Vengeance and Recompense," and that the doctrine is fully developed in Marqah. But the doctrine of the Resurrection is not implicit in "The Day of Vengeance and Recompense," for there was a time when this concept was not considered to be eschatological at all. It was only later that this day was made co-terminus with "The Day of Judgement."

It is noticed in the Defter that there are no prayers for the dead. This does not prove that the Sam. did not believe in the Resurrection. J. Mill⁹¹ in his "The Modern Samaritans" quotes the High Priest as authority for the statement that the Samaritans have no form of prayers for the dead. Yet Phinehas the H.P. (14th cent.; C.p.237) has a prayer "for persons who had died that year." The prayer on the Sabbath of Unleavened Bread is as follows:-

"It is fitting that I should mention that it is incumbent upon me to remember those of them that have passed away this year. May God make each one of them dwell in the Garden of Eden."

This however reflects the position attained in the 14th cent.

Moses Gaster⁹² states that:-

"Samaritan tradition, however, makes no mention of the fact that the Sadducees denied the immortality of the soul, or reward and punishment after death."

The Sadducean position was that they were people who strictly applied the letter of the law, and never deviated from it. The Sadducees did not deny the Resurrection; they only affirmed that there was no evidence or warrant for it in the Pentateuch.

Of the evidence so far examined from Sam. sources, apart from the recently translated M.M., there is no definite statement about a resurrection of the body, or a resurrection of the dead, these concepts not being precisely the same. A resurrection of the body is specific, while a resurrection of or from the dead is more general and philosophical. It is near to the 14th cent. that one turns to see if there has been any marked development or evolution. But before doing so it may be questioned what contribution the Muslim religion made towards Sam. Theology and Philosophy? It is doubtful if the Muslims contributed as much to Sam. doctrine as did the Christians.

Dr. Tisdall⁹³ writes of the Arabs:-

"Familiarity with the Abrahamic races also introduced the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection from the death to the Moslim faith."

The Muslims also derived Faith, Repentance, Heaven and Hell, the Heavenly angels, and Gabriel the Messenger of God from Jewish sources.⁹⁴

In the Carmina Samaritana, there are distinct references to the after-life. It is assumed that G. Gesenius is translating hymns that are late for they are closely akin in meaning to those of the 14th cent.. In one hymn (iii.13) it states:-

"My future dwelling place, is the seat of
Your authority: There is neither sea
there, nor bridge, nor indeed the sky itself."

The same hymn (iii.22) makes reference to the Taheb:-

"May the Taheb be close to us; and you
will forgive according to your mercy,
for you are able."

Another hymn in this collection is by "The illustrious teacher Abul-Fath". Cowley⁹⁵ makes reference to an Abul-Fath, who at the instigation of Phinehas b. Joseph the H.P. (1308-1363) compiled his chronicle (1355). In this hymn⁹⁶ he writes:-

"We seek from Thee what we ask,
O King of our spirits;
Without Thee there is no
resurrection for our life."

There is no doubt here about the word Resurrection.

However, even here, it does not say that it is a resurrection

of the body, but of life; Resurrectio ad vitam nostram.

Another hymn (vii.9-11) has more to add:-

"And on the great day of Resurrection,
On that pure and brilliant day,
A great redemption will be announced,
But it will not be a resurrection for them;
Unless a fire will burn in their heart,
And each of them will despise his works."

And again (vii.14-16):-

"And the word will come to them:-
'There is not freedom for you to-day.
However much now you turn to your god,
In the fire be you burnt up entirely,
On account of that which you have done,
With my people, and with my covenants.'"

The same hymn (vii.28) adds:-

"But my people, pleasantness will inhabit
it (i.e. the free state or freedom),
And there will be a fountain for it in the
Garden of Eden,
Since they have walked in my way."

Again in the same hymn (vii.31):-

"Happy is Israel among the nations,
In this world and the next."

In hymn xii (30) mention is made of Moses:-

"And he ascended into heaven."

With fuller development of such words as Messiah, Resurrection, Future Dwelling Place, Redemption, Freedom and Ascension, we seem to have moved far away from the 4th cent. Sam. way of thinking, and to be caught up in a millieu whose overtones are distinctly reflective of 14th cent. Samaritanism.

An examination of the writings of Ben Manir shows that

he has not much to say in the matter of eschatology. He makes mention of "The Day of Vengeance" (C.p.385), but not in a way that gives an exegesis of the expression. Of God he says:-

"He existed before Creation,
He will exist after the Day of
Vengeance,"

thus walking in the foot-steps of Marqah. For him it is a point in time or at the end of time. When he refers to the Judgement Day he can but say (C.p.321):-

"Have pity, O Pitiful One,
In the Day when we stand before Thee."

He is looking forward to the return of the "Messianic Era" of Favour, when the Sam. will gather at the Garden of Eden on Mount Gerizim. He often thinks of the return of God's Favour. (cf. C.pp.96,98,99,100). He also makes use of the optative expression of the "Hundred Years." (cf.C.p.96, 99,100). He does not once mention Resurrection, and in the Sam. Mss. examined does not allude to the Taheb. The fact that he looks forward to a "Messianic Era" (of a hundred years?) without a Sam. Messiah or Taheb is not a unique attitude to adopt. In The Assumption of Moses (7 - 29 A.D.), a Pharisaic work, there is no mention of a Messiah, and no Resurrection of the body: only that of the spirit. There is no Resurrection of the body in the Book of Wisdom, Philo, Secrets of Enoch, and 4 Maccabees.

These are composed by writers influenced by Alexandria, and

draw their materials from Plato, Aristotle, the Pythagorians and the Stoics. With them the soul pre-exists. This would appear to be the viewpoint of later Samaritanism, for Muslim b. Murjan (18th cent.; C.p.327) refers to one,

"Born out of the world of the soul
into this world."

The teaching of Philo, 4 Maccabees, and Book of Wisdom is that there is no final judgement, and no Sheol. The Book of Wisdom speaks of a Messianic kingdom ruled by God, but there is no Messiah. 2 Enoch (1-50 A.D.) mentions a Messianic Kingdom, but there is no reference to a Messiah. At the end of the Messianic Era there is a final judgement called "The Day of Judgement" (xxxix.1; Li.3); The "Great Judgement" (Lviii.5); and "The Day of the Great Judgement." (L.4; Lii.15). In the Defter there is a reference to "The Day of Great Judgement" (C.p.85); and a reference by Ab-Gelugah (C.p.75) to "The Day of Judgement."

(A) Aaron b. Manir.

It is not known whether Ben Manir was a Dosithean. He appears to hold views that are different from Abisha b. Phinehas. Ben Manir agrees with the Dositheans in that he does not stress the Resurrection. Neither for that matter does he deny the Resurrection. He omits mention of the Taheb, and this fact along with the lack of mention of the

Resurrection could indicate that he was a man of definite views. On the other hand, it is likely that he introduced the concept of the "Hundred Years," of Messianic peace, happiness and plenty. The concept of the "Hundred Years" will call for discussion later.

Ben Manir writes (C.p.179):-

"Those who have not seen the Garden of Eden, shall see this night of Passover a light which comes forth from Eden, shines upon it, and the tree of life abides in it."

If Ben Manir has been influenced by the Zohar, a writing ascribed to Moses de Leon (D.1305), and which was attaining a wide popularity, then he has not accepted all that the Zohar states. "A light which comes forth (emanates) from Eden," is a thought in the Zohar associated in a context where it states, that after death, that part of the soul called the Ruah enters Eden, where it dons the body it tenanted in the world, so that it may enjoy "the lights of Paradise."⁹⁷

(B) Abisha b. Phinehas

Of all the Sam. writers of the 14th cent. none attempts to deal with eschatology to the same extent as Abisha b. Phinehas. No one mentions the Taheb as often as he does; eleven times in one hymn (C.pp.511-519). He also speaks freely of the next world. He writes (C.p.696):-

"As a refuge in this world for you, and in the next as a place of rest for you."

In the Sam. Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy he is the one who introduces the concept of fire (C.pp.698,501,516 (3 times)).

There is to be an opportunity of recollection after death for he says (C.p.502):-

"You will only realise what you have been about after the day of your death. Not till the day of your end, till the day when you stand before your Lord, when your evil-doing will be laid bare."

Abisha does not state precisely what is to stand before the Lord for judgement. As death (of the body) has occurred, one can assume that the principle of identity is not the body. The picture however is a little confusing, for he later continues (C.p.503):-

"As for them who do not rise up thereon here with you - the Lord remember them favourably."

Abisha beseeches God (C.p.507):-

"And accept me in the great day of judgement; MY Lord."

He makes the observation (C.p.509) regarding the condemned that:-

"God will destroy their body and soul."

Following on Plato, the Alexandrian School believed in the immortality of the soul, a concept accepted by the Jew Philo (25 B.C. - 50 A.D.). He did not believe in the resurrection of the body, for matter was evil. The body is the "utterly polluted prison" of the soul.⁹⁸ Ezekiel⁹⁹ had said :-

"The soul that sins shall die."

Abisha certainly is not influenced by Greek ideas, but has a leaning towards the Judaistic viewpoint. He may hold to the point of view of Ecclesiastes (xii.7).

It is after the death of the Taheb that "The Final Day" (C.p.513) is to come when "The earth and its generation will be destroyed." (C.p.515).

At the judgement there is to be the great division. "The innocent holy ones are to go into the Garden of Eden" (C.p.516). But the guilty are to be burnt in the fire. Moses is to intercede and pray for the guilty. And

"All people and nations will rise from the tombs."

Here Abisha, as did Abul Fath, mentions a resurrection. As it is "from the tombs,"¹⁰⁰ the conclusion is that it is a resurrection of the body. But no saviour is to rescue them from the burning fire, burning down to Sheol (C.p.516). The picture seems to be then, that the innocent holy ones of Samaria are to enter the Garden of Eden. The guilty of Samaria are to be interceded for by Moses; the pure three; and Aaron and his sons will make atonement. He (i.e..Moses) will bring them out of affliction. The remainder of the people will go down to Sheol. In that place there will be the "burning of the excessive fire" (C.p.516).

But has Abisha a clear picture of what a Resurrection

entails? For example is the Taheb to rise again from the dead? For of the Taheb he writes (C.p.515):-

"I have mentioned nothing else, (e.g.) what will be done after him; After his death in peace when he will enter the grave, and be gathered to his people, and be buried in safe keeping."

In this condition he is to be with Joseph and Joshua. The Star, "shall never be moved from above his grave."

Being "gathered to his people" is a phrase mentioned in the Pentateuch¹⁰¹. It could refer to the time in history when the Hebrews had a concept of the After-life akin to that of "Ancestor Worship." And the phrase "buried in safe keeping" with Joshua and Joseph, may be another way of expressing the same idea.

After the "Day of Vengeance and Recompense" (C.p.499) there will come "a recollection of it," presumably by those who survive. It will be a day when,

"You will stand before your Lord, when your evil-doing will be laid bare."
(C.p.502).

On the Day of Vengeance (C.p.516):-

"All places will be shaken which contain the dead where they are buried."
"The ground will be rent, and from it will come forth spirits." 102

Abisha continues:-

"All people and nations, when they rise from the tombs will be naked, their spirits evil-devouring."

Is the Resurrection of the body implied here? It seems that the indestructable element of personality is the spirit, and here the emphasis is rather on "evil-devouring" spirits rather than people and nations who rise up naked. They could be naked, being devoid of clothes. They also could be naked by virtue of the absence of flesh. It may be that Abisha has "The Valley of Dry Bones"¹⁰³ in mind when painting his picture of those who arise from the tombs, particularly the part that has reference to Israel and its restoration, :-

"Therefore prophesy, and say to them, Thus says the Lord God: Behold, I will open your graves, O my people; and I will bring you home into the land of Israel. And you shall know that I am the Lord when I open your graves, and raise you from your graves, O my people. And I will put my Spirit within you, and you shall live, and I will place you in your land; then you shall know that I, the Lord, have spoken, and I have done it says the Lord." 104

Abisha is convinced that only Israel will be localized in the Garden of Eden.

"They will dwell in the midst of the Garden of Eden after they pass into it." (C.p.517).

Thus in the Shirah Yetimah does Abisha present his eschatological picture, and his conception of the Resurrection. Perhaps it is correct to say that it is a Resurrection rather of the spirit than of the body. Of the three Christian Creeds, it is the one associated with the

Eastern Church - The Nicene - that omits "body" but states:-

"And I look for the Resurrection of the dead."
It reflects the Eastern outlook based on the Platonic immortality of the soul. It is first met with in a work by Epiphanius B. of Salamis, 374. The other two Christian Creeds are essentially Western and Latin. The Apostles' Creed can be traced to the middle of the 2nd cent.¹⁰⁵ It lays emphasis on

"The Resurrection of the body"

The Athanasian Creed, so called, was probably composed by Hilary of Arles, 429. This Creed states:-

"At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies; and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; And they that have done evil into everlasting fire ."

An examination of what Abisha states leads to the possible conclusion that he believes in the Resurrection of the spirit.

(C) Abdullah b. Solomon.

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.490) in an expression of the Sam. Creed ends with the words:-

"And in the Day of Vengeance and Recompense, and in the hour in which flees the spirit from the body, from this world to the next."

He therefore believes that when the body is dead the spirit

departs into the next world. But this is not to say that he believes in a Resurrection, either of the body or of the spirit. He mentions God (C.p.642) as:-

"The Ruler of our spirits,"

but not in any sense implying destiny: God rules over all, therefore He rules over our spirits. He subscribes to the concept of the two worlds when he writes (C.p.490):-

"This world and the next."

There is also to be (C.p.490):-

"A Day of Vengeance and Recompense."

which he also designates simply as (C.p.490):-

"The Day of Vengeance."

And with "The Day of Vengeance," (C.p.213), he includes the concept of "Fire" (C.p.213: three times). With the "Latter End" (C.p.444) he alludes also to "Paradise" (C.p.446) or "The Garden of Eden." He is enthusiastic about the blessings of "The Hundred Years" yet to come, and, unlike Ben Manir, mentions the Taheb (C.pp.384,425). But like Ben Manir he does not stress a Resurrection. Presumably the spirit passes from this world to the next when death of the body occurs.

Now one would imagine that the Sam. Burial Service¹⁰⁶ would give a comprehensive picture, especially as the Burial Service is late, and is found in three 18th cent. Mss. Together with anonymous writers, a contributor who can be

dated is the scribe Muslim b. Murjan Ha-Danfi (C.1727). It is a fairly safe assumption to infer that the Burial Service of any religious sect would give an inkling of the aspirations of that sect, and of what it holds to be the true end of Man. Some of the Sam. Burial Service is later than the 14th cent. Yet it is assumed that it is largely the work of 14th cent. liturgists, particularly Abdullah b. Solomon. In the Sam. Burial Service it is affirmed that God is "Eternal" (C.p.855), and that "there is none that endures for ever." (C.p.855).

There is to be,

"A day of reckoning."

With regard to death the spirit is to depart from its body (C.p.856). God is referred to as "Lord of spirits" (C.p.857), and then a new concept is introduced (C.p.865):-

"The Resurrector of the spirits,"

with God in mind. The full quotation is:-

"And forgive her (i.e. Israel) O Lord,
who art Resurrector of the spirits, Cause
her to rest in the Garden which is her place."

Although a resurrection of spirits is obvious, the resurrection refers nationally and not individually. Yet as with Abul-Fath and Abisha b. Phinehas, a Resurrection is mentioned, howbeit not a Resurrection of the flesh or of the body.

In this Liturgy where one would conclude that After-life

is foremost in the minds of the mourners the Day of Judgement is mentioned (C.p.859), but no reference to the Taheb. This may be because the Taheb was not held to be a redeemer. The Sam. "Messiah" or Taheb is never mentioned in a context of vicarious suffering or sacrifice, unlike the Christian Messiah. There is no mention of the "Hundred Years," as the person now dead would not enjoy the "Messianic Era" of peace, and prosperity. This omission seems to imply that the advent of the Taheb and the "Hundred Years" are not unconnected. No mention is made of Sheol, but of "Abbadon" (C.p.864), but as Abbadon is held to be a department of Sheol, the terms are almost synonymous. The Judgement of God is spoken of (C.p.859), and also the Great Fire (C.p.860). The thought uppermost in the Burial Service is that while "There is none that endures for ever" (C.p.855), "Everlasting Life" (C.p.860) is ascribed to God. This concept referred to by Marqah in the 4th cent. is a description of God, when compared with transient beings like Man. Marqah in contrasting God with Man, referred to God as "Everlasting Life," and Man as "Transient dust." So also in the Sam. Burial Service this fundamental line of demarcation is never forgotten.

The Sam. Burial Service does not mention a Resurrection of the body. As this is the Sam. viewpoint in the 18th cent. it would appear reasonable to conclude

that the concept of the resurrected body did not obtain in the 14th.

There is mention in the Burial Service that (C.p.856):-

"(Death) will tear out the spirit from its body, and the corpse be left over."

and request is made:-

"Return to your Creator before the departure of your spirit."

One wonders whether the "departure of your spirit," presumably from the body, does not also entertain the possibility of a departure from the Creator of the spirit to Abbadon (Sheol), should an adverse verdict occur at the Judgement. Murjan Ha-Danfi (C.p.856) writes:-

"O Son of Man, O wretch, think not on this world. Arise and go up to Him. In Him you shall dwell."

He continues (C.p.857) that death comes to all, to Adam, Seth, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. "There came (even) to him (i.e. Moses) the judgement of death."

The expression of Murjan Ha-Danfi (C.p.856)

"In Him you shall dwell."

and what follows calls to mind what St. Paul said at Athens¹⁰⁷. After referring to God who "made the world and all things therein" a familiar Sam. theme, Paul¹⁰⁸ goes on to say (xvii.28) quoting Epimenides, the Greek Poet:-

"For in Him we live, and move, and have our being."

He further indicates that "God hath appointed a day in which

he will judge the world in righteousness by a man (add. Jesus; Codex Bezae) whom he hath ordained."¹⁰⁹ Then Paul mentions the Resurrection of the dead.¹¹⁰ Jesus Christ refers to Himself as "The Son of Man," and this thought may be in the mind of Murjan. That Murjan should say "In Him you shall dwell," is a concept of Stoic vintage. "Son of man" is a title found in Ezekiel (Passim) and came to be looked upon as a Messianic title used by Jesus Christ.¹¹¹ Bishop Berkeley (1685-1753), the founder of the Philosophy of Idealism, had as an axiomatic principle, that objects cannot exist anywhere except in the mind. If it is felt that Berkeley introduces God as a Deus ex machina, and so throws his philosophy open to criticism, as some would claim, it must be affirmed, that for him, continuity of existence can only be achieved by postulating God's existence and His mind, "for in Him we live, and move, and have our being."

That death is emphatic for Murjan Ha-Danfi (C.p.857) is shown by mentioning the "Meritorious Ones."

"Where are the meritorious devoted ones?"

"The judgement of death came to them, and it had no mercy for their merit. It had no pity for their merit, neither had it pity for their prophetic status. They drank this cup."

The sum total of this disquisition into the philosophy,

and ideological background of the Sam. Burial Service is that God is (C.p.865):-

"Resurrector of the Spirits,"

and that He will give Israel rest in "the Garden of Eden, (a state rather than a place) and the guilty are to go straight to the fire (in Muslim style)." 112

The 4th cent. Defter never went beyond the Pentateuch when making reference to God as "The God of the Spirits".¹¹³ The reference to spirits was in a general sense. This could be because the Sam. never ascribed, at that time, a particular spirit to a particular body. By the time of Abul Hasan (11th cent.), however, reference is made to "Our spirits" (C.p.70). So also Ab-Gelugah (12th cent.) alludes to "My spirit." (C.p.77). Amram the High Priest (1255-1269) mentions "Our spirits." It seems therefore that from about the 11th cent. spirit began to be associated with a personal pronoun, and the "abstract" spirit in the Defter to become personalized. It may be that Corporate Personality was tending to slip into the background, and for there to be an emphasis on the individual. Abul Hasan (C.p.70) refers to "our spirits," "our souls" and "our bodies." The emphasis tends to be from the general to the particular.

Looking back to the 4th cent. and tracing the imprints made, it seems evident by the time of the 14th cent. that

the permanent feature about Man is his spirit. And that the end of the trail is more or less the same as the beginning anent the spirit of Man, corresponding to the opinion expressed in Ecclesiastes (xii.7):-

"And the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it."

3. THE DAY OF VENGEANCE AND RECOMPENSE.

After the advent of the Taheb (C.p.515):-

"The descendants of Israel will increase and be fruitful,"

especially,

"In great days before the Lord turns aside,"

and

"The earth and its generation will be destroyed as in the flood."

The Sam. view differs therefore from that of the Jewish Apocalyptists¹¹⁴ who expected the advent of the Messiah to precede the Last Judgement, and the end of the world.

The Sam. view falls into line more with that of the Christian. The advent of the Taheb precedes a period of peace referred to by Christians as the Millennium. This resembles the scheme of Ta Eschata as outlined in the Revelation of St. John the Divine in Chapter XX. Both the Sam. and the Christians uphold a similar modus operandi of things, in the sequence of the advent of the Messiah;

a period of peace; a period of falling away of the lapsi; then the Judgement; the Day of Vengeance and Recompense; and finally Ekpurosis.

There is now distinct evidence that the Sam. believed in a hereafter. The evidence on this matter in the Defter was not too clear-cut, due often to the very obscurity of allusion to the subject. It was difficult to pin-point any 4th cent. writer, for every one was evasive and non-committal. Abisha now discards any semblance of uncertainty, and commits himself to a point of view not completely alien to orthodox views. He hopes (C.p.696) that Moses:-

"May establish the shade of his roof as a refuge in this world for you, and in the next as a place of rest for you! "

Elsewhere it had been mentioned (C.p.512) that:-

"The nations and the uncircumcised"
are "To come under the shade of his roof,"
referring to the Taheb.

Abisha now brings into focus the full implication of the two worlds. Marqah had made reference to the "unseen" and "seen" (worlds) without, in any way suggesting any connection, even in a Platonic sense, it being understood that one was created for the angels and the other for mortals. Ab-Gelugah (12th cent.; C.p.75) appears to have moved forward tentatively when beseeching God, on behalf of

himself, to

"Have compassion on me in both worlds."

It is only when the value of the individual is stressed, at the expense of the Corporate Personality of the nation, that a doctrine of the Resurrection tends to develop.

Both the Jewish and Christian Churches afford evidence of this in their teaching. The Sam. never seem entirely to get rid of the concept of Corporate Personality. God is a god of the Nation, or of many people rather than a God of one.

Ab-Gelugah in thinking about himself in the singular, and not as one of a group, finds himself thinking in terms of "both worlds." Abisha is able in faith to make the next step forward, of seeing the possibility of himself moving from one world (The seen) to another (The unseen).

Abisha now begins to think of a Day of Vengeance, in which fire is to play a prominent part. An analysis of this hymn of Abisha shows that he has not deviated from a plan of writing very closely akin to the Book of Revelation.¹¹⁵ There is made evident for the first time, from a perusal of the different Sam. writers, the suggestion that there is to be a conflagration of the world at the end. This is a concept subscribed to by Christian, Jewish and Muslim writers.

The Day of Vengeance and Recompense is (C.p.499):-

"A day which is sealed,"

"A day which is pre-eminently great when the world will seem like a dream."

"After which comes a recollection of it,"

presumably by those who survive (i.e. This being Abisha's comment on "The first resurrection," (REV.XX.5).

He continues (C.p.502; cf. REV.XX.12)

"You will only realize what you have been about after the day of your death, (Not till the day of your end, till the day when you stand before your Lord, when your evil-doing will be laid bare."

While Abisha keeps to the fore a public arraignment, when saying:-

"For you are a stubborn people, rebellious ever since the day of your birth,"

he also specifies a judgement (C.p.503):-

"But he who does not abide in or by them (i.e. "These commandments") will be for a day which is appointed." 116

In the 2nd hymn (C.p.504) Abisha pursues the subject further and adds (C.p.507):-

"My Lord illumine my mind and fill me with Thy loving kindness, so that I may return to Thy hand, and accept me, In the great day of Judgement, my Lord."

In Stanza Teth (C.p.509) Abisha appears to be in a contemplative mood about the two worlds, for he queries:-

"What is the life and the good?
Finish it and pass on!
Life is the second world - The Day of Vengeance
which you will recognize;
And the good is the first world - your world
until the hereafter."

By which token he suggests that the world is good, for God created it¹¹⁷, and that life (everlasting?) is to be found in the second world.¹¹⁸

It is noticed that Abisha parallels the Day of Atonement with the Day of Vengeance, for he writes:-

"And for the reviving of us, like this day, is the Day of Vengeance, and what follows it."

This is some indication of what a momentous day Yom Ha-Kippur was to the Sam. as also it was to the Jew. One day would help to deepen the impression of the other, and vice versa. Both days would, to those who fulfilled the Law, be Days of Atonement. He continues in the case of those whom God judges and condemns:-

"What will he destroy if not their soul and their body?"

It is to be noted that the spirit is not included in this destruction. Perhaps Abisha holds to the point of view of Ecclesiastes¹¹⁹:-

"And the spirit shall return to God, who gave it."

The third hymn of Abisha (C.p.511) in the Atonement Hymnal gives a full picture of Sam. Eschatology. Abisha gives free rein to his eloquence, and introduces features not before mentioned.

He refers to:-

"The glories of the Day of Vengeance."

"It resembles this day, which is the day
of the Fast."

Abisha is now fully aware of two spheres of influence
(C.p.512) for he adds:-

"Let us place our trust in God,
King both above and below."

Yet while for him God is king, he never conceives of the
Kingdom of God or Kingdom of Heaven.

Abisha now refers to the "Final Day" (C.p.513), and
that (C.p.515):-

"The earth and its generation will be
destroyed as in the flood (of Noah)."

The realm of Nature will be greatly disturbed.

"The sun's light will be paled every
beginning of the month, and the moon
and the stars will not shine. Everything
that stands still will be overturned -
valleys and mountains - by the shaking
caused by the day of vengeance in its
radiance and glory." 120

R. McL. Wilson¹²¹ states that the Valentinians believed
that fire would "eventually consume all matter, and itself
be consumed, to exist no more." The Stoics¹²² called this
conflagration Expurosis.

Pfeiffer¹²³ referring to Book IV of the Sibylline
Oracles mentions the final judgement together with the
destruction of the world by fire, and the resurrection;
which is the more significant in that Book III of the
Oracles describes the initial success and final ruin of

Beliar "from the stock of Sebaste (i.e. Samaria)." The Sam. also refer to Belial as the personification of evil. Belial is also found in the D.S.S.. "Belial, or Satan, is the evil spirit, the angel of darkness, the Commander of the Army of evil."¹²⁴

Abisha continues:-

"All places will be shaken which contain the dead where they are buried."

(C.p.516) "The ground will be rent and from it will come forth spirits."

This indicates that sometimes Abisha is very logical and consistent, for he has already declared that God will destroy "their soul and their body." This does not mean that he upholds a trichotomy. When the Sam. writers speak of the soul it is often in the sense of the active principle of life.

For his next observation Abisha goes back to Deut. (xxxii). He says:-

"To-day I will make my arrows drunk with the blood of the slain, and the captives, and all the abyss."

He makes specific mention of Sheol (Abyss), (C.p.516).

Sheol does not figure prominently in Sam. literature. In the Defter no mention is made of Sheol; no reference to what happens in the hereafter. Yet Sheol does occur in the Pentateuch.¹²⁵ Abisha refers to Sheol on at least two occasions (C.pp.106 and 516). One would imagine that the

Sam. Burial Service¹²⁶ would make some reference to the hereafter. Sheol is not mentioned but Abaddon occurs.¹²⁷ The Book of Revelation¹²⁸ speaking of Abaddon says:-

"They have a king over them the angel of the bottomless pit; his name in Hebrew is Abaddon, and in the Greek he is called Apollyon (The Destroyer)."

The word Abyss began to be used quite a lot in the 2nd cent. especially as it formed part of the Gnostic system of Valentinius. That Abyss came to be known with the end of things, may be due to the fact that it was associated by people like the Gnostics with the beginning of creation. For the Gnostics, in the beginning was the "Abyss" and "Silence," (cf. the Sam. Mashtog (in MM) = the Silence before Creation), two aeons from which emanated the Pleroma. Actually the Greek Hades corresponds to the Sheol of the O.T., and is usually translated as Hell. Hades is placed in sharp antithesis with heaven. Kendrick Grobel¹²⁹ writes, in translating the Gospel:-

"And they are not wont to go down to AMENTE."

This Sahidic word literally means "The West," and is presumably used in reference to the opposite place of Paradise, which is usually placed in the East. AMENTE is the Egyptian name for the abode of the dead, and is usually substituted in Coptic biblical texts for Hades (Sheol).

On the Day of Vengeance,

"The assembled angels will go forward one by one from the upright people, enquiring about one thing and another."

This comes very near to suggesting that the angels themselves, if not judges, are assessors. However there are those who make intercession for those on trial. The Pure Three (i.e. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) will say:-

"Deliver, O my Lord, our righteous children,"

and "Moses will pray for his people, pure Israel,"

while "Aaron and his sons will make atonement."

Then will occur the crisis and segregation (C.p.516) for Abisha writes:-

"Then will the people be divided into two sections."

"The innocent holy ones are to pass into the Garden of Eden."

"The guilty are to be burned at the fire."

Abisha is the first Sam. writer to be so forthright on this matter of separation. The only parallel instance in the O.T. is in Daniel.¹³⁰ There is an interesting rider to this situation for,

"Moses will pray for the guilty;
He will bring them out of affliction."

Whether they are to receive full re-instatement is doubtful for he says:-

"They will be like dust, and like earth, not knowing anyone of those entering the garden."

(cf. O.T. picture of Sheol).¹³¹

Abisha continues:-

"But as for those who pass into the Garden,"
he cannot explain adequately their

"abundant blessings."

The above appears to be the treatment of those who are
Israelites both good and evil. Then comes the remainder
for he writes:-

"All people and nations, when they rise from
the tombs will be naked, their spirits evil-
savouring."

They are called

"Ethiopians,"

and "their appearance evil to behold."

As the people arise from the tombs naked there is
specific evidence here of a Resurrection of the body. They
are called Ethiopians because their bodies have become
black.¹³² It is likely that among other experiences
Abisha remembered the Black Death (1348) and similar sporadic
appearances of it in later years (1360). Those with the
plague became swollen and cyanosed. On death the body
becomes ebony-like (Ethiopians?). It is suggested that
when the 14th cent. writers make allusion to "the plague,"
that it was the Black Death they had in mind. A feature of
the disease was the pyrexia or burning. Such people would
cry out for water and cool air. In a hot climate like
Samaria it would be "hell on earth." Abisha in his hymn

mentions Sheol (C.p.516) and the Garden of Eden (C.p.512). The Jews had believed in Sheol from earliest times. This was especially so, for the Jew always preferred the social aspect to that of the individual. So long as Corporate Personality persisted as a concept, there was little or no room for a doctrine of the Resurrection. There was no need for one as the individual lived on in the race. So Sheol continued to be regarded from a social point of view. But "The greater the conception of God grew, the more did the concept of Sheol become modified."¹³³ In the O.T. Psalm cxxxix.8 indicates the evolution of the Sheol doctrine:-

"If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there:
If I make my bed in Sheol, Behold Thou art
there."

Abisha mentions Sheol, for the conflagration is to reach to Sheol and the foundations of the mountains.¹³⁴ The destruction of the world by fire is found in the N.T. only in the Epistle of II Peter (iii.7,10,12).

Yet, Abisha continues (C.p.516):-

"The Lord our God is one Lord - through the
burning of the excessive fire."

He is able now not only to continue to think of God as One, but to see the real significance of the destiny of each individual person. He is now able to say:-

"Let us again go forth, walking to my grace.
My soul will not be void, and my Lord will
forgive my iniquities." (My emphasis).

However he seems to be convinced that only Israel
(i.e. the Sam.) will survive the judgement and that they
will be localized in the Garden, for he writes:-

"Blessed are they who keep His Book,
Blessed are they who love Moses to
whom the Lord drew near. These are
the chosen ones, and these are His
select - apart from all the peoples
in the land and round about. They will
dwell in the midst of the Garden of Eden
after they pass into it."
(C.p.517).

Those who "keep His Book" are, of course, the Shomerim or
Sam..

In an attenuated form of the Sam. Creed (C.p.490)
Abdullah b. Solomon ends with the words:-

"And in the Day of Vengeance and Recompense;
And in the hour which flees the spirit from
this body from this world to the next."

Abdullah identifies himself with the ancient Creed (C.p.3)
in that the Day of Vengeance and Recompense is not
associated directly with the Taheb. Indeed in the Sam.
Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy¹³⁵ Abdullah does not mention the Taheb
at all. He conforms to the 14th cent. acceptance of two
worlds: of moving from this world to the next. He also
states a belief in which the spirit flees from the body,
soul and spirit, whereas the 4th cent. Sam. writers spoke
chiefly of body and soul. With Abdullah it is the spirit

which flees from the body, a statement which recalls Ecclesiastes (xii.7):-

"And the spirit shall return to God
who gave it."

If he actually believes that the spirit does flee from the body, then Abdullah is being influenced by those who uphold the Soma - Sema (The body a tomb) teaching once propounded by a Gnostic sect called the Ophites. Pfeiffer¹³⁶ (op.cit. p.131 f) mentions; the Ophites were those who furnished that exact information on life after death of which echoes come down to modern times. They considered the body as a tomb of the soul (Soma-Sema). After death the Ophic initiates, having been purified, enjoyed immortality; the wicked went to a horrible hell. The Persian Jallaladdin (c.1207-1273) in the Masnavi speaks of that which "steals away our souls from the prison-house of earth"¹³⁷ He also asks the question¹³⁸:-

"With what object are souls imprisoned in
the bonds of flesh and blood?"

Another Persian poet Omar Khayyam (c.1071-1123) in his Rubaiyat¹³⁹ upholds the antithetical doctrine of flesh versus spirit. Jami, a Suf poet of Persia, composed a poem called Salaman and Absal.¹⁴⁰ The poem has to do with the union of Salaman (soul) with Absal (body). It would seem that in the Near Middle East in the 13th-14th cent. the problem of body and soul (spirit) occupied the minds of

poets and theologians. If Abdullah believed that the spirit actually flees from the body, then he accepted the antithesis of these two.¹⁴¹ The Day of Vengeance has not for its chief object punishment of Israel's enemies only. The Day of Vengeance is conceived by Abdullah, to denote the occasion when the spirit flees from the body from this world to the next. He does not specify anybody. It can refer either to the Sam. or to their enemies.

Although Abdullah's hymn (C.p.213) deals mainly with God, His attributes and His relationship to Man, it is because of this relationship that we find in this hymn a descant that has for its motif "The Day of Vengeance." God is to continue to exist even after the Day of Vengeance, a concept that has persisted in Sam. belief, and was evident even in the 4th cent. Abdullah asks who will save him,

"From the vengeance of my Lord?"

and, "Who will have pity on me from the outpouring of flame?"¹⁴²

Abdullah is emphasizing a personal and individual judgement. The concept of Corporate Personality has slipped into the background. As he has already made mention of "flaming fire," it would appear that he subscribes to the concept of the world being destroyed by fire. He is afraid of what will happen to him at the "Latter End." He continues:-

"Oh Saviour, save me for I have no salvation beside Thee,"

and, "Oh Saviour, save me on the Day of Vengeance, because of his prayer (i.e. Moses)."

He writes:-

"In His vengeance, He will fight, and in His fight, will fire consume."

He also announces that:-

"He will judge on the Day of Vengeance, the angels will be witnesses."

There is no suggestion here of angels being judges, or of an angel that destroys. God judges, and God will destroy with fire.

Edmund Sutcliffe¹⁴³ makes reference to the Resurrection and The Final Judgement. He quotes the Habakkuk Commentary (V.4 f.) as saying:-

"God will place the judgement of all nations in the hands of the elect."

In the N.T. Jesus Christ¹⁴⁴ says:-

"You who have followed me will sit also on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

St. Paul¹⁴⁵ asks:-

"Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?"

Also¹⁴⁶:-

"Do you not know that we are to judge angels?"

Generally speaking there is a marked preference by Sam. writers particularly those of the 14th cent. to use the

expression The Day of Vengeance¹⁴⁷ rather than the full formula The Day of Vengeance and Recompense. In the Liturgies of Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread¹⁴⁸ the 14th cent. writers do not refer to The Day of Vengeance and Recompense. The Day of Vengeance is not mentioned by Ben Manir. Abisha b. Phinehas refers to it twice (C.p.243 and p.240). Abdullah on the other hand alludes to it five times (C.p.213 (four times) and C.p.238).

In the Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy¹⁴⁹ the picture is slightly different with regard to the 14th cent. writers. The Day of Vengeance is again not mentioned by Ben Manir. Abisha mentions it eleven times (C.pp.509-517), and The Day of Vengeance and Recompense twice (C.pp.449 and 501). Abdullah b. Solomon alludes to the Day of Vengeance three times (C.pp.490,667,668), and the Day of Vengeance and Recompense once (C.p.490).

In the Defter¹⁵⁰ the Day of Vengeance and Recompense occurs anonymously three times (C.p.3 (twice) and C.p.208). Marqah once refers to the Day of Vengeance (C.p.21). The expression, The Day of Vengeance predominates in M.M..¹⁵¹

The Liturgy of the Feast of Weeks¹⁵² shows that the Day of Vengeance is mentioned by Ben Manir (C.p.385); Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.379), and Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.373).

As the Sam. Burial Service Liturgy¹⁵³ is later than the 14th cent. the three Sam. writers under discussion make no

contribution.

The New Year Liturgy¹⁵⁴ shows that the only 14th cent. writer to refer to the Day of Vengeance is Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.464).

The three writers do not refer either to the Day of Vengeance, or the Day of Vengeance and Recompense in the Sam. Liturgies for the Zimmut Pesah and Zimmut Sukkot.¹⁵⁵

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.748) refers to the Day of Vengeance in the Feast of Tabernacles.¹⁵⁶

The Sam. therefore, in the main, accept the shortened form of The Day of Vengeance; to that extent keeping in line with the view expressed in the Dead Sea Scrolls¹⁵⁷ for in the Manual of Discipline (ix.23-4) reference is made to The Day of Vengeance. T.H.Gaster¹⁵⁸ refers to it as The Day of Requital, pointing out that it is derived from Deut.xxxii.35 as found in the Greek and Sam. Recensions, and that it is the standard term for "Doomsday" among the Sam.. Sutcliffe¹⁵⁹ points out that Eschatology plays a prominent part in the Qumran Community.

Maimonides¹⁶⁰ (1135-1204) stresses the fact that Vengeance (Retribution) was a fundamental concept in Judaism. On the other hand Crescas¹⁶¹ (1340-1410) treats Retribution as a "mere belief" since the highest ideal of Judaism is to serve God without hope of reward. The concept of The Day of Vengeance by the time of the 14th

cent. was widely accepted by different religious sects, and the Sam. are but sharing in an ideological background that influenced many, generally speaking.

The question may be posited, what effect did The Day of Vengeance have on the minds of the Sam.? The Sam. believed in a Theodicy, and when the Day of Vengeance comes God will judge. With this day in mind the Sam. must obey the Law¹⁶². The basis of belief in this day is found in Deut.xxxii.35. Bowman¹⁶³ points out that, at the earliest stage the Day of Vengeance implied merely a temporal deliverance of the Sam. from their enemies, and a renewal of God's Favour here and now. "At a later stage the Day of Vengeance and Recompense is removed to the end of time, as if the Sam. had given up hope of deliverance in this world, and it now becomes the name for the Day of Judgement." He adds that, "It is, of course possible, that both aspects were held contemporaneously."

Montgomery¹⁶⁴ states:-

"Closely associated with the early Sam. doctrine of the Day of Vengeance and Recompense is the Doctrine of the Taheb."

This statement is difficult to sustain from the early evidence as found in the Defter. The Day of Vengeance and Recompense, in the Defter, is found in Cowley (page 3); The Day of Vengeance (C.pp.4,12,84 (three times), while the Taheb occurs four times (C.pp.4,42,45,56). In the Prayer

of Joshua (C.p.4) the Taheb is mentioned but no Day of Vengeance. The Day of Vengeance, and the Taheb, in the Defter do not appear to be associated. M.M.¹⁶⁵ however, associates the Taheb with the Day of Vengeance.

With regard to the Day of Vengeance, Moses is acquainted with its secrets (C.p.244). The merit of the fathers is to deliver people on that day (C.p.243). It is stated that the glory of God endures both on and after that day (C.p.213). The records of man's deeds are stored away in "His storehouse till the Day of Vengeance" (C.p.233). And generally 14th cent. teaching in Sam. circles emphasizes that good deeds are rewarded by rest in the Garden of Eden, and evil deeds by the burning fire. The 14th cent. Sam. writers intimate that it is a time of individual as well as communal retribution and vindication.

The Sam. Creed (C.p.3)¹⁶⁶ expresses a belief in five cardinal tenets; in God, Moses, The Torah, Mount Gerizim and the Day of Vengeance and Recompense. With the passage of time there is a psychological tendency to bring these tenets into close association. Moses is brought very close to God; The Torah is even called Everlasting Life, a title Marqah¹⁶⁷ reserved for God. Mount Gerizim is to be the mount of the Divine Presence. It is on the Day of Vengeance that God is to be judge; the Torah is to be the criterion or standard of judgement; while Mount Gerizim is

to be the place of rest for the redeemed. There will be found the Garden of Eden. But what of Moses? He is associated with God, with the Torah, but what is his position in regard to the Day of Vengeance? Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.379) says of Moses:-

"Thy Lord shall teach thee the secrets of the world from before the beginning until after the Day of Vengeance."

As the pre-existence of Moses seems to be postulated by the 14th cent. writers, the association of Moses with the Day of Vengeance would almost appear to be axiomatic. It therefore occasions no surprise when Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.373) writes of Moses:-

"He shall be set apart in the Day of Vengeance, That he may deliver from disfavour, That he may give thee salvation."

He appears now to occupy a position not unlike that of Jesus Christ. Indeed Moses, according to Abisha (C.p.379) is to

"be exalted above all Mankind"

and to sit "upon the throne."

Moses, according to Abdullah (C.p.375):-

"May deliver from disfavour,"

a function which 14th cent. Sam. writers now come to associate with the advent of the Taheb. It is almost suggested on occasion that Moses may be the Taheb. The conclusion to be drawn from the premises in M.M.¹⁶⁸ is that Moses might be the Taheb. This knowledge is given in the

section called The Day of Vengeance. Moses is to have a specific status and function on the Day of Vengeance; of that there can be little doubt. The evidence however does not warrant the suggestion that Moses is to be associated with the Day of Vengeance, and the Taheb with that of Recompense. The evidence in the 14th cent. would give little support to that thesis.

It is safe to conclude that the Sam. theologumenon of the Day of Vengeance (and Recompense) is derived from the Jewish Day of Yahweh, which appears as early as Amos, and may never have been completely forgotten by the Northern Kingdom, to whose notice it was brought. The Israelites had assumed that the Day of Yahweh would be a day of judgement against other nations. Amos told the people that God would judge and punish the outside nations,¹⁶⁹ but he proceeds to include Judah¹⁷⁰ and Israel.¹⁷¹ Amos continues¹⁷²:-

"You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities."

and¹⁷³:-

"Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! wherefore would Ye have the day of the Lord? It is darkness and not light."

The Sam. however take their stand on Deut.,xxxii.35:-

"The Day of Vengeance and Recompense,"

with other nations chiefly in mind.

In N.T. times it came also to be described as the Day of Judgement.¹⁷⁴

Montgomery¹⁷⁵ points out that:-

"The Day of Vengeance and Recompense is the grand objective of the Samaritan philosophy of history which lies at the base of all the chronicles."

The Prophets of Israel shared with their predecessors and with their contemporaries the belief that there would be an end of things; that Yahweh was the Lord of the end of things.¹⁷⁶ The Legends of the Jews afford evidence that the concept of the Day of Judgement had, in no way, diminished in strength. The Resurrection was to take place on the Day of Judgement;¹⁷⁷ On the Day of Judgement there was to be reward and punishment¹⁷⁸; There is the suggestion that Israel shall be spared¹⁷⁹ (iii.47):-

"From the sufferings of the time of Gog and Magog, from the travails of the Messianic time, and from the day of the great Judgement."

Islam also has a Day of Judgement, which undoubtedly is derived from Judaism, and gives it an interpretation only slightly different from that of the Jews, Sam. and Christians. The Muslims however, make the Day of Judgement an article of faith¹⁸⁰, and, by so doing bear comparison with the Sam. who believe

"In the Day of Vengeance and Recompense," (C.p.3) as an article of faith.

The Quran attempts to give the length of the Day of

Judgement as of a thousand years or of fifty thousand years.¹⁸¹ On this day not only Mankind but also the genii and irrational animals will be judged. The angels will have the task of assembling men into ranks, and bringing them to order. When God judges men, Muhammad will undertake the office of intercessor after it has been declined by Adam, Noah, Abraham and Jesus. The Sam. cite Moses as intercessor while the Christians speak of Jesus Christ as mediator and advocate. Muhammad however affirms that seventy thousand of his followers will enter Paradise without a judgement.¹⁸² The Muslims lay stress on the balance or scales, whereby the deeds of men shall be weighed and judged. This is not an exclusive Muslim concept for the Book of Daniel¹⁸³ refers to the kingdom of Belshazzar, and that

"You have been weighed in the balances and found wanting."

This concept however is developed in the Quran. The unique Muslim feature is that^{183B}:-

"every creature will take vengeance one of another."

The Sam., Jews and Christians leave vengeance in the hands of God.¹⁸⁴ The good will enter Paradise, while the evil ones will enter hell. Of the Sam. writers the eschatology of Abisha b. Phinehas comes nearest to Islam in this respect. For the Muslims¹⁸⁵ hell is divided into seven

stories; one for wicked Muslims; one for Jews; one for Christians; one for Sabians (Samaritans?); one for Magians; one for idolators, and the seventh for hypocrites. The nineteen angels¹⁸⁶ will watch them all. Sale¹⁸⁷ states that for the concept of Hell Mohammed was probably indebted to the Jews, and in some measure to the Magians, "both of whom agree in making seven distinct apartments in hell." The Hilukh, a late Sam. writing envisages Hell as containing seven stages or degrees. These stages are Sheol, Abbadon, Beer Shanar, Tit Hayaven, Shaare Manet, Sal Manet and Gehinnon. Tisdall¹⁸⁸ says that Mohammed tends to follow Jewish Legends rather than the legitimate history in the O.T. The Hindus say that beneath the surface of the earth are seven lower stages, while above it are seven higher storeys. In the Avesta the Persians refer to the earth as consisting of seven KARSHVARES or great regions. It would seem therefore that these different religious traditions have a somewhat similar, if not identical, background. It is likely that the Sam. are closer to the Jews than to the Muslims from the point of tradition and inclination.

While the Sam. of the 14th cent. vascillate between a belief of a Paradise on earth, and a Paradise in heaven, the Muslims say that Paradise is above the seven heavens. While the Jews and Sam. lay stress on the holiness of God's kingdom, and the moral side of Paradise, the Muslims

emphasize the sensual aspect of the case. In a way the Muslims are consistent, if they believe in the resurrection of the flesh, or of the body. The Sam. however are just as consistent for they never forget the holiness of God, and of His moral requirement, fully exemplified in the Law, and as demonstrated, and taught by Moses. While Muhammad, and the Sam. are indebted to Judaism for the concept of Paradise in a number of aspects, he, by introducing the sensual side, has deviated towards the opinion held by the Persian Magi. It is not improbable that he also had taken note of the Christian accounts of the felicity of the good in the next life.¹⁸⁹

The 14th cent. saw the Sam. concept of the Day of Vengeance and Recompense as exemplified in particular by Abisha b. Phinehas, approximate in broad lines, but not in detail, to the concept as held by the Jews, Christians and Muslims.

4. THE TAHEB

One of the three hymns of Abisha b. Phinehas in the Atonement Hymnal¹⁹⁰ has a very important place in Sam. eschatology, and is referred to as the Shirah Yetimah. M. Gaster¹⁹¹ draws specific reference to this hymn. In a manner recalling to mind the writer¹⁹² of the Revelation to John, Abisha informs his readers (C.p.512) that he has had

a dream, and that he is commanded by Moses to expound it: As Abisha insists that he is commanded by Moses to reveal the import of his dream, implying thereby that he is in the true line of descent from the prophet Moses. His dream deals specifically with the Taheb (C.p.512):-

"Who will arise with joy at the end of time."

Abisha says that he is now to tell them about "The Taheb and His Rule." A comparison of Abisha, with other references to the Taheb, up to and including the 14th cent. is given below.

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>THE TAHEB</u> <u>AUTHOR</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>times</u>	<u>COWLEY</u> <u>(Page)</u>
DEFTER		4	
Durrán			42, 45
Prayer of			
Joshua			4.
Anonymous			56.
MEMAR MARQAH.			
Book I		5	
II		1	
III		1	
IV		6	
V		0	
VI		0	
FEAST OF WEEKS	Abdullah b.Solomon	2	384, 425
	Eleazar b.Phinehas	1	318
	Phinehas	1	347
Anonymous		1	419
DAY OF ATONEMENT	Abisha b.Phinehas	11	511-519
BURIAL SERVICE	-	-	-
PASSOVER	Mattanah Ha-Mizri	1	265

THE TAHEB (Cont'd)

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AUTHOR</u>	<u>No. of times</u>	<u>COWLEY (Page)</u>
NEW YEAR	-	-	-
FEAST OF TABERNACLES	-	-	-
ZIMMUT PESAH AND ZIMMUT SUKKOT	-	-	-

It would appear therefore that in the 14th cent. the doctrine of the Taheb was a province of the Sam. theology left to Abisha to develop.

The birth of the Taheb was in peace, "when his light dawned in heaven and earth, and his star in the midst of the heavens of heavens." It has also been suggested that when Jesus Christ was born the Pax Romana was most evident. In both respects a star¹⁹³ played its part. The Sam. believe that the coming of the Taheb will fulfil the prophecy in Num.(xxiv.17):-

"There shall come forth a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel."

"And when this Taheb grew up his purity became manifest."¹⁹⁴

Macdonald¹⁹⁵ draws the reader's attention to the fact that "the author now sets out his story partly as though the events had taken place - a typical Sam. practice in the eschatological literature."

Or as the grammarian would have it, they make use of the "historic present."

It would appear that there is to be "a continuous kingdom until the final day." The enemy will say:- "How good are your tents, O Taheb!" and "How great is his presence!" "He will rule over eleven nations who are mentioned in his laws." Thomson¹⁹⁷ states that:- "there are many references to the coming of one who should restore unity to Israel and subdue 'seven nations'; the reference of the latter statement being to the 'seven nations' whom Joshua subdued." There is no doubt but that by the 14th cent. Joshua comes into greater prominence in the hymns and prayers of Sam. writers. It may be that it is but coincidence that this prominence occurs at the same time as that of the Taheb. Thomson¹⁹⁸ states that:-

"A Christian writer, EULOGIUS, says that the Samaritans expect a reappearance of Joshua; that also remains unconfirmed from Samaritan sources."

Eulogius (c.415) was Bishop of Caesaria, and was associated with holding a Synod at Diospolis (Lydda) to consider the Pelagian controversy¹⁹⁹.

Joshua is not over-emphasized in the Defter, being normally associated with Caleb (C.p.77). However there is an important prayer in the Defter called "The Prayer of Joshua" (C.p.4). Cowley²⁰⁰ indicates that with regard to anonymous compositions in the Defter such as the prayer of Joshua, there is no evidence to determine its date. He

indicates that they were composed some time before the date of N²⁰¹ (1258) and V3²⁰² (14th cent?). In the prayer of Joshua (C.p.4) mention is made of Moses, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; these being followed by mention of the Taheb. Here again it may be but coincidence that of the four occasions the mention of the Taheb is found in the Defter (C.pp.4,42,45,56) one of them should be in the Prayer of Joshua!

In the Pentecostal Series²⁰³ there are Midrashim based on the story of Joshua fighting the Amalekites. Aaron b. Manir uses the theme three times (C.pp.322,323,327), and Eleazar b. Phinehas (C.p.329) handles the same theme, thereby indicating that 14th cent. writers were now giving more consideration to Joshua. M. Gaster²⁰⁴ states that ancient chronicles were "translated and paraphrased into Arabic at some time in the 12th or 13th cent," and that "all the subsequent Samaritan chronicles in Arabic begin with this paraphrase called the Book of Joshua."

Abisha continuing the hymn (C.p.512) writes:-

"They will come and believe in him
(i.e. The Taheb) and in Moses and his
law."

This means that Abisha does not believe that the Taheb is a Moses Redivivus.

It appears also that "the nations and the uncircumcised" are to "come under the shade of his roof." The inference is

that the Taheb is to rule over the nations as a king. Indeed Abisha has already said that there is to be "a continuous kingdom until the final day." There is no special significance in this title, for "Kingship had not such a hold on the Israelites of the North as it had among the Jews.²⁰⁵ The Sam. believed in a theocracy, for God was their king. The Defter refers to God as:-

1. "King of all the world" (C.p.72)
2. "King of all kings" (C.p.70)
3. "King of our spirits" (C.p.30)
4. "King who feedeth" (C.p.44)

In spite of the possibility that "the nations and the uncircumcised" desire to come under the rule of the Taheb, he still has a preference for his own people, for he says:-

"Blessed are Israel and its descendants -
there is no other people like it! "

Abisha again refers (C.p.514)

"To the mention of Moses and the chosen
Taheb,"

thereby suggesting that he has two different people in mind. Indeed there appears to be here a very close affinity between Moses²⁰⁶ and the Taheb which cannot be readily resolved. It may be because of Abisha's intention to be abstruse. Or again it may be that economy in the use of words has led to ambiguity. Is there an implied suggestion here of the "Two Messiahs"?

Sutcliffe²⁰⁷ translates the Damascus Fragments (xiv.19)

and refers to

"The Messiah of Aaron and Israel, and
he will make atonement for their iniquity,"

suggesting that this means one Messiah. T.H.Gaster, in conversation, stated that two Messiahs are implied. He thinks that this is what is meant in the Dead Sea Scrolls.²⁰⁸ At least Dr. Gaster has history on his side. There was Moses and the High Priest Aaron; Solomon and Zadok; Zerubbabel and Joshua. The coins of Israel, prior to the uprising (133-135) had the designation of Bar Cochba as "Prince of Israel" and Eleazar the High Priest. Does Abisha conceive of Moses and the Taheb (Joshua?) as the two Messias of Aaron and Israel? Of one who has the priestly function and the other as kingly? Dr. Gaster, in conversation, said that the idea of two Messiahs had nothing to do with the Gnostic Pleroma of God. He said that in the 1st cent. those who held to the concept of two Messiahs held that they would be earthly; sacerdotal and political. That they were mortals and would die. They were to function during that chaos which would lead to God's reign. There will be wars. The Kingly Messiah will lead the forces into battle and achieve victory. He is not a divine figure. He is really the second of the forerunners who were expected. In the 1st cent. John the Baptist was held to be a forerunner preparing the way.²⁰⁹

Does Abisha conceive of the Taheb as one exercising the prophetic function of Moses, for he writes:-

"All this for the sake of Moses, for his prophethood is a mighty thing, and the Taheb is his prophetic function."

Or does he imply that the Taheb was Moses?²¹⁰ Abisha then quotes Deut.xviii.18, implying thereby that the Taheb is the prophet that was to come. This is also one of the proof texts of the Messianic Era quoted by the Dead Sea Sect.²¹¹ This prophet, Abisha says, will "judge very righteously, not with anger or wrath. He will not again sin,²¹² or be angry or do wickedly."

In Stanza Zain (C.p.515) Abisha completes the picture of the Taheb as he sees it, he writes:-

"I have mentioned nothing else, (e.g.) what will be done after him, after his death in peace when he will enter the grave, and be gathered to his people, and be buried in safe keeping,"

with Joseph and with Joshua.

"The Star, the Taheb, who made his light to shine, shall never be moved from above his grave."

That the Taheb was "gathered to his people," is in the strict tradition of the Pentateuch, and might well be a survival idiom from the ancient rite of Ancestor Worship.²¹³

That is the completed impression which Abisha has of the Taheb. He has made a more complete definition of the Taheb than was found in the Defter. He mentions the Taheb

eleven times in one hymn (C.pp.511-519) as against the mention of him four times in the whole of the Defter. The Defter states that the world will be happy when the Taheb comes and brings peace. Those who dwell in God's Favour will be protected (C.p.42). There are no personal data; only what he does for Israel. Abisha now brings the picture of the Taheb into clearer focus.

Abdullah b. Solomon (C.p.384) in his reference to the Taheb, expresses the optative statement:-

"May we stand on Mount Gerizim," making allusions to the era of a hundred years, when all enemies shall be subdued, and there shall be gladness, and glory and rejoicing.

He concludes:-

"Blessed is he (i.e. The Taheb), who brings peace upon us, who pass over into the Garden of Eden."

In this instance the Garden of Eden is localized on Mount Gerizim, the holiest of the Mountains. Abdullah associates the Taheb with the return of full splendour of Mount Gerizim in the days of Favour, which are to come. The era of a hundred years will call for consideration later.

In the Liturgy of the Feast of Tabernacles the Taheb is not mentioned by any of the 14th cent. writers. There are actually three references to the Taheb but by later writers. However it is of some interest to discover that their picture

of the Taheb does not vary. Muslim (Meshalmah) b. Murjan (1727: C.p.745) prays that:-

"He (i.e. God) will raise up the Taheb
in three days,"

and recalls a phrase used by Jesus Christ in the Johannine Gospel²¹⁴:-

"I will raise him (it) up at the
last day."

Muslim b. Murjan hopes that when the Taheb comes, the tongue of the Hebrews will prevail over that of the Arabs. In spite of the renaissance of Hebrew in the 14th cent. for liturgical purposes, Arabic continued to be the prevailing medium of expression in the Near Middle East. As this writer was aware of the diminishing numbers of the Sam. people - "May He increase your numbers" (C.p.733) - he must have conceived of a Taheb, who would predominate locally, and that the conflict would be one of, in one aspect, the Hebrew tongue versus that of the Arab.

Solomon b. Ghazal (1857: C.p.767) alludes to the Taheb in a personal manner:-

"Raise up the Taheb for me; Raise
confusion from upon me."

In this sense he conceives of the Taheb as a personal saviour.

The picture of the Taheb by an unknown author (C.p.770) is much clearer. His reign is to coincide with the optative statement of the "hundred years." The focal point is to be "the top of Mount Gerizim." There is to be the restoration

of "The Tabernacle." The writer also mentions the "Favour" of the Taheb. It seems therefore that the return of God's "Favour" is to coincide with the raising up of the Taheb. But there is a marked development of thought beyond that of the 14th cent. for the Taheb is not only a "preserver" of life, but he also forgives sin.

"May he forgive the sin and iniquity of every one of you."

"And may he forgive hundreds of the great ones, and hundreds of the priests, and a hundred of all the congregation of Israel."

"A hundred of all the congregation," once again raises the question as to whether the word "hundred" means the word "dead," as the Aramaic word is the same for both. One can hardly imagine only a hundred of the congregation being forgiven. Normally in the eyes of the 14th cent. Sam. writers the Taheb is held to be a "Restorer" or "Returning One" ; now he is to be a redeemer and forgive sins. This is a new concept; of one whose presence coincides with "his favour," and who forgives sin.

Dr. Lerner²¹⁵ writes:-

"The paucity of references to the Day of Vengeance is somewhat offset by the more frequent allusions to the associated Messianic idea of the Taheb, and the anticipated restoration of the days of favour which shall follow the current Panuthah."

On what grounds does Dr. Lerner base his assumptions? The evidence as found in his Thesis is analyzed as follows:-

	<u>14th cent. writers.</u>	<u>Post-14th cent. writers.</u>
	<u>Times mentioned</u>	<u>Times mentioned</u>
Taheb	1	5
Day of Vengeance	7	1
Day of Vengeance and Recompense	1 in Creed (Anon)	1
The Vengeance	2	

Times the Taheb is mentioned - 6.

Times the Day of Vengeance is mentioned - 8.

The only 14th cent. writer to mention the Taheb, in this work, is Mattanah Ha-Mizri (C.p.265).

"In thy goodness may there be Taheb,
and may this be thy bidding."

An examination of the Liturgical works as shown in the Analysis reveals that the Taheb is mentioned 35 times, and the Day of Vengeance (sic) 51 times. All allusions to "The Day" described in various ways total 82 times. This does not include M.M.

A general survey of these works of the relation of the Taheb to the Day of Vengeance suggests that there are more references to the Day of Vengeance than to the Taheb, and that the Taheb is not specifically connected with that day.

There is a tendency however for later writers to connect the Taheb with the restoration of the Sanctuary on Mount Gerizim. M.M.²¹⁶ also associates the Taheb with the Day of Vengeance.

As to whom the Taheb might be Dr. R.M.Grant²¹⁷ makes the following observation:-

"Could it be that Simon (Magus) was more closely related to the Samaritan religion than Luke, who regards Samaria as a Christian mission field, wants to admit? Could it be that he was regarded as the Taheb or 'restorer' of the Samaritans?"

Dr. Frank G. Slaughter²¹⁸ looks upon Simon Magus as the Sam. "Messiah" or Taheb. He says that Simon tells the people of Samaria that he will produce the sacred vessels of the Temple hidden on Mount Gerizim²¹⁹. The sacred vessels of Moses had been brought there and hidden by Joshua.²²⁰

In the Feast of Weeks²²¹ the coming of the Taheb (C.p.384) is associated with the era of gladness, glory and rejoicing designated as the "hundred years." Mention will be made of again of the period of a "hundred years," which began to figure prominently from the 14th cent. onwards. The hundred years cannot really coincide with the full period of restoration brought about by the Taheb as he only lived for 110 years, and it is hard to imagine that a boy of 10 years would remove all his enemies and bring peace. This latter view, however, cannot be entirely disregarded.

He is referred to as "The prophet" (C.p.425) and is to see the holy habitation set upon the holiest of the mountains.

Eleazar b. Phinehas (14th cent.; C.p.318) refers to

the "God of the Taheb," and then adds:-

"May the light return, and mayest thou
be glorified and exalted."

Could this be an allusion to Moses, who in this Liturgy is referred to as "The Light" (C.p.318; also 311,314)? If Moses is alluded to here, then Moses could either be the Taheb, or else exist cojointly with the Taheb, which would indicate a situation not unlike that of "The two Messias of Aaron and Israel."

In the days of the Taheb (C.p.340) the Shekhinah is to return with his "Favour" on Mount Gerizim. So that the advent of the Taheb is to coincide with the return of the era of Favour.

In the anonymous mention of the Taheb (C.p.419), he is to be associated with "the final days," preceding the Day of Vengeance.

It is hard to resist the conclusion that the "hundred years," preceding the final day, and during which the Taheb is to arise, has a parallel in the Book of Revelation (xx) when for a thousand years "the old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan,"²²² will be bound and shut up. Christ will reign for a thousand years²²³. Is the "hundred years" not comparable in expression and intention to that of the Christian Millennium? It seems possible. The Taheb is to inaugurate the "Messianic Era." Mowbray²²⁴ calls it the "Millennium." This word has not been met with in any thesis

whereas the hundred years is quite common from the 14th cent. onwards. The imperfectly defined Taheb is clearly not priestly, nor royal after the pattern of David. He is a prophet, and one like Moses (cf. Deut.xviii.18), and in Sam. Theology bears a resemblance to Ezekiel's NASI. In Sam. Theology Moses is actually referred to as NASI. Abdullah b, Solomon (C.p.373) refers to Moses as:-

"Prince of the princes of the human species."

Phinehas (C.p.378) calls Moses a prophet, a priest and a prince. With the end of God's Disfavour,

"Aaron and his sons will make atonement" (Abisha b.Phinehas; C.p.516); that is, the true (Zadokite) priesthood will offer atonement for Israel, and the Taheb will usher in a new age of Favour. This is parallel in thought to the Book of Revelation²²⁵ where it is recorded:-

"But they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him for a thousand years."

Bowman²²⁶ considers "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" of the Manual of Discipline (Dead Sea Scrolls) to be parallel to the Nasi of Ezekiel and his Zadokite Priests. And also to the Taheb of the Sam. and their Zadokite High-Priest. Priests were anointed, and could be called

"Messiahs of Aaron." Bowman adds that:-

"The Samaritan Taheb seems modelled on Ezekiel's Nasi but referred back to Moses rather than to a prince of David's stock."

The Johannine Gospel, perhaps the earliest piece of testamentary evidence, shows that the laity believed in a Messiah²²⁷. The Christian Church made rapid growth in Samaria, and this could not very well be so without accepting a belief in the Messiah. The Sam. woman went away into the city, and asked what must have been a question understood: "Can this be the Christ?"²²⁸ Yet the old Sam. Creed (C.p.3) does not mention the Taheb. Bowman²²⁹ states that neither the Taheb, nor the doctrine of the End are found in the 11th cent. writers Abul Hasan and Yusuf b. Salama.

J.M.Nutt²³⁰ points out that DOSTAI and Simon Magus contested the title of Messiah. He quotes Origen as saying that Dositheus made himself the Messiah, Son of God. This mention of one as "Son of God" is suspect in the light of orthodox Sam. teaching. Nutt²³¹ states that the Messiah, as the son of Joseph, was a home product.

Maimonides²³² mentions the obvious when he says that Moses lived 120 years, and Joshua lived 110 years. Thomson²³³ says that "the Taheb was to live 110 years, that is to say the age of Joshua - he was not to attain the age of Moses."

Incidentally also, Joseph lived until he was 110 years old.²³⁴ The Sam. Burial Service²³⁵ does not mention the Taheb at all, but mention is made of Joseph dying at 110 years

old. Moses' death is also alluded to (C.p.856). That the Taheb is not mentioned in the Sam. Burial Service confirms the belief that he was not a redeemer, but a conqueror, who was to give victory and peace to Israel in this world.

Thomson²³⁶ says that the Sam. declared Simon Magus to be "the mighty power of God." And continues:-

"This would imply not only that Simon claimed to be the Taheb, but that the Taheb according to his claim was a much loftier personage than one who was about to repeat in his own person the glories of Joshua."

M. Gaster²³⁷ states that in the ASATIR:-

"The ideas of the Taheb are very vague and embryonic."

The PITRON²³⁸ or Commentary on the Asatir, making reference to the Children of Moses, says:-

"And the Taheb will only arise from among them. And know that the cause of their being hidden away from the sight of the creatures, and their absence from the Children of Israel was only in consequence of the request of their father to the Lord God."

Assuming that the Commentary of the Asatir is as early as the 12th cent. it does not appear that Moses was looked upon as the coming Taheb. The Moses Redivivus myth probably developed later.

It is in the 14th cent. that a fuller description of the time of the Taheb and the signs of his advent are to be found, especially in the hymn or poem of Abisha b. Phinehas

(C. pp. 511-519).

In the early stages of the development of the doctrine of the Taheb, the Sam. held him to be a straightforward restorer. He was held to be a man with human qualities of a high nature, but not divine. In no way was he connected with moral and spiritual rehabilitation and salvation. He was never associated with the concept of resurrection. In some respects he is more akin to Joshua than to Moses. He is not connected with the principle of vicarious sacrifice, as the Messiah is with the Christians. He cannot be thought of in terms of Isaiah chapter 53. He does not enter at any time into conflict with the evil powers and elements.

M. Gaster²³⁹ gives a full picture of the Taheb according to Sam. Oral Law and Ancient Traditions, stating that the Taheb will die at the age of 120 years like Moses. It seems likely therefore, although this view is not expressed elsewhere, that there were two traditions in existence. The one tradition conceived of the Taheb, as being like Moses, and dying when 120 years old. The other tradition states that the Taheb when he dies will be 110 years old, the age of Joshua. In the 14th cent. interest was being shown in Joshua to a greater extent than before, an example of which is the Samaritan Book of Joshua, which Bowman,²⁴⁰ by the way, holds to be Dosithean. The Dosithean views

were held not to be orthodox. A discrepancy in the matter of the Taheb's age at death could be indicative of two schools of thought, one orthodox, the other heterodox. There was, in existence, a divergency of opinion, for Bowman²⁴¹ says that:-

"The Dosithean heretics were active among the Samaritans abroad, especially in Egypt."

The Sam. like the Jews, had a Diaspora, and if such a Diaspora is widely scattered, and loosely held, then dissident elements inevitably arise. One school could conceivably hold tenaciously to Moses, another school might take a more liberal view; some would hold to the Pentateuch; others would tend to rationalize and preserve a chronicle of history more legendary in character, hence the interest in Joshua, especially as it was he who led Israel into the Promised Land.

It would seem likely therefore that the doctrine of the Taheb received definition and substance in the 14th cent. especially at the hands of Abisha b. Phinehas. He had the intuition and poetical insight to give the Taheb a place in Sam. Theology which before had been rather nebulous. The evidence would suggest that he was not unaware of Christian beliefs. Indeed he leans more to Christianity than to Judaism or Islam in developing the picture of the Taheb. Abisha's hymn (C.pp.511-519) has so

many points in common with the Book of Revelation²⁴² that to exclude the latter from a critical examination of the ideological background of 14th cent. Samaritanism would be prejudicial to a true analysis of the situation. Indeed the New Testament seems to be the source from which Sam. writers may have derived ideas and suggestions, rather than the Old Testament or the Qur'an.

ANALYSIS OF

"THE TAHEB"

AND

"THE DAY"

THE DAY OF VENGEANCE AND TAHEB

<u>The Defter</u>	<u>4th cent.</u>	
Taheb	4	
Day of Vengeance	8	
Day of Vengeance & Recompense	3	
Day of Great Judgement	1	
Day of Judgement	1	
<u>Yom Ha-Kippour Liturgy</u>	<u>14th cent.</u>	<u>Post-14th cent.</u>
Taheb	11	1
Day of Vengeance	17	4
Day of Vengeance & Recompense	3	1
Day of Judgement		1
Day of Vengeance		1
<u>Feast of Ha-Succoth</u>		
Taheb		3
Day of Vengeance	2	
Thy Vengeance		1
Day of Retribution		1
<u>Liturgies for the Zimmut Pesah & Zimmut Sukkot</u>		
Taheb		1
<u>New Year Liturgy</u>		
Taheb		
Day of Vengeance	1	1
<u>Burial Service.</u>		
Taheb		
The Day		4
Day of Reckoning		1
The Reckoning		1
Day of Judgement		1
Day of Vengeance		3
Latter End		1

THE DAY OF VENGEANCE AND TAHEB (cont'd)

<u>Feast of Weeks</u>	<u>14th cent.</u>	<u>Post-14th cent.</u>
Taheb	5	4
Day of Vengeance	4	3
Day of Judgement	1	1
Day of Vengeance & Burning		1
<u>Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread</u>		
Taheb	1	5
Day of Vengeance	7	1
Day of Vengeance and Recompense	1	1
The Vengeance	2	
Latter End	2	1

MEMAR MARQAH

<u>Book I</u>	<u>Times Mentioned</u>
Taheb	5
<u>Book II</u>	
Taheb	1
Day of Vengeance	2
<u>Book III</u>	
Taheb	1
The Judgement	2
<u>Book IV</u>	
Taheb	6
The Day of Vengeance	29
The Last Day	1
The Great Judgement	1
The Great Day of Judgement	1
The Reckoning	4
That Great Day	1
The Day of Resurrection for all men	1
The Day of Regret	1

MEMAR MARQAH (cont'd)

<u>Book IV</u>	<u>Times mentioned</u>	
The Day of Recompense	3	
The Day of Interrogation	1	
The Day of Trembling	1	
The Day of Terror	1	
The Day of Judgement	1	<u>SECTION 12</u>
The Day of Tears	1	<u>CALLED THE DAY OF</u>
The Day of Deliverance	1	<u>VENGEANCE</u>
The Day of Assembly	1	<u>THE TAHEB MENTIONED</u>
The Day of Truth	1	<u>4 TIMES IN THIS</u>
The Day of Fear	1	<u>SECTION.</u>
The Day of coming forth from the ground	1	
The Day of Grief	1	
The Day of Joy	1	
The Day of the Lord's Appearance	1	
<u>Book V</u>		
The Taheb	-	
The Day of Vengeance	4	
<u>Book VI</u>		
The Taheb	-	
The Day of Vengeance	1	
The Day of Vengeance & Recompense	1	

5. THE MESSIAHS OF AARON AND ISRAEL.

The Liturgies ²⁴³ of the Zimmut Pesah and Zimmut Sukkot stress the affinity of Moses and Aaron. The sun and the moon are used as symbols for Moses and Aaron. Just as the "conjunction" or coming together of Moses and Aaron brought about the exodus of Israel from Egypt, so the Sam. attached a great importance to having a correct calendar based upon the juxtaposition of the sun and the moon. The two Liturgies mentioned above therefore bring into prominence the relationship of Moses and Aaron. Ben Manir (C.p.99) refers to Moses as,

"The sun of the house of Levi,"

and when Moses met Aaron (C.p.100):-

"It was a meeting of the moon with the sun."

Abisha, however, seems to conceive of Moses (C.p.107) as both sun and moon for he writes:-

"And he commanded the reckoning of them through Moses the prophet, the sun of the firmament of Amram, and the moon of the tribe of Levi, for the sake of keeping holy the seventh day."

It might well be that even in this ambiguous statement Moses is the sun, and Aaron the moon. The relation of Moses to Aaron is a close one, and it is not always easy to understand the allusions that Abisha makes about them. He writes:-

1. "As there are stars in heaven, so there are stars on earth."
2. "They have a great star, and they have a great priest."
3. "The one in the midst of the gardens, the other in the midst of the lands."
4. "One is the star and head of the fourth (heaven), the other is the star of Levi and minister."

If Moses is proclaimed as the "Light of the World" (C.p.107), he is also declared to be the "Prince" (NASI). From such statements of Abisha, Moses can be looked upon as the "Prince" and Aaron as the "priest" or "minister." Both Moses and Aaron were "anointed" ones of the Lord. This brings to mind the Books of Zechariah²⁴⁴ and Haggai²⁴⁵ where the two Messiahs are Zerubbabel and Joshua - one the prince and the other the priest. Cecil Roth²⁴⁶ mentions the reference to "The Messiahs of Aaron and of Israel." This dual Messiahship has led to a discussion as to whether the expression means one Messiah or two. Millar Burrows²⁴⁷, when discussing the Damascus Document (part nine) translates:-

"Until arises a Messiah from Aaron and from Israel,"

being of the mind that there is but one Messiah.

T.H.Gaster²⁴⁸ translates as "the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." R.H.Charles,²⁴⁹ making reference to the "Fragments of a Zadokite Work," states,

"The advent of the Messiah 'from Aaron and Israel' is looked for."

Charles translates this to mean that the Messiah was to be a son of Mariamne and Herod (i.e. from Aaron and Israel). T.H.Gaster in conversation said that the text should not be emended; that it means "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel."²⁵⁰ Which means that the Zadokite or priestly party expected a Messiah not only from Levi, as in the Testament of the XII Patriarchs, but from Aaron and from Israel. In the Testament of the XII Patriarchs, in Sirach, and in Jubilees there is a steady glorification of Levi. The Zadokite Fragments tend to bring the situation to a head. Abisha refers to Moses as the "Prince." In the Zadokite Fragments regarding David the title "king" is replaced by that of "prince."²⁵¹ A prophecy of the Zadokite²⁵² Messiah is found in Num.xxiv.17; this proof text also is used by the Sam. For some forty years B.C. the hope of a Messiah from Judah was discarded in favour of a Messiah from Levi. This hope was eventually abandoned after the breach of John Hyrcanus with the Pharisees, and there is then a reversion to the original hope of a Messiah from Judah.

The prerogatives and powers ascribed to the priestly Messiah from Levi in the Testament of the XII Patriarchs are very lofty. He was to be free from sin (T.Jud.xxiv.1); to walk in meekness and righteousness (T.Jud.xxiv.1), He was to war against BELIAR (T.Reub.vi.12; T.Lev.xviii.12;

T.Dan.v.10). He was to open Paradise to the righteous (T.Lev.xviii.10). The saints were to eat of the tree of life (T.Lev.xviii.11).

The Liturgies of the Zimmut Pesah and Zimmut Sukkot bring Moses and Aaron very close together. There is no reference to them being the two Messiahs, yet they are thought of along the lines of the pattern of a prince and a priest. Moses is the "prince" and Aaron is "the star of Levi and minister." In these Liturgies the Taheb is only mentioned once, and that by a post-14th cent. writer, Isaac b. Solomon (C.1840; C.p.112).

Dupont-Sommer²⁵³ discusses the Damascus Document, pointing out that the work has been associated by scholars with various groups of pious Jews. In the list he enumerates, there is the inclusion of the Dositheans. When he comes to the controversial passage of the Damascus Document, he translates²⁵⁴ in the singular:-

"Until the Anointed of Aaron and Israel arises and expiates their iniquity."

Against such a background the incident of the woman of Samaria²⁵⁵ is worth further consideration. M.M. has stated that the Taheb will come "To reveal the truth,"²⁵⁶ - a function associated with Moses - this expression being approximately what the woman said to Jesus Christ when referring to the advent of the Messiah, "He will show us

all things." The Greek verb Anaggelei²⁵⁷ means to declare, to set forth, or to teach. It is noticed that the qualifying phrase, "Who is called Christ," is omitted from certain Syriac Texts. It cannot be omitted on the grounds that the word Christ is used because the woman later says, "Can this be the Christ?"²⁵⁸ The expression, "He who is called Christ," is omitted by Tatian's Diatessaron (2nd cent.); Old Syriac (2nd-3rd cent.); and the Peshitta²⁵⁹ (5th cent.). Did the Syriac Texts omit the expression, "He who is called Christ," because it was an inadequate or inaccurate paraphrase of Messiah? If in Syria there was a current tradition of two Messiahs, the translator could, probably in his ignorance, have believed that the Greek noun Messiah was a neuter plural, and so retained the singular verb. It is to be noted that this significant omission occurs in Syriac Texts referring to an incident in Samaria in the Johannine Gospel. Bowman has already drawn attention to the connection of "The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans."²⁶⁰ Origen²⁶¹ says that Dositheus made himself the Messiah. When Jesus Christ spoke to the woman, what did He really have in mind when He²⁶² said:-

"If you knew the gift of God (Dositheus?), and who it is that is saying to you, 'Give me a drink,' you would have asked him, and he would have given you living water." ?

The gift of God occurs again in another Sam. context where Simon Magus, another Messiah, is mentioned.²⁶³

It might well be that this Johannine chapter is reflective of the tradition of two Messiahs being current in Syria, and that the Damascus Document, with its Syrian connections, is but further supporting evidence.

6. "HAS THE EXPRESSION. THE HUNDRED YEARS, ANY ESCHATOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE?"

During the 14th cent. a new expression came into Sam. terminology. It was "The Hundred Years." It was a pious hope or wish which began to be expressed when looking forward to the future, a future of hope, of peace, security and happiness. Indeed it has about it all the ingredients of a "Messianic Era."

The two earliest writers to mention the hundred years are Aaron b. Manir and Sa'dallah Al-Kethari. These two, according to AD, "both belong to the early fourteenth century."²⁶⁴ After them the expression comes to be used ad nauseam. Every cent. after the 14th sees some writer allude to the hundred years. This at least shows how one Sam. writer was prone to copy another. But how did the expression arise? It may be that a 14th cent. writer had noticed how close in Hebrew the words "death" and "hundred" were. Life was so hard for the Sam. in the 14th cent. as

in others, that those who died would appear to be at rest in peace. So that to wish for others that which is best, then what better than a hundred years of rest and peace, without strife and oppression. A play on the roots M' and MWT would not be beyond the Sam. for there is evidence that they resorted to Gematria.

In the Pentecostal Series²⁶⁵ Aaron b. Manir in one hymn (C.p.385) mentions the hundred years five times.

In the Feast of Tabernacles²⁶⁶ an unknown author (C.p.770) gives a picture of the Taheb in which his reign coincides with the optative statement of the hundred years. It appears that the reign of the Taheb has aspects which will be found in the era of the hundred years. There will be peace, happiness, security, for victory has been achieved over Israel's enemies. Both the Taheb and the hundred years are associated with the top of Mount Gerizim. There is to be the restoration of the Tabernacle. There is to be a return of God's Favour. This return is connected with the raising up of the Taheb. So that the Hebrew word "return" has almost a double meaning; the coming of the Taheb (The Returning One) and the return of God's Favour. In this hymn (C.p.770) the Taheb forgives sin :-

"May he forgive sin and iniquity of every one of you."

"And may he forgive hundreds of the great ones, and hundreds of priests, and a hundred of all the congregation of Israel."

A "hundred of all the congregation," once again raises the question as to whether the word "hundred" means the word "dead." One can hardly imagine only a "hundred" of the congregation being forgiven.

The number of a hundred is not without some significance to the Middle-Eastern and Far-Eastern mind. For example, China had "The policy of the hundred flowers." This alludes to a time in history when there is peace and security, and when the Arts, Literature and the Sciences can be allowed to blossom. For China it is a kind of "Messianic Era."

Did the first Sam. writer in the 14th cent. get the idea of a hundred years from Jallaladdin's description of Paradise? The Sam. writers associate the period of a hundred years with Mount Gerizim where the people are to gather, and one Sam. view is that Paradise, or the Garden of Eden, will eventually be found on Mount Gerizim. In the Muslim Paradise²⁶⁷ there is to be found a tree called Tūbā, or the tree of happiness. This tree possesses all that man can desire. So great is this tree that:-

"A person mounted on the fleetest horse
would not be able to gallop from one end
of its shade to the other in a hundred years."

This hundred years is associated with Paradise. So also The Sam. writers associate the Garden of Eden or Paradise with a hundred years. In both cases there is perfect

bliss. As Jallaladdin lived a century or more before either Ben Manir or Sa'dallah Al-Kethari, it is not impossible for either or both of them to have read the works of the great Persian Poet Jallaladdin (1207 - 1273).

Aaron b. Manir and Sa'dallah Al-Kethari are the only two 14th cent. Sam. writers who refer to "the six sides" (directions or corners). Sa'dallah refers to it once (C.p.388), and Ben Manir four times (C.pp.385,386,649,678). These writers also are the first to mention the hundred years. By a coincidence Jallaladdin in the Masnavi²⁶⁸ also mentions "the six sides." A recurring theme in the Masnavi²⁶⁹ is that of "hundred." To quote a few:-

- P.89. "You have found a hundred precious blessings."
- P.155 "By a hundred tokens and a hundred evidences."
- P.158 "Even though it may **cause** him a hundred deaths."

If either of the Sam. writers named did read the Masnavi what would their reactions be to the story of Ezra²⁷⁰? It runs:-

"Ezra beheld the ruins of Jerusalem and he said; 'How shall God give life to this city after it has been dead?' And God caused him to die for a hundred years, and then raised him again to life. God said, 'Nay, Thou hast waited a hundred years.'
The family of Ezra were full of joy at his return."

Is it not likely that Ben Manir or his counterpart read this about their hereditary enemy Ezra, and in place of Jerusalem thought in terms of the opposite mount, of Mount Gerizim? The family of Samaria would be full of joy at

the return of God's Favour. Ben Manir or his colleague would also appropriate for themselves a period of time such as a hundred years.

Or does the hundred years idea emanate from a source which the Malef²⁷¹ makes use of ? Answer to question 42 in this Sam. Catechism states that Adam repented one hundred years. He was a Nazarite for a hundred years after being compelled to leave the Garden of Eden. At the end of that time he was informed of the acceptance of his repentance. From then on God established from Adam the pure chain from which He raised up the prophet of God (i.e. Moses). Here again the "hundred years" is a concept in close association with the Garden of Eden.

A good example of the optative statement of the hundred years is given by Abdullah b. Solomon in the Liturgy of the Feast of Weeks. He writes (C.p.384):-

"May you be observing it (i.e. Shabuot) for a hundred years. May it come upon you every year with gladness and glory, and rejoicing, together with the removal of all your enemies; Yea, all of them, in the days of the Taheb, and his deliverance."

or again, with the same author (C.p.358):-

"May you observe this day a hundred years complete; For a hundred may you return here; both you and your children."

The benediction of this hundred years includes the advent of the Taheb, who will defeat Israel's enemies; they will

"see the habitation set upon the holiest of the mountains" (C.p.425). There will be the return of God's Favour.

The hundred years has every appearance of being a "Messianic Era," sometimes associated with the Taheb, but on most occasions it is not so. For example in the Sam. Liturgies for the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread the hundred years is mentioned twenty-one times, but the Taheb only once (C.p.265), by a 14th cent. writer. After the 14th cent. the hundred years occurs twenty-four times and the Taheb five times (C.pp.170, 172, 178, 200, 280). There are also seventeen other references to the hundred years in the Rubrics. In other words, in the Liturgies under examination, the hundred years is mentioned sixty-two times, as against the six times of the Taheb. Which might indicate that the 14th cent. writer Abdullah may have been guided by intuition in seeing in the benediction of the hundred years a possible alignment with the advent of the Taheb. A theme that recurs sixty-two times in the above Liturgies cannot be without some special significance.

Lerner²⁷² in a footnote considers the possibility of a play on the roots M' and MWT by the Sam. to mean either "dead" or "hundred." He states that:-

"Avigad and Schwabe, in Excavations at Beth She'arim 1953; p.8, reproduce an inscription in which Maith is used for M-th, 'to die'."

If Lemathi is to be translated as "dead", instead of "hundreds," then the Sam. have prayers for the dead.

Brown²⁷³, relying on the Jaffa Ms. states that the Sam. have a custom, unknown among the Jews, of the ritual of taking the scroll of the Torah into the congregation, and exchanging the responses, "A hundred years in your days," with the Priest. This happens during the Sunday Morning Service. It is strange that this expression does not occur again in the Defter. As it is an Arabic Rubric there can be little doubt but that it is a later interpolation. In the 92 pages of the Defter in Cowley, it does not occur in the body of the text once. Could it have been derived from an Arabic source, and have been brought into prominence by a Sam.-Arabic writer?

Lerner²⁷⁴ says that the Taheb shall,

"inaugurate the Millennium prior to the day of vengeance."

But where is the evidence for the Millennium? The only definite period of time mentioned by the writers from the 14th cent. onwards is that of the hundred years, which has every appearance of really being a "Messianic Era." It is a "Messianic Era" of one hundred years, in which there is a theocracy with God as king, and the Taheb tentatively

put forward as Vice-regent. What do the 14th cent. writers tell us about this period of time? Aaron b. Manir stresses a hundred years of peace in which the festivals of the Lord may be observed (C.p.179). He does not mention the Taheb. Abisha b. Phinehas says (C.p.242):-

"May you make the festivals in peace, lovingkindness and grace, by him that possessed merit (i.e. Joseph)."

"For a hundred years may He (i.e. God) visit you with kindness, with glory, rejoicing and peace." (C.p.254)

Abdullah b. Solomon writes (C.p.179):-

"For a hundred years may you gather together upon this day (i.e. Passover)."

"For a hundred years may you perform it (i.e. Feast of Unleavened Bread) and may He add to you a thousandfold and bless you." (C.p.234)

He also associates with this benediction the hope that (C.p.239):-

"Our God, Amen, may remove the days of disfavour, and that the sanctuary be standing upon the holy mountain."

Therefore, the "Messianic Era" is to coincide with the restoration of "Favour", and the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim. It is to be a period of time in which the oppression of the people is to be relieved (C.p.256). Phinehas the H.P. (C.p.189) writes:-

"Each one will wish his brother, 'May you live a hundred years - O Lord - in blessing'."

This may not refer to the "Messianic Era" directly, but it is a wish consonant with well-being, which the hundred years is held to bring.

Hibat-allah Ha-Mizri (14th cent.; C.p.227) definitely associates the hundred years with the restoration of Favour, and the erection of the sanctuary. According to a later writer Abraham b. Jacob (1750; C.p.178) the Sam. are to encamp on Mount Gerizim during this period, resting in security from their enemies. Abraham Ha-Qabazi (16th cent.; C.p.188) mentions "Samaritans, priest and minister" in his hope. This means that the religious festivals of the nation are to be continued. In other words the hundred years is for those who are Sam.. Isaac b.Solomon (1840; C.p.265) hopes that in the hundred years period:-

"He may deliver you from all adversaries and enemies."

This would indicate a "Messianic Era" with God Himself as supreme. In the long hymn of Mattanah Ha-Mizri (14th cent. C.pp.265-268) he mentions the Taheb (C.p.265) at the beginning, and the benediction of the hundred years at the end. There is no connection whatever between the two, except that both are hopes for the future. But other writers do connect the Taheb with the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, with the hundred years in the background (Abraham b.Jacob the Danfi; 1750; C.pp.170,172; Muslim the Danfi;

1727; C.p.200; Solomon, the Priest, the Levite, in Shechem; 1857; C.p.280).

While no Sam. scholar has ever alluded to the hundred years as the "Messianic Era" is it safe to conclude that it is so? Lerner²⁷⁵ had stated that the Taheb would inaugurate the Millennium prior to the day of vengeance. Yet in the Sam. Liturgies examined no Chiliasm has been observed. It was tentatively suggested that Abisha b. Phinehas was aware of the Book of Revelation²⁷⁶ when he wrote his great eschatological hymn (C.pp.511-519). Yet he avoided any reference to "the thousand years."²⁷⁷ But in the previous hymn (C.pp.504-10) he refers to the hundred years (C.pp.504, 509).

In 2 Enoch (1-50 A.D.) the Messianic Kingdom is to last a thousand years. The later Christian view of the Millennium comes from this book. There is also no mention of a Messiah. Another 1st cent. work, 4 Ezra mentions a Messianic Kingdom that shall last four hundred years. At the close of this four hundred years the Messiah and all men die. In the Sam. literature the Taheb also dies at 110 years of age.

The true Sam. position would appear to be that visualized by Phinehas (14th cent.; C.p.347) when he writes:-

"And in Mount Gerizim the holiest of our mountains, may Yahweh come near unto you again, and may you return unto His Favour, and may you raise up this altar in the days of the Taheb, even in his time."

Phinehas concludes with the benediction of the hundred years twice. It may be that there are two separate traditions in the 14th cent., one of the Taheb, and one of the hundred years. There are occasions when they are separate. At other times they conflate, and form a theme hinting strongly at a "Messiah" and a "Messianic Era," fairly close to that held in the Christian Church.

Cowley²⁷⁸ links the idea of the day of Vengeance with the idea of the Taheb. With the advent of the Taheb, the period of God's Favour will be restored, and the Taheb will live on earth for a hundred and ten years, and then die. Then the Resurrection will take place after the death of the Taheb, and it will be accompanied by the final judgement when the righteous will go into the Garden of Eden, and the wicked will be burned with fire.

If, as according to Cowley, the Resurrection and the final judgement take place after the death of the Taheb, then his death, theoretically, should coincide with the end of the hundred years of peace and happiness. In other words the end of the hundred years era of God's Favour heralds in the Resurrection and the final judgement. This plan follows that set out in the Book of Revelation. Christ

reigns a thousand years; Taheb reigns a hundred years (?); at the end of a thousand years Satan let loose; nations at war; the peace of the Taheb ends; Resurrection in both cases; then final judgement. In both cases there is an Ekpurosis.²⁷⁹ The Sam. hundred years would appear to have some eschatological significance.

It may well be that the ideological background from which the concept of the Hundred Years was derived, is that of the Christian milieu. Yet the difficulty remains of the Sam. retaining the concept of the Hundred Years when the Christian Church believed in the Millennium. Having accepted the concept of the Messianic Era how could the Sam. envisage the period to be but one Hundred Years. It is possible that the age of the Taheb may have influenced them in this matter. The Taheb was to live a hundred and ten years, and then he was to die and be buried. If the Hundred Years was to be co-terminus with his reign then he would be but ten years old at the time of heralding in this Messianic Era. He would be a child Messiah! Is there evidence for the existence of any kind of prophecy referring to such a child? There is a Messianic passage in Isaiah²⁸⁰, and this passage is referred to again in Isaiah²⁸¹, "though the words are not taken exactly and consecutively."²⁸² Isaiah²⁸³ in this Messianic passage

states that,

"A little child shall lead them"

and that,

"They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my
holy mountain."

In the other Messianic passage referred to above where
the holy mountain is again mentioned, it says that:-

"The child shall die an hundred years old."

This Messianic Era is to see the creation of a new heaven
and a new earth; there will be joy and gladness, with no
more weeping. They shall build houses and plant vineyards.

It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the
Sam. may have been influenced by both Jewish and Christian
spheres. The Christians have always stressed the
Messianic content of Isaiah's prophecies. The Sam. for
their part, cannot have been completely unaware of the Book
of Isaiah. They did not recognize him as a prophet; yet
they must have been aware of his great influence in
Christian circles. As the Sam. had in their creed from
earliest times a tenet emphasizing the uniqueness of Mount
Gerizim, any reference to "my holy mountain" would be of
great importance to them. In the 14th cent. the Taheb, on
occasion, came to be associated with the return of Divine
Favour, with Mount Gerizim as the focal point, where the
Messianic Era was to be given its greatest significance.

This is but conjecture, but it would seem that the case presented is a reasonable one. The Messianic Era in Sam. eyes could very well be one in which "a little child shall lead them," and lasting for a hundred years. M.M. makes no comment whatever of the Messianic Era of a hundred years, but the coming of the Taheb is mentioned. No mention of the Hundred Years would suggest that an early dating for the document is possible.

N O T E S

SAM. ESCHATOLOGICAL TEACHING

1. Eschatological Trends found in the Sam. Defter of the 4th cent.

1. Cowley, A.E. J.Q.R. Vol. VIII, p.567.
2. ibid. p.568
3. Gaster, Moses. The Sam. p.88
4. Gaster, Moses. ditto
5. Brown, S. op.cit.
6. cf. Gen. xLiv, 29, 31; Num. xvi, 33.
7. Gen. xxv, 8. cf. Gen. xxxv, 29, re. Isaac.
8. Gen. xLvii, 30.
9. Gen. xLix, 29.
10. Oesterley, W.O.E. and Robinson, T.H. Hebrew Religion p.97.
11. Cowley, A.E. J.Q.R. Vol. VIII, p.572.
12. Joad, C.E.M. Guide to Philosophy. p.259.
13. cf. Heb. xi, 1-3.
14. Matt. xxii, 32; Mark xii, 26; Luke xx, 37.
15. Matt. xxii, 23.
16. Bowman, J. L.U.O.R. Vol. I, p.50
17. Num. xvi, 22.
18. Gaster, Moses. The Asatir, p.87
19. Whinfield, E.H. The Masnavi, p. 43.
20. Gaster, T.H. op.cit. p.69
21. Roth, Cecil. The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls, p.49
Another translation by A. Dupont-Sommer. The Essene Writings From Qumran, p.96.
"But he shall be a man full of zeal for the precept, whose time is for the Day of Vengeance. He shall do the will of God in every enterprise of his hands."
22. cf. Isa. xxxiv, 8; Lxi, 2; Lxiii, 4.
23. Gaster, Moses. The Sam. Oral Law and Ancient Traditions, Vol. I, p.82
24. Gaster, Moses. op.cit. p.81

25. Bowman.J. Journal of Jewish Studies. vi, No.2, pp. 63-72: Art; Early Samaritan Eschatology.
26. Cowley.A.E. J.Q.R. Vol. VIII, p.568.
27. cf. John, iv, 25.
28. John, iv, 37.
29. Brown.S. op.cit. p.170 (Note)
30. Gesenius. Guil. op.cit. Hymn No.iii (v.22)
31. Friedlander.M. op.cit. p.173
32. Ecclesiastes, xii, 7.
33. Daniel, xii, 2.
34. cf. Isa. xxvi, 19.
35. Daniel, xii, 2.
36. Cowley.A.E. J.Q.R. Vol.VIII, p.568.
37. Brown.S. op.cit
38. Moore.G.F. Judaism, Vol. II, p.382
39. M.M. Book IV, Par.8.
40. Moore.G.F. op.cit. Vol.III, p.205
- 41 . Brown S. op.cit. p.117
42. Daniel xii, 2.

2. THE RESURRECTION

43. Thomson.J.E.H. The Samaritans. Their Testimony To The Religion and History of Israel, p.187
44. Gaster. Moses. The Sam. p.88
45. Gaster. Moses. The Asatir.
46. Gaster. Moses. Studies and Texts in Folk-Lore. Magic. Romances. Apocrypha. Vol. I, p.83
47. Daniel, xii, 2.
48. II Maccabees, xii, 43-45.
49. Mark xii, 18.
50. Epstein.Isidore. op.cit. p.97
51. op.cit. p.89
52. Bowman.J. L.U.O.S. Vol. I, p.50.

53. Gaster. Moses. Studies and Texts in Folk-Lore, Magic, Romances, Apocrypha. Vol. I. p.94
54. cf. Church of England Book of Common Prayer; The Holy Communion Service.
55. Dyson, Hague. Through the Prayer Book, p.271
56. Dyson. Hague. op.cit. pp.270 - 271
57. Gaster. Moses. Studies and Texts etc. p.96
58. Trotter: cf. Chapter on Day of Vengeance and Recompense.
59. For a discussion of the place of this important hymn in Sam. Eschatology, see M. Gaster (Oral Law and Ancient Traditions, pp.253-259).
60. Gaster. Moses. The Samaritans, p.45
61. ditto
62. op.cit. p.84
63. op.cit. p.85
64. op.cit. p.148
65. op.cit. p.152
66. op.cit. p.153
67. Macdonald. J.
68. Montgomery. J.A. op.cit. p.255
69. op.cit. p.239
70. op.cit. p.240
71. op.cit. p.255
72. op.cit. Chap. xiii.
73. Gaster. Moses. Studies and Texts, p.139
74. op.cit. p.176
75. op.cit. p.188
76. op.cit. p.187
77. op.cit. p.269
78. Thomson. J.E.H. op.cit. p.175
79. Thomson. J.E.H. op.cit. p.197
80. Nutt. J.W. op.cit. p.11.

81. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.269
82. Whitham, A.R. op.cit. p.104
83. Bowman, J. L.U.O.S. Vol.I. p.48
84. op.cit. p.49
85. op.cit. p.50
86. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.255
87. op.cit. p.256
88. Acts viii, 10.
89. Green, Samuel G. op.cit. p.173
90. Thomson, J.E.H. op.cit. p.197
91. p.205
92. The Samaritans. p.54
93. The Sources of the Koran. p.57
94. Tisdall. op.cit. p.58
95. Cowley, A.E. op.cit. Vol. II, p.xxvii
96. Gesenius. Guil. op.cit. Hymn V.13
97. Epstein, Isidore. op.cit. p.242
98. Charles, R.H. op.cit. p.314; "Pammiaron Desmoterion."
99. Ezekiel, xviii, 4,20
100. cf. Matt. xxvii, 52.
101. Gen. xxv, 8,17; xxxv, 29; xLix, 29,33.
102. cf. Matt. xxvii, 51-53.
103. Ezekiel, xxxvii.
104. Ezekiel, xxxvii, 12-14.
105. cf. Thomas. Griffith. op.cit. p.148
106. Crown. Alan David, Dissertation, Leeds, 1958.
107. Acts xvii, 16-32.
108. Acts xvii, 28.
109. Acts xvii, 31.
110. Acts xvii., 32.
111. cf. Matt. xvi, 13.
112. Macdonald, J. S.J.O.T. Vol. 13, No.2, p.158.
113. Lev. xvi, 22; xxvii, 16.

3. THE DAY OF VENGEANCE AND RECOMPENSE.

114. cf. Thomson, J.E.H. op.cit. p.196
115. Rev. Chaps. xx and xxi
116. cf. Rev. xx, 12.
117. Gen. i, 31
118. cf. Rev. xxi, 1.
119. Ecclesiastes xii, 7.
120. cf. Hab. iii, 1-11; Matt. xxiv; Mark xiii; Luke xxi; Rev. vi, 12; Samaritan Oral Law, pp.116-123; The Pitron on verses 35,36,37 in The Asatir, p.261.
121. The Gnostic Problem, p.133.
122. Wilson, R. McL. op.cit. p.147
123. Pfeiffer, Robert H. History of New Testament Times p. 228 f.
124. Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings From Qumran; p.74 (Note).
125. Deut. xxxii, 22.
126. Crown, A.D.
127. cf. Dupont-Sommer, A. op.cit. p.209
"Thou hast redeemed me from the pit, and from Sheol of Abbaddon."
128. Rev. ix, 11.
129. Grobel, Kendrick. op.cit. p.196
130. Dan. xii, 2.
131. Oesterley, W.O.E. and Robinson T.H. op.cit. p.444
132. Sale, George, The Koran, p.73.
cf. M.M. Book IV, Par.12. "Their faces will be darkened."
133. Charles, R.H. op.cit. p.45
134. cf. Dupont-Sommer, A. p.249; Deut. xxxii, 22.
135. Macdonald, J.
136. Pfeiffer, Robert H. op.cit. p.131 f
137. Whinfield, E.H. op.cit. p.16
138. Whinfield, E.H. ibid. p.25
139. Fitzgerald, Edward. The Rubaiyat, and Salaman and Absal.

140. Fitzgerald. Edward. op.cit.
141. cf. St. Paul; I Cor. xv, 44.
142. cf. M.M. Book IV, Par.12:- "Therefore on the Day of Vengeance the great fire will be kindled."
143. Sutcliffe. Edmund, The Monks of Qumran. p.88 f.
144. Matt. xix, 28.
145. I Cor. vi, 2.
146. I Cor. vi, 3.
147. cf. M.M. Book IV; Par.12 is called "The Day of Vengeance."
148. Lerner, I.
149. Macdonald, J.
150. Brown, S.
151. cf. Book IV
152. Boys, D. J.
153. Crown, A. D.
154. Baguley, E. C.
155. Mowbray, D. D. W.
156. Green, L. C.
157. Roth, C. op.cit. p.49
158. Gaster, T. H. op.cit. p.69
159. Sutcliffe, Edmund. op.cit. p.83
160. Epstein, Isidore. op.cit. p.215, 219
161. Epstein, Isidore. op.cit. p.219
162. Bowman, J. B. J. R. L. Vol.40, No.2
163. Bowman, J. J. J. S. Vol.VI, No.2, Sept. 1955.
164. Montgomery, J. A. op.cit. p.246
165. Book IV, Par.12
166. cf. Epstein, Isidore. op.cit. p.215. The Articles of the Jewish Creed according to Maimonides' Enumeration. Sale. George. op.cit. p.55, The Muslim Creed.
167. The Defter (C.pp.20,25,26).
168. Book IV, Par.12.
169. Amos i, 1 - ii, 3.
170. Amos ii, 4.

171. Amos ii, 6.
172. Amos iii, 2.
173. Amos v, 18.
174. Matt. x,15; II Pet.ii, 9.
175. Montgomery.J.A. op.cit. p.241
176. Oesterley,W.O.E. and Robinson.T.H. op.cit. p.227
177. Ginzberg, Louis, op.cit. i, 101; iii, 443
178. ibid. i, 102, 320; iii, 98-99
179. ibid. iii, 47
180. Sale, George. op.cit. p.55
181. Sale, George. op.cit. p.65
182. Sale, George. op.cit. p.68
183. Daniel v. 27
- 183B. Sale.George. op.cit. p.70
184. cf. Deut.xxxii, 35; Ps.xciv, 1; Heb.x,30; Rom.xii,19
185. Sale, George. op.cit. p.71
186. Sale, George. op.cit. p.72
187. op.cit. p.73
188. Tisdall. The Sources of the Quran. p.109
189. cf. Sale.George. op.cit. p.79

4. THE TAHEB

190. Macdonald.J.
191. Gaster.M. Sam. Oral Law, p.96
192. Rev. i,10. cf. Muhammad in the Quran;
Sale. George. pp.130 and 380.
193. Matt. ii, 2.
194. cf. Luke i, 80a.
195. Dissertation, Leeds.
196. cf. Deut. vii, 1.
197. op.cit. p.193
198. op.cit. p.194
199. Green, Samuel. op.cit. p.311

200. op.cit. Vol.II, p.xxii
201. N. Ms. cf. Cowley, op.cit. Vol.II, p.xv
202. V. Ms. cf. Cowley, op.cit. Vol.II, p.xviii.
203. Boys, D.J.
204. Gaster, M. The Sam. p.156
205. Thomson, J.E.H. op.cit. p.194
206. cf. Also M.M. Book IV, Par.12.
207. op.cit. p.85
208. cf. Dupont-Sommer. op.cit. p.160
"The Anointed of Aaron and Israel arises and
expiates their iniquity," implying one Messiah.
209. John i, 23. cf. H.J.Schonfield: The Lost "Book of
the Nativity of John." p.1. "The Baptist Messiah."
210. cf. M.M. Book IV, Par.12.
211. Gaster, T.H. op.cit. p.353
212. As Moses did, stressed in M.M. Book V, hence his
death.
213. cf. Gen. xxv, 8,17; xxxv, 29; xLix, 29,33;
Deut. xxxii, 50.
214. John vi, 39,40,44,45.
215. op.cit. p. Lxxxvi.
216. M.M. Book IV, Par.12.
217. Grant, R.M. op.cit. p.73
218. Slaughter, Frank.G. The Thorn of Arithmathea, p.80
219. op.cit. p.83
220. op.cit. p.90
221. Boys, D.J.
222. cf. Rev. xx, 2 .
223. cf. Rev. xx, 4 .
224. Mowbray, D.D.W. op.cit. p. CLxvi.
225. Rev. xx, 6.
226. Bowman, J. Transactions of the Glasgow Oriental
Society, Vol.XVI, p.6; "Ezekiel and the Zadokite
Priesthood."
227. John iv, 25.

228. John iv, 29.
229. Bowman.J. L.U.O.S. Vol.I, p.50.
230. The Samaritan Targum, p.49.
231. op.cit. p.69
232. Friedlander.M. op.cit. p.221
233. Thomson.J.E.H. op.cit. p.172
234. Gen. L, 26.
235. Crown . Alan David.
236. Thomson.J.E.H. op.cit. p.195
237. Gaster.M. The Sam. p.141
238. The Asatir, p.299
239. Gaster.M. Sam. Oral Law. pp.266-269
240. Bowman.J. L.U.O.S. Vol.I. p.50
241. Bowman.J. L.U.O.S. Vol.I. p.48
242. Revelation xx - xxi.

5. THE MESSIAHS OF AARON AND ISRAEL.

243. Mowbray.D.D.W.
244. Zech. iv, 14.
245. Haggai, i and ii.
246. Roth.Cecil. The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls. p.56
247. Millar Burrows. The Dead Sea Scrolls.
248. Gaster.T.H. The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect.
249. Charles.R.H. Eschatology: Hebrew, Jewish and Christian.
250. cf. Dupont-Sommer A. op.cit. p.160
251. Zadokite Fragments, vii, 4.
252. ditto ix, 8
253. Dupont-Sommer. A. op.cit. p.40
254. op.cit. p.160
255. John Chap. iv

- 256. M.M. Book iv, Par.12
- 257. John iv, 25: Souter. Alexander, Novum Testamentum Graece.
- 258. John iv, 29.
- 259. Lake. Kirsopp. The Text of the New Testament, p.40
- 260. op.cit. B.J.R.L. Vol.40, No.2, p.298.
- 261. Nutt.J.W. op.cit. p.49
- 262. John iv, 10.
- 263. Acts. viii, 20; cf. Nutt. op.cit. p.49

6. HAS THE EXPRESSION, THE HUNDRED YEARS,
ANY ESCHATOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE?

- 264. Cowley A.E. op.cit. p.xxix
- 265. Boys.D.J.
- 266. Green.L.C.
- 267. Sale.George; op.cit. p.75
- 268. Whinfield.E.H. (Ed)
- 269. Whinfield.E.H. op.cit. pp.87,89,96,97,113,143,155,
158, Et Passim.
- 270. op.cit. p.214
- 271. A Late Sam. Catechism incorporating earlier material.
- 272. op.cit. p.307
- 273. The Defter.
- 274. op.cit. p.Lxxxvi
- 275. op.cit. p.Lxxxvi
- 276. Revelation xx - xxi
- 277. Revelation xx. 3,5,6,7.
- 278. The Jewish Encyclopaedia, Vol.X, p.669
Art: The Samaritans.
- 279. cf. Woodroffe. Sir John, The Garland of Letters.
p. 232. "The period of Cosmic Life (Madhye)
is a hundred years of Brahma when the world
dissolves (Laya). The Varnas (Letters) persist
during all these years of Brahma."

280. Isa. xi, 1-9

281. Isa. Lxv, 25.

282. Oesterley.W.O.E. and Robinson.T.H. op.cit. p.247

283. Isa, xi, 1-9.

P A R T VI

1. ANGELOLOGY

AND

2. DEMONOLOGY

1. ANGELOLOGY

The Sam. Liturgies reveal ample evidence for a belief in angels, if not in demons. There is abundant evidence in the Pentateuch for the belief in angels. The angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush.¹ The books of Genesis, Exodus and Numbers make mention of angels. They are also found ubique in the N.T. M. Gaster² states:-

"Some writers have declared that the Samaritans do not believe in angels; it is difficult, however, to find a source for this assertion, for there is nothing in Jewish writings to confirm this statement."

Montgomery³ says that Reland maintained that the Sam. possessed no belief in angels. Montgomery states that Epiphanius (4th cent.) witnessed to the denial of the belief among the early Sam.. Epiphanius was of Jewish extraction and was born near Gath about 310. In 367 he became B. of Salamis in Cyprus. "His chief work is an attack on Heresies, of which he enumerates no fewer than eighty."⁴ Green⁵ states that "the treatise is useful as a record of facts and opinions but is of little or no critical value." Nutt⁶ states that the Christian Fathers held that the Sam. did not believe in the existence of angels, nor in the immortality of the soul. He mentions the opinion of Origen and Leontius. Nutt⁷ quotes Philastrius who makes reference of a Dosithean who denied the Resurrection,

the Holy Spirit, Angels and the Last Judgement. There could be truth in this statement for there is no concrete evidence in the 4th cent. Defter for a belief in the Resurrection, and the Holy Spirit. But the Defter has much to say about Angels. Epiphanius lived in the 4th cent.; Leontius was B. of Antioch (c.340); Origen lived in the 3rd cent. (185 - 254), and Philastrius (c.300). Yet by the time the Defter comes into being in the 4th cent. a belief in angels is in evidence.⁸ Epiphanius⁹ mentions four Sam. sects, the Sebuaeans, Gorthenians, Essenes and Dositheans. The occasion for sects would arise when differences of opinion occurred over different aspects of doctrine. If the Dositheans were Gnostics, then their objections to the Resurrection, the Holy Spirit, Angels, and the Last Judgement is understood. The Gnostics held that there were aeons or emanations coming from the Godhead. By these aeons the Gnostics tried to explain creation, revelations and redemption. There was no Holy Spirit of God because the Holy Spirit was one of the thirty-two aeons in the Pleroma. Did the 4th cent. writers in the Defter then avoid mention of the Holy Spirit because they knew that it was accepted in Samaria as a Gnostic aeon? After the Bar-Cochba rebellion was finally suppressed in 135, the Sam. town of Neopolis (now Nablus) flourished and attracted many philosophic cults to the district.¹⁰ Neo-platonism

and Gnosticism were among them. Montgomery¹¹ quotes Heidenheim as the chief advocate of an extensive Gnosticism existing in Sam. Literature. The Defter hints at Gnosticism, and there does appear to be evidence, but so superficial is it that it is best to say that there appears to be echoes of Gnostic nomenclature, but not the acceptance of Gnostic teaching and ideas.¹² Montgomery¹³ says that "there is little to show that Samaritanism was ever Gnostically minded."

Acts xxiii.8 is sometimes quoted for evidence to support opinion that "The Sadducees do not believe in angels." But the point at issue in the text is that of the Resurrection. Being guided by the Greek Text, the translation and meaning is, that the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection whether it be of an angel or of a spirit, but that the Pharisees confess to a resurrection of both an angel and a spirit. The point at issue is the Resurrection, and angel is used only as a Reductio ad absurdum. This does not mean that the Sadducees believed or disbelieved in angels, for this text cannot be adduced as evidence; it is not concerned with a belief in angels!

Nutt¹⁴ raises the problem whether the Sam. regard angels as attributes of God, or uncreated existences. "The Prayer of the Angels" (C.p.9) could be of help here if it was known definitely whether the prayer applies to men or angels. If

it is truly a prayer of the angels then what does it say?

It says:-

"We give thanks to Thee for Thou art our Creator."

"We are all sinners before Thee and Thou hast knowledge of our wickedness."

I Enoch (Lxxxiii - xc; 166 - 161 B.C.) makes mention of the seventy angels who sinned, and who dealt treacherously with Israel. The lustful angels (Nephilim) will be judged first. And also the faithless angelic patrons (xc.20 - 25). In I Enoch (vi - xxxvi) there is to be a judgement on angels, who married the daughters of men.¹⁵ In the Book of Daniel, while there is no mention of angels who are judged, a judgement must be supposed in the case of the angelic patrons of Persia and Greece, who were hostile to Israel. There is to be a final judgement on men and angels in 2 Enoch and 2 Baruch. The Epistle of Jude (N.T.) mentions angels¹⁶ as well as men on "the judgement of the great day." Charles¹⁷ says that judgement on wicked angels was an accepted dogma of Judaism for at least 300 years before the Christian Era. They are also found in the New Testament. St. Paul (I Cor.vi.3) writes:-

"Know you not that we shall judge angels?"

II Peter (ii.4) writes:-

"For if God spared not angels when they sinned, but cast them down to hell, and committed them to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgement" etc.

It has been suggested that when Jude (verse 6) wrote:-

"And angels which kept not their own position but left their proper dwelling have been kept by him in eternal chains in the nether gloom until the judgement of the great day,"

he was referring to the Gnostics. Should he have the Gnostics in mind - which seems rather doubtful - then it is ironical that they should be referred to as "angels," and not "aeons."

The writer of "The Prayer of the Angels" (C.p.9) must have thought about angels to so name the prayer, or else others called it "The Prayer of the Angels." Has the writer in mind the incident of Gen.vi.1-4? The M.T. has "Sons of God," but the Alexandrine Text of the Lxx has "Angels of God." That the angels of God took to wife the daughters of men might be hinted at when the writer says:-

"For the sake of them that love Thee remember, and forget not their seed."

I Enoch (vi - xxxvi) affirms that there will be a judgement on those angels who married the daughters of men.

The Sam. were able with the use of angels, supported by evidence from the Pentateuch - the locus classicus being Ex.iii.2 - to reduce anthropomorphism to a minimum. The tendency to avoid anthropomorphism is evident in the Defter.

In spite of numerous allusions to angels in the Defter, there does not appear to be a Sam. tradition of the "Fall of angels," nor of their marrying the daughters of men. There is no evidence of either evil angels, or of angels opposing the purposes of God. The angels, supported by evidence from the Pentateuch, are messengers of God. In M.M.¹⁸ there is reference to the three angels appearing to Abraham; the two angels to Lot; the one angel to Joseph, and the one angel who appeared in the Burning Bush. There is no trace of a belief in guardian angels so far in the evidence examined. Very rarely do angels act as intermediaries yet Nutt¹⁹ says that Adam received from God through the mediation of angels the method of calculating for purposes of ascertaining the Calendar. In this respect Nutt²⁰ mentions El Tholidoth (1149; by Eleazar b. Amram) as evidence.

The Defter is emphatic that God gave the Law to Moses without any mediator (C.pp.49, 50, 51, 52, 56). An example is given (C.p.56):-

"The supreme God gave it, the supreme prophet received it."

and again (C.p.59):-

"And He gave it to Moses His faithful one."

The N.T. has a few interesting references to the activity of angels anent the Law. Stephen²¹ in his speech before

the Sanhedren said:-

"You have received the Law as delivered by angels."

Paul²² speaking of the Law says that it was,

"ordained by angels."

The writer²³ of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the Law as :-

"The message declared by the angels."

On this point the Sam. and the N.T. writers are following a different tradition.

Epiphanius (4th cent.) who attacked heresies, and who enumerated or listed no fewer than eighty²⁴ states that the Sam. affirm the existence of angels, but that the Sadducees denied their existence. Concerning their existence M. Gaster²⁵ says that the Sam. did not ascribe to angels any power whatever of good or evil. Yet the Defter (C.p.12; stanza QOPH) does imply the existence of hostile immaterial powers, for it says:-

"Above and below there are those who bring darkness upon us, for it is the function of those who bring darkness, to stir up wrath in every place; but when the appearance of the luminaries is altered, and the deep withholds its springs, wickedness finds not whither to flow forth, therefore it returns to its own source." 26

Cowley²⁷ states that there is no evidence for determining the date of three anonymous compositions, the prayers of Moses (C.p.45); of Joshua (C.p.4) and of the

Angels (C.p.9), but they give the impression of being early. In each of these compositions, there is no mention whatever of angels; that is, apart from the title, the prayer of the Angels. As these prayers cannot be dated, the evidence of them cannot be used in any precise way, as indicating what the Sam. believed in the matter of angelology at a particular period of time. But the omission of the mention of angels should be noted.

The Defter affords ample evidence that Marqah believed in angels. (C.pp.23, 24, 49, 50, 56). This is all the more interesting as Marqah is acclaimed by Bowman²⁸ to be a Dosithean. Nutt²⁹ quotes Philastrius who said of a certain Dostai, a Dosithean, that he denied the Resurrection, the Holy Spirit, Angels and the Last Judgement. In the Defter Marqah does not mention the Resurrection³⁰ nor the Holy Spirit, while he mentions "The day of great judgement" (C.p.85). It would appear therefore that even within the ambit of Dositheanism there existed differences of opinion.

Marqah on two occasions in the Defter (C.pp.50, 56) makes reference to

"Angels, Powers, and foundations."

It may be assumed that these are classifications of angels. Such classifications are not foreign to Theology. Sanday and Headlam³¹ quote a passage from Enoch Lxi.10:-

"And He will call on all the host of the heavens, and all the holy ones above, and the host of God, the Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim, and all the angels of power, and all the angels of principalities, and the Elect One, and all the other powers on the earth, over the water, on that day."

St. Paul³² also makes mention of

"Angels," "Principalities" and "Powers."

As Marqah also mentions (C.p.19):-

"That the fulness is His, by reason of His greatness."

and (C.p.21):-

"For Thou art the fulness and more so,"

it would appear that he is operating in an atmosphere of ideas not totally alien to Gnosticism. St. Paul in his letters to the Colossians and Ephesians is attempting to refute a philosophy alien to the Christian Faith. The Colossian Heresy borders on that of Essenism, or Cerinthianism as affirmed by Lightfoot.³³ It had in it elements borrowed from Judaism. The Colossians³⁴ were required to worship angels. It was a new kind of theosophy or philosophy³⁵ whereby "the fulness of the Godhead is brought into relationship with men by angels which must be worshipped."³⁶ Paul points out that "in him" (i.e. Christ) the whole fulness of deity dwells bodily."³⁷ To the Ephesians St. Paul also says³⁸ :-

"That you may be filled with all the fulness of God."

St. Paul and Marqah are in full agreement that angels have a subordinate position in the economy of God. Paul indicates that world discord is partly due to rebellious angels. In the Sam. Faith the angels occupy an office of service to God; there is never any discord or rebellion. They are "The angels of the Favour."³⁹

The Pax Romana of the 1st and 2nd cent. saw the rise of many diversions in belief. Syncretism of religion had been taking place, by the inclusion of esoteric elements; in no small measure, due to a meeting of Greek, Jewish and Oriental systems of thought, especially in Asia Minor and the Levant. Gnosticism of the 2nd cent. was not a development occurring overnight. St. Paul's epistles afford evidence of Gnostic ideas already being paraded in Asia Minor. Pagan mythology, Greek philosophy, sometimes combined with elements from Judaism, produced esoteric systems which promised Salvation to carefully prepared initiates. Angels (or aeons) played a very prominent part in a number of these systems. Marqah is emphatic when he refers to God as (C.p.24):-

"God of all angels,"

possibly suggesting thereby that there was no room for reactionaries.

It is clear from the Defter that in cent. succeeding

the 4th, a belief in angels continued to be accepted by the Sam.. Ab-Hisdah (Abul-Hasan) of Tyre (11th cent.; C.p.70) says:-

"And all the Holy angels are ever exalting Thee."

Ed-Dustan (C.p.69) writes:-

"God created the heaven and the earth enduring are they for ever, one for the use of angels, the other for the use of mortals."

Ed-Dustan is not here shown to be an orthodox Sam. for the world, they believe, is to be destroyed. As heaven is for the use of angels, and the Sam.⁴⁰ never affirm that men eventually become angels after death, a resurrection of mortals seems to be excluded. Ab-Gelugah (12th cent.; C.p.77) alludes to:-

"The Abode of angels."

The evidence indicates that the Sam. appear always to have had a belief in angels. Beyond the fact that they exist, and are subordinate to God, the Sam. has not given any further consideration to angelology. Neither are there any evil angels.

Brown⁴¹ in "The Service for the Eve of the Sabbath" quotes in extenso Gen. 1.24- 11.7 in which he states:-

"And God said: Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."

But the Sam. Recension says:-

"And the angels of God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."

That the Sam. recension deviates from the M.T. may be due on the part of the Sam. to avoid anthropomorphisms.

The third hymn of Abisha b. Phinehas (C.p.511) in the Atonement Hymnal gives a very full picture of Sam. eschatology. When the people or spirits come forth on the Day of Vengeance (C.p.516),

"The assembled angels will go forward one by one from the upright people enquiring about one thing and another."

It is to be observed here that the angels do not judge. Their function is similar to that of the angels in the Book of Revelation. They are there to assist, and to help forward the purposes of God. Abisha upholds the 4th cent. writers point of view with regard to angels, while he has little or no place for a belief in Demons. But while angels have no names in the Defter, Abisha does mention a name or two. He has a MALIFUT (C.p.489) in which he says:-

"The holy Kebala preserves us by his glory."

Kebala is the name of an angel.⁴² M. Gaster⁴³ says of the Sam. belief in angels:-

"They know two or three, and speak of a fourth, whom they call Kebala."

The word Kebala is a hapaxlegomenon and occurs in Num.iv.20, which the Sam. receive as:-

"They shall not enter the sanctuary lest they see Kebala of the Holy of Holies and die."

On another occasion (C.p.698) Abisha writes:-

"The prophet (i.e. Moses) whose pillars were Penuel and Kebala."

Kebala would seem to be the most frequently mentioned angel in the Liturgy. Kebala is mentioned again (C.p.494):-

"Thus shall the cloud continually be Kebala, the secret at the top of the rock."

As used here Kebala would appear to retain the primitive idea of "covering up."⁴⁴

Abisha (C.p.500) writes:-

"And she conceived, the children struggled together within her (Gen.xxv.21-22); From the one a rank, and from the other a rank was established; The four angels, and Moses, and the priests."

From other sources it can be ascertained that the names of this hierarchy of four angels are Kebala, Penuel, Anusa and Zilpah.⁴⁵ M. Gaster⁴⁶ writes:-

"And in the Asatir we find the elements being represented by angels, the angel of fire, water, wind, etc."

An examination of Abisha's works shows that the quarternity motif is often uppermost in his mind. He mentions (C.p.510) that the Creator made use of the four elements, fire, spirit (air), earth and water. It may well be that the four named angels are representative of the four elements. As Man is held to have been formed out of the four elements by

God (cf. Abraham Ha-qabasi; 16th cent.; C.p.708), the link between "The four angels, and Moses and the priests," (C.p.500) can now be established. How else can Abisha maintain that Jacob was the ancestor not only of Moses and the priest, but also of the four angels? God created angels as distinct from mortals. The Pentateuch⁴⁷ however does record that the angels (sons) of God took wives of the daughters of men. Abisha might be implying that there is a connection between "Moses and the priests" and "the four angels," by virtue of the common denominator of the four elements. St. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians⁴⁸ makes mention of those who were slaves to the elemental spirits (Stoicheia) of the universe, where it is hard to distinguish between the "natural" elements, and that of "supernatural" spirits. II Peter⁴⁹ speaks of the elements (Stoicheia) which will be "dissolved" or "melt" with fire, where the emphasis is on the "natural" aspect.

R.M. Grant⁵⁰ says:-

"In post-exilic Judaism we first encounter the archangels of God."

Their number varied; 7, 6 or 4. Three archangels are mentioned in the O.T.; Michael, Gabriel and Raphael. In I Enoch the fourth is Uriel, sometimes Phanuel. In the Dead Sea War Scroll⁵¹ the names of four occur; Michael, Gabriel, Sariel, and Raphael. The Gnostic Ophites named four, Michael, Sariel, Raphael and Gabriel. While the

Sam. name four angels, they are not considered as archangels.

There is an ancient tradition which affirms that it was an angel who handed the tablets to Moses, and not God. Ample evidence is to be found in the 4th cent. Defter that God handed the two tablets directly to Moses without an intermediary (C.pp.51, 56, 59). What then does Abisha mean to imply when he writes (C.p.508):-

"In the midst of it an angel, who had in his hand a tablet, written with the hand of him who gave it to him - written by the finger, not by the hand. He greeted him and said, 'Let there be to you a goad.' At that hour Moses rose and worshipped."

The Sam. are insistent that the tablets were written by God, "with the finger," and given by Him to Moses. Is Abisha here aware of another tradition? Or can it be that God is not only conceived as an angel, but that this angel might have the name Kebala? In the third hymn of the Atonement Hymnal written by Abisha he once again mentions (C.p.511):-

"Kebala, the secret of the Name, according to the secrets of the Name of the Lord."

What evidence is there for God being looked upon as an angel? In the Pentateuch⁵² God is "the angel who has redeemed me from all evil."

The Defter (C.p.83) quotes this passage:-

"Yahweh the God who hath been my shepherd
all my life unto this day, the angel who
hath redeemed me from evil."

R.M. Grant⁵³ refers to the belief of the Gnostic Saturninus
that:-

"The world was created by seven angels
(including the God of the Jews)."

Grant⁵⁴ describes the Gnostic system found in the book of
Baruch, composed by a certain Justin, in which "the tree of
life" is the chief of the angels who resembles Elohim.
His name is Baruch (blessed). According to Grant⁵⁵
Irenaeus regarded Baruch as the name of God.

R. Mcl. Wilson⁵⁶ points out that the angels or semi-divine
beings in Greek Philosophy are called "Heroes." Gesenius⁵⁷
in translating Abul-Fath's hymn into Latin rather
remarkably writes:-

"Heros heroum! Qui omnes heroes subigis,
Tue vinces hostem, Subiges eum magnitudine
roburis tui,"

which, in the days of Seneca (c.4 B.C. - 65 A.D.) would
have suggested that God was an angel, or at best a demi-god.

The conclusion is that Abisha continues to uphold the
Sam. doctrine of a belief in angels; that there are four
who are pre-eminent; two of which he names Kebala and
Penuel in the Sam. Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy.

In his four hymns in the Pentecostal Series (C.pp.366,
368, 375, 410) which deal mainly with Moses, Abisha makes
frequent reference to angels. Abisha has a dream, and is

describing the scene on Mount Sinai. Angels pre-dominate, after God and Moses. Angels ascended and descended; glorious angels; the host of angels. The hosts of angels fly at the command of God to meet Moses with love. They surround him and say, "This is he whom God chose." Abisha mentions four occasions in which the angels surround Moses. They recount all the glories of his greatness. They call him, prophet, priest and prince of Time. They ascribe to him an attribute only given to God when they say, "O Thou (i.e. Moses) with whom there is no second, O son of Jochebed." Moses is referred to as "The tree of life in the midst of the garden." It has been suggested that Abisha, when he wrote his eschatological hymn (C.pp. 511 - 519), may have been influenced by the Book of Revelation.⁵⁸ It may also be that he was impressed by the position which the tree of life has in that book. However the tree of life has figured prominently in other writings, and is found in the Gnostic system of the book called Baruch.⁵⁹ In this Gnostic system Elohim desires a female named Eden. The text used in support of this view is the one which the Sam. make use of; "Elohim planted a garden in Eden."⁶⁰ The garden is the totality of twenty-four angels; twelve resemble their father; twelve resemble their mother. The tree of life is the chief of the angels, who resembles Elohim. His name is

Baruch (blessed). In the Pentateuch⁶¹ Elohim is called an angel.

It is not easy to understand what Abisha means when he said (C.p.367):-

"The glory was standing upon the throne."

In the history of Gnosticism it is known that Simon Magus replaced Dositheus as "The standing one" (Ho Estos).⁶²

Having so much to say about angels, and taking such a great interest in angels, it would not be out of place for Abisha to have been influenced by the Book of Revelation in which angels are a conspicuous feature or by some Gnostic treatise such as Baruch, for while Gnostics refer to aeons and not angels, the terms could be looked upon as synonymous in their respective milieu. The various references which Abisha makes regarding Moses naturally brings to mind The Book of Revelation. The tree of life, for example, is mentioned three times in Revelation.⁶³

Abisha continues to give prominence to angels in his hymns in the Liturgy of Zimmut Pesah, and Zimmut Sukkot, Especially is this so in the KIME (C.p.430). Having postulated that the Creator, "thus created and established everything by His command," he writes:-

"And Kebala made the heaven of heavens
for His holiness."

It is true that the expression "The heaven of heavens" is to be found in the Pentateuch.⁶⁴ It is found also in the

Defter (C.pp.58, 59, 60). But the expression "The heaven of heavens" began to be defined, so that, as matter came to be thought of as evil, especially by those gnostically inclined, the Supreme God in the essence of His purity became remote from the world. Men began to think in terms of heavens, firmaments, spheres and circles. Maimonides⁶⁵ for example refers to the "ninth sphere." The Gnostics believed that the Supreme God did not create the world. They held that creation was the work of angels or aeons, one of whom was called the Demiurge, whom they identified with Yahweh of the O.T. It is likely that the germ of this idea emanates from Plato's Timaeus where "God is represented as not creating, but as informing the world, as a potter does not create but informs the clay he moulds."⁶⁶ Cerinthus, a Gnostic, taught that the world was not created by the Supreme God. Basilides explained creation by a theory of downward emanations from the Divine. This world was formed by angels of the lowest or 365th heaven. God was aloof from this world and unknown. Valentinus believed in a Supreme God, and a Demiurge who created the world. Marcion also upheld a similar distinction. What has Abisha really in mind? Is he suggesting that an angel also made "the heaven of heavens" for God's holiness? Or that Kebala by being a mysterious and unknown expression best serves as the correct attribute of

God? Basilides, who affirmed that this world was formed by angels of the 365th heaven, also stated that God could only be defined in negative terms. He is "the God who is not."⁶⁷ As Abisha uses Kebala, he almost implies that he is "the angel who is not." Altogether Abisha mentions Kebala six times in the Liturgies (C.pp.430, 489, 494, 508, 511, 698). Elsewhere Solomon b. Tabiah (19th cent.) mentions him once (C.p.354), while Joseph ha-Rabban (16th cent.) refers to:-

"The God of Kebala" (C.p.652).

The Sam. do not accept the tradition that the angels created the world, although very early Gnostic teaching - probably rife in Samaria, a home of Gnosticism - held that Yahweh was one of the seven angels who created the world. In the Kime (C.p.430) while:-

"He (i.e. Kebala) raised up there a habitation, and established it in his holiness," - "The angels of the Lord were standing there; these being the priests, the ministers of His holy place."

It therefore seems by analogy that as "angels" are designated "priests" so God is designated as "Kebala." Kebala is used as a mysterious hapaxlegomenon suitable as a description of God because of its vagueness.

Abdullah b. Solomon in his hymn, "The Hymn of the Birth of Moses" (C.pp.746 - 753) mentions the presence of angels at the birth of Moses and referred to as

"The hosts of the Holy One."

The circumstances narrated are almost identical with those obtaining in the story of the birth of Jesus Christ.⁶⁸

Abdullah mentions:-

"And the day of his (i.e. Moses) birth was celebrated with rejoicing among the angels."

In his introduction Green⁶⁹ has occasion to refer to

"The God of spirits." He says:-

"Though this (i.e. the above epithet) is nowhere amplified in the liturgy for the Feast of Tabernacles, it does indicate Samaritan belief in angels, though they clearly play a minor role as far as the Feast of Tabernacles is concerned, and there is no identification of the angels."

Should this opinion of Green be accepted, then another piece of evidence is removed from those who would hold that the spirits are those of people who have died. But the Pentateuch⁷⁰ leans the other way, referring to God as:-

"The God of the spirits of all flesh."

The M.T. (Eccles.xii.7) affirms that after the death of a man:-

"The dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit (Ruah) shall return to God who gave it."

On the other hand Man is never conceived of in the Semitic mind as an "Angel." Indeed as God is referred to as an Angel,⁷¹ Man can safely be excluded from that category. Therefore the epithet "The God of spirits," does not

necessarily imply Sam. belief in angels. In the Day of Vengeance, on Mount Gerizim God is to judge with "Angels as his witnesses" (C.p.238) not spirits. Incidentally the translators of the Greek of Hebrews⁷² had to face the same issue with regard to the Greek word Pneumata :-

"Of the angels he says, 'Who makes His angels winds (spirits?), and His servants flames of fire.'"

Even in the 19th cent. there is a hesitancy to give a clearer definition to Kebala, for Solomon b. Tabiah (C.p.354) writes:-

"There came down upon Mount Sinai
myriads of angels - Kebala and his hosts."

When the Early Church Fathers stated that the Sam. did not believe in angels, they were probably passing judgement on a particular sect of the Sam. It is known that heterodox sects such as the Dositheans existed. The evidence afforded by the Defter leaves one in no doubt about a belief in angels in the 4th cent. and onwards.

Montgomery⁷³ states:-

"We thus observe that Samaritanism by no means followed the extreme development of angelology and diabolology, and has been able to withstand the doctrines of Islam in this field."

Following on a belief in God, the Muslims affirm a belief in angels.⁷⁴ The existence of angels is a necessary postulate in the Quran, and "he is reckoned an infidel who

who denies there are such things."⁷⁵ They, like the Sam., have names for four angels; Gabriel (sometimes considered to be the Holy Spirit); Michael, the friend and protector of the Jews; Azrael, the angel of death; and Israfil, who will sound the trumpet at the resurrection.

The Sam. do not designate an angel of death. Cowley⁷⁶ however without reference says:-

"Finally there is a destroying angel, Mehablah, who corresponds somewhat to Satan."

The Jews were aware of, and mention the angel of death.⁷⁷ The angel of death occurs very often in rabbinic literature in which he is identified with Satan. Another tradition holds that there are several angels of death. It is to be noted that although the Sam. name four angels, they do not follow Judaism or Islam in having a named angel of death. Sale⁷⁸ affirms that the whole doctrine of angels Muhammad and his disciples borrowed from the Jews. The ancient Iranians held to a belief in angels, and the Jews may have been influenced partly or in full from this source.

Memar Marqah⁷⁹ says:-

"Three such angels appeared to Abraham and announced tidings to him."

Some of the Muslim commentators pretend that there were twelve, or nine or ten in number.⁸⁰ The Muslims who hold to the scripture tradition of three angels, name them,

Gabriel, Michael, and Israfil. It is here suggested that the Muslim tradition of twelve, nine (eight?) and ten angels may have its root in the Aeons theory of the Gnostic Valentinus where there is a reference to the Dodecad, Ogdoad, and Decad, all being in the Pleroma. Closely associated with a belief in angels by the Muslims, is a belief in Jinns. These are an intermediate order of creatures, and the Muslims are taught by the Quran to believe in them. The Sam. however never re-acted to this particular doctrine. If there is no trace in the Sam. Faith of a belief in guardian angels⁸¹ there is too no belief in an advanced demonology. Indeed in Sam. literature it is hard to find a reference to Satan or to Belial.⁸² The Muslims believe in Satan or the Devil, whom Muhammad named as Eblis, and who was once one of those angels, who fell, for refusing to obey God, and whose name originally was Azazil.⁸³ Guillaume,⁸⁴ when referring to Jinn says there are good and bad ones; the bad ones being called "Satans." Their leader, he says is "the Satan" or Iblis (a form of the Greek diabolos or devil).

The Muslims go further and appoint angels over hell fire. There are nineteen of them so appointed⁸⁵. The Sam. in their eschatology did not develop their concept of hell fire until the 14th cent. (according to the evidence available and examined). Even then they did not ascribe to

angels any specific function apart from that of being witnesses on the day of Judgement.⁸⁶

The conclusion is that the Sam. were very conservative in their doctrine on angels, accepting their existence as proved by the Pentateuch, and not following the lead given by Judaism or Islam in this matter.

2. DEMONOLOGY

A general examination of the field of Sam. belief shows that they had little place for demons. Montgomery⁸⁷ points out that there are but few allusions to evil spirits in the literature. It can also equally be shown that they do not give prominence to good spirits. Montgomery states that Petermann⁸⁸ learned orally that the Sam. considered as devils: Azazel, Belial, Jasara (the hornet), and also ranked in the same class the Cainites, and the Nephilim. So the Sam. did not blindly follow Jewish development in the matter of angelology and demonology. The Sam. conception of angels has remained simple, having avoided even a belief in guardian, and good angels.

Sin or disobedience is due to the "evil imagination" of Man (Gen.vi.5). For example there is no development of demonology in connection with the serpent.⁸⁹ The serpent is mentioned on occasion in the Sam. liturgies, but not too

frequently. In the Defter all that Marqah can say about the serpent is (C.p.19):-

"He closed the mouth of the serpent,
for that it destroyed life."

M.M. makes a few allusions to the serpent, especially in regard to the death of Moses. Moses says⁹⁰:-

"Today I depart from the world and die.
I am purchased by the word of the serpent,
taken up through the eating of Eve, pledged
through the action of Adam."

Moses adds later⁹¹:-

"The Divine Favour will be hidden from
you: You will walk in the way of the
serpent."

While the Sam. do not subscribe to a doctrine of Original Sin, there can be little doubt but that M.M. associates the death of Moses with what transpired in the Garden of Eden.⁹² The Sam. do not concentrate on the serpent incident too much, for they never dwell on the question of Original Sin. Comparatively little is made of the fall of Adam in the Sam. hymns. In this matter they are almost Pelagian⁹³ in outlook, sin being in no small measure, not only due to disobedience, but to ignorance or lack of knowledge; this more so than moral turpitude. It may be that as Man errs mentally rather than morally, so there is little said about temptation and evil spirits. Man is not so much tempted into sin as being ignorant of the Law.

Thomson⁹⁴ states, after mentioning the basic tenets of the Sam. Creed ending with the Day of Vengeance and Recompense,

"To this is to be added the doctrine of angels and demons."

This rather overstates the case, for such a doctrine is never given the status of ever being associated with the Creed. In any case the statement is inaccurate for the Sam. have no doctrine of demons.

Nutt⁹⁵ mentions that the evil spirits are descendants of Cain, and that the Nephilim⁹⁶ are evil angels. The Sam. do not make a point of emphasizing the evil side of the nature of either of them.

As the connection between demons, and the spirits of the departed, is often a common feature in the evolution of religious beliefs, the fact that the Sam. had so little to say about the departed may account for their belief in demons not being over strong. On the other hand, there is evidence in the O.T. of a belief in the presence of demons, which have been classified into theriomorphic demons, and anthropomorphic demons. Under the heading of demons in animal form (theriomorphic) are the Seraphim⁹⁷; the Se'irim;⁹⁸ Azazel⁹⁹ and Robetz.¹⁰⁰ The Seraphim were demons in serpent form, which, because of their bite, were "the burning ones." On one occasion at least they

reached the status of angelic beings.¹⁰¹ The Se'irim were the "hairy ones" and took the form of goats. These originally had been gods, having had their own sanctuaries and priests, but had been degraded to demons. Robetz some consider to have reference to the Assyro - Babylonian demon Rabitzu, which means the lurker. The data suggests that Azazel¹⁰² was originally a god of the flocks. He later became degraded as a demon of the waste. Finally, in the Book of Enoch he became identified with the author of all evil. He was never a demon in animal form himself, but was always associated with the Scape-goat. There are also anthropomorphic demons in the O.T. which the Sam. never consider, such as Lilith, the night-monster¹⁰³; Aluqah, a flesh-devouring ghoul;¹⁰⁴ "The pestilence that walks in darkness" (The Babylonian demon Namtar?) and "The destruction that wastes at noonday" (The Babylonian demon Nergal?), both from Ps.xci.6. What then is the evidence to be derived directly from Sam. sources?

The only evil influence mentioned in the Defter is of Belial.¹⁰⁵ In that part of the Defter known as the Durrán, and ascribed to Amram Darah¹⁰⁶, mention is made of the Sabbath, in reference to which:-

"Belial is driven from it and blessings have charge of it, by the command of the God of old."

That Belial is the name for the devil in the Defter,

occasions no surprise, for this name is mentioned in the Pentateuch.¹⁰⁷ In the N.T. it is spelt Belial or as some Mss. have it, Beliar. Others prefer Belian or Beliab. The variation occurs only in the ending of the name, b, l, n, or r. The D.S.S. make mention of Belial.

Belial is mentioned in the Sam. Burial Service (C.p.864) where it says:-

"In what should your heart rejoice when you hearken to Belial? And what is after? Brightness, or existence in Abbadon."

Marqah (C.p.55) makes reference to the rare creatures called the Cherubim when he writes:-

"The pot of Manna, and the rod, and the cherubim, are Thy work."

These creatures are placed by God at the east of the Garden of Eden,¹⁰⁸ and as they obey God, they can be considered as not being evil.

In the Defter the only reference to Azazel (C.p.62) is but a statement of fact:-

"Welcome, O Fast day, whereon was given up high two goats for a guilt offering; one for Azazel, and one for Yahweh."

The Malef, which is a late Catechism of the Sam. and therefore post-14th cent. says of Adam, following on question 26:-

"He sinned because of Belial, who was hostile to Adam and his sons."

Belial is described as a spirit without flesh. He was a

spirit like the angels. He entered the serpent. Belial it was who enticed Eve to eat of the tree of good and evil. Belial tempted Eve, for Adam was more perfect in his image and in the Holy spirit.

The Malef also mentions that the Cherubim guard the Tree of life.

It also states that the sons¹⁰⁹ of Belial are descended from Cain.

The theological climate of the Malef is much different from that of the 14th cent. A person, Belial, is now blamed for the sin of Man. He is now known to be hostile to the interests of Adam and his sons, and he motivates the serpent. Marqah in the 4th cent. stated that (C.p.19):-

"He closed the mouth of the serpent,
for it destroyed life."

thereby placing the onus on the serpent.

As the various Gnostic systems stressed that matter was evil, there was little or no occasion to think in terms of a personal devil or Satan. As it is held that the seeds of Gnosticism are likely to have had their genesis in Samaria, it may be that living in the same milieu as Gnosticism the early Sam. felt no urge to develop the philosophy of a personal devil. Nothing much is said about Belial right up to the 14th cent. In the Asatir there is no trace of fallen angels, and no demonology.

Pfeiffer¹¹⁰ states that the Covenanters of Damascus had two names for Satan, Belial and Mastema, and that is the case in Jewish literature in apocryphal times. Belial (or Beliar) occurs in Jubilees, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Martyrdom of Isaiah, and the Sibyllines (iii.63). Mastema also occurs in Jubilees. In Judith¹¹¹ the expression Betomestham occurs. This has been interpreted to mean Beth-Masten, "The house of the Devil," and is considered to be a pseudonym for Samaria. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (140 - 110 B.C.) the prince of the evil spirits is Beliar. Beliar, the counterpart of God, is a real person; he will eventually be bound¹¹² and cast into the fire for ever.¹¹³ Pfeiffer points out that it is interesting to note that Beliar is cast into the fire by the Messiah descended from Levi. He also states¹¹⁴ that the Messianic era, on this earth, following the general resurrection, the last judgement, and the punishment of Beliar, will consist of an eternal residence of the saved in Eden, and the New Jerusalem.¹¹⁵ Cecil Roth¹¹⁶ says that a fragment of a florilegium found in the Fourth Cave mentions Belial:-

"And behold a man accursed, a man of
Belial, shall arise to be a snare."

T.H.Gaster¹¹⁷ in the translation of the Book of Hymns of the Dead Sea Sect shows that Belial is mentioned in the third

hymn. Indeed Belial is mentioned in the Manual (1, 18, 23 - 24), and in the Zadokite Document (iv. 13, 15; v.18). In the Wars of the Sons of Light it occurs passim. The word Belial is also found in the Didache (xxi.3). Another epithet for Belial is that of "The spirit of darkness."

Demonology among the Sam. is inchoate. While the Sam. do not deny the existence of evil powers, they do not make a point of always emphasizing either their existence or their potency. M. Gaster¹¹⁸ says:-

"The only name known to the Samaritans is that mentioned by them as Belial, who is believed to be the power which caused Eve to disobey the command of God."

It would seem, however, that this view comes rather late. The Deifter does not lay any emphasis on Belial for sins committed. When he is mentioned (C.p.45), he is driven forth from the Sabbath and its blessings. The next significant reference occurs in the Sam. Burial Service (C.p.864) in which Belial, if hearkened to, would place one in Abbadon. It will be recalled that the Malef, which is late, has a developed teaching on Belial. As the Sam. in the 4th cent. must have been aware of Gnostic influences where matter generally was evil, and not men or powers, it could well be that Sam. leanings were towards Gnostic opinions, rather than identified with the Jews and Christians in their beliefs about Belial, and in placing the source or cause for evil upon him.

Brown in compiling his thesis made use of material not only from Cowley, but also from the Jaffa Ms. of Leeds University. He¹¹⁹ quotes a prayer of Abraham b. Joseph ha-Gabazi (16th cent.; J.Ms.p.279) where Belial is mentioned as being banished from the Sabbath. He does not mention why, except that God made the day holy and glorious, and that He made it an Israelite garden. Belial would therefore seem to be likened to the serpent that was driven forth after being cursed by God.¹²⁰

N O T E S

ANGELOLOGY AND DEMONOLOGY

1. ANGELOLOGY

1. Ex. iii, 2.
2. Gaster.M. The Sam. p.78
3. Montgomery.J.A. op.cit. p.215
4. Green.Samuel G. op.cit. p.251
5. ditto
6. Nutt.J.W. op.cit. p.45
7. Nutt.J.W. op.cit. p.48
8. cf. Also M.M.
9. Nutt.J.W. op.cit. p.46
10. cf. Perowne.Stewart, Hadrian, p.166
11. Montgomery.J.A. op.cit. p.269
12. cf. Marqah (Cowley. pp. 19, 20, 21).
13. Montgomery.J.A. op.cit. p.210
14. Nutt.J.W. op.cit. p.69 (Note)
15. Gen. vi, 2.
16. Jude i, 6.
17. op.cit. p.414
18. M.M. Book I.
19. Nutt.J.W. op.cit. p.125
20. op.cit. p.124
21. Acts vii, 53.
22. Gal. iii, 19
23. Heb. ii, 2.
24. Green.Samuel G. op.cit. p.251
25. Gaster.M. The Sam. p.78
26. cf. M.M. Book IV. Par.12. "The Angels of Wrath."
27. op.cit. Vol.II, p.xxii
28. Bowman,J. L.U.O.S. Vol. p. 51
29. op.cit. p.49
30. cf. M.M. Book IV.Par.12. "The Day of Resurrection for all Men."

31. Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans, p.122
32. Rom. viii, 38; Eph. i, 21; vi, 12; Col.ii, 15.
33. Clogg,F.B. An Introduction to the New Testament. p. 83.
34. Col. ii, 18.
35. Col. ii, 8.
36. Clogg,F.B. op.cit. p.84
37. Col. ii, 9.
38. Eph. iii, 19.
39. M.M. Book IV. Par.12
40. cf. M.M. Book V. Par. 3. says of Moses:- "He ascended from human status to that of the angels."
41. op. cit. pp. 38 - 39.
42. Nutt.J.W. op.cit. p. 69 (Note 1).
43. Gaster.M. The Sam. p. 78
44. Gaster.M. The Sam. p. 78
45. cf. Nutt.J.W. op.cit. p. 69 mentions Fanuel (Gen.xxxii, 31), Anusa (Ex.xiv, 25), Cabbala (Num.iv, 20), and Nasi (Ex. xvii, 15).
46. op. cit. p.78
47. Gen. vi, 2.
48. Gal. iv, 3, 8-9.
49. II Pet. iii, 10, 12.
50. Grant.R.M. op.cit. p.43
51. Dupont-Sommer,A. op.cit. p.183
52. Gen. xLviii, 15-16.
53. Grant.R.M. op.cit. p.16
54. Grant.R.M. op.cit. p.19
55. Grant.R.M. op.cit. p.42
56. Wilson.R. McL. op.cit. p.240
57. Gesenius,Guil. op.cit. Hymn V, verse 3.
58. Revelation xx - xxi.
59. Grant.R.M. op.cit. p.19
60. Gen. ii, 8.

61. Gen. xLviii, 15-16.
62. Grant,R.M. op.cit. p.90
63. Revelation ii, 7; xxii, 2; xxii, 14.
64. Deut. x, 14.
65. Friedlander,M. op.cit. p.28
66. Joad.C.E.M. God and Evil. p. 49
67. Whitham,A.R. op.cit. p.106
68. Luke ii, 13 - 15.
69. Dissertation, p. 109.
70. Num. xvi, 22; xxvii, 16.
71. Gen. XLviii, 15-16; C.p.83.
72. Heb. i, 7.
73. op.cit. p.219
74. Sale.George, op.cit. p.55
75. Sale.George, op.cit. p.56
76. Cowley.A.E. J.Q.R. viii, p.571.
77. Ginzberg, Louis, Legends of the Jews. Vol.I, 305, 306.
78. op.cit. p.56
79. Book I, Par.1. cf. Gen. xviii, 2.
80. Sale.George, op.cit. p.165
81. cf. Montgomery,J.A. op.cit. p.221
82. M.M. Book IV, Par.12. "Sons of Belial."
Book V , Par. 2 "Sons of Belial."
Once only in the Defter; C.p.45.
83. Sale.George, op.cit. p.56
84. Guillaume,Alfred, Islam, p.65
85. Sale.George, op.cit. Chap.Lxxiv, p.430
86. cf. M.M. Book I, Par.11. "Pharaoh entered and the
angels punished him."

2. DEMONOLOGY

87. Montgomery,J.A. op.cit. p.219
88. cf. Nutt.J.W. op.cit. p.69
89. Gen. iii.

90. M.M. Book V, Par.2.
91. ditto
92. Gen. iii.
93. Griffith Thomas,W.H. op.cit. p.155
94. Thomson,J.E.H. op.cit. p.175
95. Nutt,J.W. op.cit. p.69
96. Gen. vi, 4.
97. Num. xxi, 6; Deut. viii, 15.
98. Lev. xvii, 7.
99. Lev. xvi, 7 - 28.
100. Gen. iv, 7.
101. Isa. vi, 2-3.
102. Once in the Defter (C.p.62).
103. Isa. xxxiv, 14.
104. Prov. xxx, 15.
105. C.pp. 28 and 45.
106. Cowley,A.E. op.cit. Vol.II, p.xxi
107. Deut. xiii, 14.
108. Gen. iii, 24.
109. cf. M.M. Book IV, Par.12
110. Pfeiffer,Robert H. op.cit. p.57
111. Judith iv, 6.
112. Levi. xviii, 12.
113. Judah xxv, 3.
114. Pfeiffer,Robert H. op.cit. p.65
115. Test. of Dan. v, 10-13; cf. Rev.iii, 12; xxi, 2.
116. Roth,Cecil. The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls, p.37
117. Gaster,T.H. op.cit. p.137
118. Gaster,M. The Sam. p.78
119. Brown,S. op.cit. p.146
120. Gen. iii, 14.

P A R T VII

C O N C L U S I O N .

CONCLUSION

Just as the physical features of a country, in no small measure, dictate its economic structure, so also it is possible to estimate the probable factors which could conceivably condition the mentality and outlook of its people. The Sam. were always susceptible with regard to their origin. Over the years they came to adopt a defensive attitude to any criticism that came their way about Sam. origins. It was this criticism, more than any other, that made them keep solely to the Pentateuch, as comprising the complete Sam. Canon of scripture. They held that they were completely orthodox in maintaining fidelity to the Pentateuch; not for them any additions such as the Jewish "Prophets" and "Writings." But as they had an inferiority complex over their origin, it is more than likely that they themselves, as did their opponents the Jews, suspect that their ancestry might be under a cloud. But opposition from the Jews occurred also on other grounds. The Massekheth Kuthim or Tract on the Samaritans¹ states:-

"When shall we receive them?
When they give up their faith in
Mount Gerizim and acknowledge Jerusalem
and the resurrection of the dead."

These charges would be in an attempt to undermine the confidence of the Sam. as to their being true members of the faith. Such accusations would put them on the defensive.

The Sadducees held that the Torah did not afford any evidence whatever for a belief in the Resurrection. The main charges against the Sam. would derive from a Pharisaic source.

Epiphanius wrote the Panarium (374 - 377), his chief work on heresy, in which he quotes 20 heresies before Christ, including the Samaritismi (Sebuaei, Gortheni and Dosithei), but these are only heresies as judged from the standard of the Christian Church.

That the Jews had some cause for doubting the credentials of the Sam. cannot be denied. Antiochus Epiphanes tried to stamp out the worship of Yahweh, and establish the ritual of Greece. On that occasion the Sam. abjured all connection with Israel or its God, and requested that their Temple might be dedicated to Zeus Hellenios. As the source of this criticism is Josephus² it may be that he is biassed against the Sam. so that caution must be exercised here in regard to his criticism.

Moses Gaster³ says of Israel:-

"The worship of strange gods and the imitation of foreign forms of worship seems always to have been the practice of the higher classes. One must always distinguish between the religion of the upper stratum of society, fickle in its ways, and liable to constant change, and the sturdy mass of the population."

Montgomery⁴ makes reference to an Arab geographer,

Idrisi (c.1154) who alludes to the Samiri, a race of

Samaritan Jews inhabiting some islands in the upper part of the Red Sea. He says that they are descended from Jews who worshipped the golden calf in the time of Moses. That the Samaritans are idolators is suggested in the KORAN⁵ where mention is made of Al Sameri, coming from a certain tribe of the Jews called Samaritans, who made the golden calf for the people in the absence of Moses.

In the 4th cent. the Jews made an aspersion declaring that the Samaritans worshipped a dove.⁶ Montgomery⁷ also states that the dispute as to whether the Samaritans were genuine converts or lion-converts was not allayed until the 4th cent. As the dove is a symbol of the Holy Spirit it is possible that they had taken over a Christian church, for the Sam. did persecute the Christians when the occasion arose.

The Sam. would appear to have had the scales of criticism weighed against them, but it is possible that they are the victims of calumny. The Defter does not give any evidence that they in any way deviated from the set norm of the Pentateuch. Such bitter adverse criticism would put the Sam. on the defensive. It is safe to say that they clung desperately to what they had.

Moses Gaster⁸ writes:-

"Their history is tragic, and it is not an easy matter to reconstruct their spiritual life, their inner development, nor the causes which have contributed to the decay and fossilization of the old tradition. They had no impulses from without, and no driving force from within, which could compel them to productivity. Harassed on all sides they were satisfied to remain on the defensive, and to preserve the little that had been handed down to them from their fathers. Dwindling in numbers, they lost heart, and their outlook became more and more circumscribed."

They clung to tradition and the Pentateuch in their desperate attempt to maintain the status quo, for they were so often attacked and shaken by their bitter spiritual enemies, whose attitude is summed up in the words of Jesus the son of Sirah⁹:-

"There be two manner of nations which my heart abhorreth, and the third is no nation; They that sit upon the mountain of Samaria, and they that dwell among the Philistines, and that foolish people that dwell in Sicheim."

The geographical position of the land of Samaria also helped to mould the mental outlook of the people. Samaria was hemmed in by the Great Sea on the West, and although Caesaria was a port in Samaria, the people never became known as a sea-going nation. On the East was the Jordan and Peraea. To the South was Judea and Idumaea, while the Northern part of the country was contiguous with Galilee and Phoenicia. In other words Samaria was a small area of land "cabined, cribbed, and confined," with only a mountain range on the East adjacent to the Jordan, that might protect them in difficult times. The people relied on agriculture

mainly for a living. Crops would be sown in the Spring, never knowing whether they would be harvested, for their land like Judea, formed a bridge with Egypt on one side, and Assyria on the other; a land which separated the Ptolemies from the Seleucids. Invariably armies were on the move, and Judea with Samaria became the route, if not the battle-ground, for the contenders. Life therefore was always precarious, for contending armies tend to rape and to pillage, or else soldiers are billeted on the people. Being a small nation, the people were virtually vassals, and having no king, the High-Priest would act as plenipotentiary. As High-Priest he would tend to envisage any situation in illo tempore in a religious context. Being subordinate to greater military powers than themselves, they lived in an era of Disfavour (PANUTAH). Generally speaking conditions would be such that there was usually more cause for alarm than for jubilation. Depression would describe their outlook, and this mood is so often translated in their hymns and prayers, where the predominating theme is repentance and penitence. By the very nature of circumstances they look to the future; to a return of the days of Divine Favour (RAHUTAH).

Servility, coupled with repressive measures is usually not in the interests of the psychology of the individual or the nation, and this is exemplified by the Sam. people.

They never produced a visionary equal to the Canonical Prophets, and with the exception of a few writers, they never produced works comparable with those found in the Hebrew Canon. This is explained when it is considered that the Sam. tended to be introspective. Cognizant of external circumstances they sought an analysis from within rather than from without. Circumstances on occasion led some of the Sam. to move elsewhere so that they had a Diaspora like the Jews, but even then they never produced a Moses Maimonides. It can safely be said that they were not an extroverted nation. They could not subscribe fully, say, to the Latin motto, "Respice. Aspice. et Prospice ." They certainly looked back on history and past achievements, but always with the Pentateuch for "terms of reference." They looked up, in that they held to the Oneness of God for inspiration. But they did not look forward with any degree of confidence. They were sustained by the possible implementation of God's Favour in the form of a Messianic Era. But they waited passively for this Era; they never acted in a positive way to achieve its realization. In the 14th cent., in spite of the seeming vigour of Abisha b. Phinehas, one cannot deny the introspective trend of Ben Manir, Abdullah b. Solomon and Abisha b. Phinehas. This introspection is exemplified in repetition, of maintaining the status quo of strict

orthodoxy in interpretation, and this, in spite of recognizing the tentative approach of these writers to interpret their belief in the prevailing idiom. The treatment Samaria received over the cent. was, broadly speaking, no different to that meted out to the Jews. But the vigour of the latter is especially shown in the realm of scholarship.

The defensive attitude of the Sam. is indicated by their almost total dependence on the Pentateuch. They never sought to use the Pentateuch as a spring-board of inspiration. The 4th cent. Defter demonstrates how fully the Sam. made use of the Pentateuch, holding it to consist of the Five books of Moses. Rarely is there an attempt at exegesis. They accept the Sam. Pentateuch as a tertium quid, after God and Moses. It is remarkable how two branches of Semitic stock, both possessing an almost identical Pentateuch could react to it in a way almost diametrically opposed to each other. The Jews received it as a real source of inspiration. The Hebrew Prophets show how inspiring it really was. While the Sam. on the one hand seem almost to bury the talent of the Pentateuch, the Jews on the other hand, exploit this talent to the full. The attitude of one people is negative, the other positive. The Jews moved forward with the times, and after the production of the LXX. there was the development of an

exegesis both mystical and allegorical. The Pentateuch, as already indicated, was the source of inspiration of the Hebrew prophets. Among the Sam. practically all their writers were High-Priests or Priests. This led to a difference in emphasis, and therefore of interpretation although it must be said that the Sam. faith does tend to become spiritual with little emphasis on sacrifice. The renaissance of Samaritanism in the 14th cent. may partly have been due to the desire to get back to the Hebrew, the original language of the Pentateuch.

The defensive attitude may also have been due to possible involvement in the disputes of other religions, although there is very little evidence for involvement, even at a distance. It is known that the "Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans",¹⁰ a sentence omitted in a few Mss.¹¹ That the Jews detested the Sam. cannot be denied. "Josephus is hardly to be trusted when he speaks of the Samaritans, whom the Pharisees specially hated."¹² The Rabbis are equally bitter. They accuse the Cutheans (i.e. Samaritans) of lighting false beacons to confuse the reckoning of the New Year. The Pharisees also accused them of saying that Ashima was Elohim. But in point of fact the Sam. observe the Passover more strictly than the Jews, and keep steadfastly to the ordinances of the great fast of Atonement, and all the feasts of the Law. But

knowing how the Jews were ready to bring them into dispute over Sam. credentials, they kept to the letter of the Law, hence their title Shomerim.¹³ It is suggested that while not criticizing the Christian religion, they frame their prayers and hymns in such a way as to suggest that they have the Christians in mind. The Sam. were persecuted under Islam¹⁴; and many were attracted to the New Faith. But as they upheld the Oneness of God they did not become over-involved in disputes with the Muslims. They never resorted to open polemics with other faiths. They defended their beliefs, preferring to be on the defensive rather than to attack.

The Sam. attempt to adhere strictly to the Pentateuch, although they were fully cognizant of thought of other religions. Yet in spite of what Cowley¹⁵ in his article on the Sam. liturgy suggests that:-

"The extent of the Samaritan debt to Jewish literature will become more evident on a careful study of the texts,"

the Sam. resist the tendency to plagiarize from the Hebrew Canon and the Apocrypha. Indeed the urge seems to be away from such sources, so that the Sam. could always avoid the accusation that they copied from those whom they condemn.

It can be said however that the basic truths in the Pentateuch are sometimes clothed in thought-forms not strictly Sam.. Montgomery¹⁶ says:-

"It is true that, as we saw in the Chapter on Samaritan Theology, there are considerable traces of an incipient Gnostic speculation. But all these speculations had their parallel in orthodox Judaism."

He suggests that "Samaritanism, while a debtor to Jewish Kabbalism, never went the whole length."¹⁷ He also quotes Heidenheim as the chief advocate of an extensive Gnosticism existing in Samaritan literature.¹⁸ It must be said that Marqah does make excursions in the direction of Gnosticism, it being possible to see traces of Valentinism or Ophitism.

When the 4th cent. writers were composing their hymns keeping in mind the Pentateuch as "Terms of reference," it is possible to see that they were aware of thought-forms in the Christian field. For example Amram Darah (C.p.28) says:-

"Unique without associate, there is neither second nor consort."

This is in the strict Pentateuchal tradition concerning the Oneness of God. Yet is it not possible that there is an echo here of Nicaea? Marqah (C.p.24) mentions:-

"Light of Light,"

an expression familiar at Nicaea, and later incorporated in the Christian Creed. Eusebius of Caesaria, in Samaria, signed the Nicene Creed, although not over-willing to do so, and his letter accompanying the Creed to his church is very disingenuous.¹⁹ Trotter²⁰ attempts to show that Amram Darah might have been well aware of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Further research may reveal that the letter was

written to the Sam., thus solving a problem that has persisted over the cent.

Of the 14th cent. writers, Ben Manir in one hymn (C.p.649) appears to follow a pattern not unlike that found in the Epistle to the Hebrews,²¹ while generally speaking, he presents his thought in such a way as to recall Moses Maimonides' Guide to the Perplexed.²² Abisha b. Phinehas appears to have a good knowledge of the Book of Revelation, while Abdullah b. Solomon's hymn on the birth of Moses (C.pp.746-753) resuscitates thought-forms found in the first eight chapters of the Johannine Gospel. That the 14th cent. writers were aware of the revival of 12th cent. Kabbalah is brought out clearly by Mattanah Ha-Mizri (C.p.265).

It appears that the Sam. re-acted not unfavourably to the religious interpretations of Islam. This relationship has been discussed by Macdonald.²³

An interesting question is whether the Sam. were cognizant of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and whether there was any affinity between the two spheres of spiritual expression, suggesting an ideological background common to both. Does an examination of the Scrolls lead to the conclusion that they are dependent on a common ideological background, or have they little or nothing in common? Such was the peculiarity of the Sam. mind that up to and including the

14th cent. there is no developed doctrine of the Holy Spirit.²⁴ It is not found in the Pentateuch. But mention is made of the Holy Spirit in the Damascus Document. Dupont-Sommer²⁵ translates:-

"And he made known to them His Holy Spirit,
By the hand of His anointed, and showed
the truth."

In part 7 of the Document²⁶ he translates:-

"And not to defile each man His Holy Spirit."

There is also mention of the Holy Spirit in the Hymn Scroll.²⁷ The Hymn Scroll (ix.35) makes mention of God as Father²⁸:-

"For Thou art a Father to all Thy sons of
truth."

The Sam. do not refer to God as Father.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls "Truth" is often synonymous with the Torah, as with the Mandaeans and Sam.. The Sam. and the D.S.S. both refer to the satanic power as Belial. With the Dead Sea Sect as with the Sam., history is divided into an "Era of Wrath" and an "Era of Favour." In the light of obvious discrepancies the exact relationship of the D.S.S., the Johannine Gospel and the Sam. Mss., will call for further research especially on the part of those scholars who are attracted by the similarity of thought that does occur in these separate spheres.

On balance it would appear that the Sam. are exemplars of extreme conservatism keeping strictly to the Pentateuch

as their final authority, although cognizant of thought-forms of other religions. In matters of comparison and of "coincidences of thought," it is wiser to be cautious than to misconstrue and misinterpret a given situation. It is best to remember what Sutcliffe²⁹ has to say in such a case:-

"In any given age new ideas and new modes of expression pass into currency, and become common property."

As one passes from one Sam. writer to another, one is aware, on occasion, of monotonous repetition, suggestive almost of barrenness of scholarship.³⁰ Conservation ad nauseam may be construed as loyalty and fidelity to tradition and antiquity, but such fidelity should lead to periods of inspiration. The Hebrew Prophets were well versed, one presumes, in the Pentateuch. They assimilated its teaching subjectively. The Pentateuch, for them, was not only a monument of the past, but a sign-post of the future. They read, marked, learned, and inwardly digested the Scriptures. The Sam., for their part, were actuated by perpetuating the thoughts almost in extenso, of previous Sam. writers. The 4th cent. writers became the models of later writers. Indeed there are two prayers (C.pp.81, 82),

"In the style of the Durran, and in the style of Marqah" (C.p.81),

composed by Phinehas the H.P. (1308 - 1363). But when a new concept is introduced succeeding writers tend to follow.

A good example is that of the benediction of "The Hundred Years." It came into prominence in the 14th cent., probably introduced by Ben Manir, or Sa'dallah Al-Kethari, for these appear to be the earliest writers to use the expression, Abisha b. Phinehas and Abdullah b. Solomon used it; and in every succeeding cent. afterwards it is found. This "Hundred Years" theme can be adduced as a proof that the Sam. writers did copy from each other. And although, at the time of its introduction, it was new, it nevertheless does afford an example of how Sam. writers follow very closely in each others' footsteps. It is contended, however, that writers like Ben Manir, Abisha b. Phinehas and Abdullah b. Solomon do introduce new ideas and new modes of expression which pass into Sam. currency, and become virtually Sam. property, but they do so only because, as they believe, such ideas and modes of expression reflect adequately the basic tenets of the Pentateuch.

Nothing is more conducive to maintaining the status quo that persistent persecution, for psychologically people who are persecuted tend to believe that they are so persecuted because of what they stand for, or of their way of life. "Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."³¹ They feel that they must hold on to what they already have. Persistent persecution throws the individual back on what

he already holds to be true, and early disciplines come to the fore once again. They form a sheet-anchor in times of drastic changes. The Sam. were nearly always in a position of subordination suffering at the hands of successive overlords, who would punish them for resistance, or for non-resistance, as the mood took them. The flower of scholarship does not develop in times of stresses and strain. "The Golden Age" of any nation is when that nation appears to be in an "Era of Favour." The Sam. mentality cannot be properly understood without being fully aware of this factor of continuous persecution.

The Renaissance of Sam. scholarship in the 14th cent. with the discarding of Aramaic as the language of the liturgy in favour of Hebrew might have been due to the coming together of the Sam. of Damascus and Nablus. While Bowman holds to this theory, T.H.Gaster, in conversation, thinks there is little to support, as he called it, this "oecumenical" movement. Bowman³² writes:-

"In the 14th century there was a union between the Dosithean and the old priestly party; rather the priestly part absolved the Dosithean."

He suggests that the Dositheans "were willing to come to terms with the old priestly orthodoxy, which later for its part, led by an astute priestly family, was willing to enlarge its conception of what constituted Samaritan orthodoxy, provided priestly position and privilege be

maintained. The old and barren priestly Samaritanism was re-invigorated by the adoption of old heretical ideas, new to them however."³³ It does appear that writers such as Ben Manir, Abisha b. Phinehas, and Abdullah b. Solomon have gone further afield in their reading because of the similarity of their ideas with those prevailing elsewhere. Only future research can prove whether Bowman is right or wrong. At least the change of Sam. outlook in the 14th cent. must have been due to some dynamic perhaps not yet brought to light.

Samaritan mentality is somewhat circumscribed in that the nature of their literary productions is almost confined to the Pentateuch and to themselves. Sam. historians like Abul-Fath concentrate on their own nation; even then they tend to resort to legend. Cowley³⁴ writes:-

"It is true that the chronicles are most bewildering in their inconsistencies, their vagueness, and their disregard of dates, but some definite results can be obtained from them."

This seeming mental atrophy is further borne out by being only concerned with themselves and not with others. If the Sam. had kept records of events from the 13th to the 16th cent. they would have been able to assist in filling in a number of lacunae. Perhaps the same criticism can be made for other cent..

The nature of their literary productions based largely on the Pentateuch and themselves does not match up to the

literary genius of other religions, and other nations. They have made no contribution to art or science. Their recording of facts or of fiction leaves much to be desired. Abisha b. Phinehas has attempted to become master of his art, but here again he has had to overcome, or attempt to overcome, the orthodox Sam. approach. He is recognized by the Sam. as "our Master," because he fits into the pre-conceived pattern as to what constitutes a great Sam. writer. Yet a study of Ben Manir, Abisha b. Phinehas and Abdullah b. Solomon leads to the conclusion that they seem to be looking elsewhere for inspiration to take them out of themselves. There exists an inhibition to express themselves freely.

There is no great Sam. sculpture; no great Sam. music; no great literature whether of prose or poetry; there is no great Sam. painting; no great contribution to Ethics, Philosophy, or Theological meditation. Theirs is a history of arrested development.

An attempt has been made to estimate and analyse the ideological background as exemplified in various Samaritan Mss. and to trace its impact on the three Samaritan writers; to discover, in what way, these writers have been susceptible to external influences, by virtue of their living in an environment conditioned by diverse religious opinions, and philosophical modes of thought. Samaritan studies have acquired an importance, not only in their

own right, but because of the recent discoveries brought to light elsewhere. The more the Samaritan field is surveyed, the more it is likely that its importance for Biblical research will become recognized.

N O T E S

CONCLUSION

1. Nutt, J.W. op.cit. p.172
2. Antiquities of the Jews. xii, 5,5.
3. Sam. Oral Law. p.19
4. op.cit. p.152
5. Sale, George. op.cit. pp.237-238
6. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.321
7. op.cit. p.177
8. The Sam. p.157
9. Ecclus L. 25-26
10. John iv, 9. cf. Ezra iv, 3-6.
11. Souter. Alexander. Codex Sinaiticus (Amended);
Latina Vetus (Vercelli; Verona; Trent, Dublin, London)
12. Murray, John. Illustrated Bible Dictionary. p.778
13. Sale, George. op.cit. p.237 (Note). Selden is of
the opinion that Aaron is designated Al Sameri
(from Hebrew verb Shamar, to keep.)
14. Montgomery, J.A. op.cit. p.126
15. Cowley, A.E. J.Q.R. Vol.VII, p.121
16. op.cit. p.268
17. op.cit. p.268
18. op.cit. p.269
19. Whitham, A.R. op.cit. p.200
20. L.U.O.S. Monograph Series No.1.
21. Trotter. L.U.O.S. Monograph Series No.1; cf. Heb.
Chap.x.
22. Friedlander, M.
23. The Muslim World, Vol.L, No.4, October, 1960,
pp. 279 - 290. Art: "Islamic Doctrines in
Samaritan Theology."
24. cf. M.M. Book I, Par.10; Book II, Par.10.
25. op.cit. p.124
26. op.cit. p.132
27. op.cit. pp. 222 and 233
28. Dupont-Sommer. op.cit. p.233 (cf. p.52)

29. The Monks of Qumran. p.118
30. cf. Nutt,J.W. op.cit. pp.79-80
31. Matt. V, 10.
32. L.U.O.S., Vol.I, p.49
33. op.cit. p.49
34. op.cit. Vol.II, p.xviii.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

OLD TESTAMENT

Gen.	Genesis
Ex.	Exodus
Lev.	Leviticus
Num.	Numbers
Deut.	Deuteronomy
Sam.	Samuel
Neh.	Nehemiah
Ps.	Psalms
Pro.	Proverbs
Eccles.	Ecclesiastes.
Isa.	Isaiah
Ezek.	Ezekiel
Dan.	Daniel
Hab.	Habakkuk

NEW TESTAMENT

Matt.	St. Matthew
Mark	St. Mark
Luke	St. Luke
John	St. John
Acts	Acts of the Apostles
Rom.	Romans
Cor.	Corinthians
Gal.	Galatians
Col.	Colossians
Heb.	Hebrews
Pet.	Peter
Rev.	Revelation

APOCRYPHA

Ecclus.	Ecclesiasticus
Macc.	Maccabees
<hr/>	
Anno Domini	All dates are A.D. except where stated.
Add.	Addition
Art.	Article
Ant.	Antiquities
B.J.R.L.	The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester.
B.C.	Before Christ
b.	Son of
Cowley A.E. The Samaritan Liturgy (two vols.) hereinafter references to this work are given in this form : C. p.	
Ca.	Circa.
Cf.	Confer
Cent.	Century or centuries
Chap.	Chapter
Car. Sam.	Carmina Samaritana.
D.	Died
Ditto	Same
D.S.S.	Dead Sea Scrolls
(Ed.)	Editor
E.G.	Exempli Gratia
Etc.	Et Cetera.

f.	following; following pages
H.P.	High Priest
ibid.	ibidem. In the same place or book.
i.e.	id est.
J.Q.R.	Jewish Quarterly Review
J.J.S.	Journal of Jewish Studies
L.U.O.S.	Leeds University Oriental Society
LXX	Septuagint
L.	Line
Ms(s)	Manuscript(s)
M.T.	Massoretic Text
M.M.	Memar Marqah
N.T.	New Testament
No.	Number
op.cit.	opere citato; In the work cited.
O.T.	Old Testament.
Pent.	Pentateuch
Par.	Paragraph or Section
p(p)	Page(s)
pl.	Plural
R.V.	Revised Version
R.S.V.	Revised Standard Version

S.J.O.T.	Scottish Journal of Theology.
Sam.	Samaritan(s).
Sam. Oral Law	The Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions.
Studies and Texts.	Studies and Texts in Folk-Lore, Magic, Romances, Apocrypha.
Sic.	So, thus; as written or spelt.
The Sam.	The Samaritans (M.Gaster).
Test.	Testament(s).
V.	Verse
Vol.	Volume

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLEGRO, John Marco
The Treasure of the Copper Scroll.
Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
London. 1960.
- ALLEGRO, John Marco
The Dead Sea Scrolls.
Penguin Series.
- AYER . A. J.
Language, Truth and Logic.
Victor Gollancz Ltd.
London. 1946.
- BOWMAN, John.
Early Samaritan Eschatology.
Journal of Jewish Studies.
Vol. vi, No. 2, pages 63-72.
Sept. 1955.
- BOWMAN, John.
The Importance of Samaritan Researches.
Leeds University Oriental Society.
Vol. 1, pages 43-54.
1958 - 1959.
- BOWMAN, John
Ezekiel and the Zadokite Priesthood.
Transactions of the Glasgow Oriental Society.
Vol. xvi, page 6 f.
1955 - 1956.
- BOWMAN, John
Samaritan Chronicle Tolida
University of Leeds, 1955.
- BOWMAN, John
Samaritan Studies, repr. from the Bulletin of
the John Rylands Library, Manchester.
Vol. 40, No. 2, March, 1958.
The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans.
Faith in Samaritan Thought.
Samaritan Law and Liturgy.

BACHER, W.

Qirqisani, The Karaite, and his work on
Jewish Sects.

Jewish Quarterly Review.

Vol. vii.

London, October, 1894.

BOYS. D.J. (A Microfilm)

A Critical Edition and Translation of the
Samaritan Festival Liturgy for Hag Shabuot
with special reference to the use of the Law.
Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leeds, 1956.

BAGULEY. E.C.

A Critical Study and Translation of the
Samaritan New Year Liturgy with a comparison
with the corresponding Jewish Rite.
Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leeds, 1956.
The Malef, Dissertation, University of Leeds, 1961.

BROWN.S.

A Critical Edition of the Translation of the
Ancient Samaritan Defter (i.e. Liturgy) and
a comparison of it with early Jewish Liturgy.
Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leeds, 1955.

BAKAN. David

Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition.
Van. Nostrand Co.
London. 1960.

BROWNE, Lewis

(Ed.) The Wisdom of Israel.
Michael Joseph,
London, 1948.

BAYNES, Charlotte Augusta

A Coptic Gnostic Treatise contained in the
Codex Brucianus.
Cambridge, 1933.

BURROWS, Millar

The Dead Sea Scrolls.
Secker and Warburg,
London, 1956.

BURROWS, GASTER, and BROWNLEE.
The Dead Sea Manuel of Discipline.
London. 1958.

BLACK, Matthew
The Scrolls and Christian Origins.
Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.,
London, 1961.

BUCKLAND, A.R. and WILLIAMS Lukyn A.
The Universal Bible Dictionary.
Religious Tract Society,
London, 1914.

BROWNING, D.C.
Thesaurus (of Peter Roget),
London, 1955.

BOUQUET, A.C.
Comparative Religion.
Pelican Book. A.89.

BOUQUET, A.C.
Sacred Books of the World.
Pelican Book. A.283.

COWLEY, A.E.
Samaritan Liturgy
Vol. i and ii.
Clarendon Press,
Oxford, 1909.

COWLEY, A.E.
Art: Samaritans.
Encyclopaedia Biblica. Vol. iv.
Edited by T.K. Cheyne and J.S. Mack.
Adam and Charles Black,
London, 1907.

COWLEY, A.E.
Art: Samaritans.
Jewish Encyclopaedia.
Vol. x. Page 669.
Funk and Wagnall.
New York and London, 1905.

COWLEY, A. E.

Art: The Samaritan Doctrine of the Messiah.
The Expositor. Vol. i.
London, 1895.

COWLEY, A. E.

Art: The Samaritan Liturgy and Reading of the Law.
The Jewish Quarterly Review,
Vol. vii.
Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1895.

COWLEY, A. E.

Art: The Samaritan Literature and Religion.
The Jewish Quarterly Review.
Vol. viii.
Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1896.

CROWN, A. D.

A Critical Edition and Translation of the
Samaritan Burial Services and a comparative
study of the Related Jewish Liturgies.
M.A. Dissertation, University of Leeds, 1958.

CLOGG, F. C.

An Introduction to the New Testament.
Hodder and Stoughton Ltd.
University of London Press Ltd.,
London, 1948.

CROSS, Frank Moore, Jr.

The Ancient Library of Qumran, (and Modern Biblical
Studies).
Duckworth.
London. 1958.

CARLYLE, Thomas

Sartor Resartus.
Chapman and Hall Ltd.
London, 1888.

CRUDEN, Alexander.

Complete Concordance to the Old and New Testaments.
Religious Tract Society,
London, 1930.

CHAMBERS ENCYCLOPAEDIA.

George Newnes,
London, 1950.

CULLMANN, Prof. O.

The Expository Times,
Vol. Lxxi, No. 2
November, 1959.

CHARLES, R. H.

Eschatology: Hebrew, Jewish and Christian.
(Jowett Lectures, 1898-99).
Adam and Charles Black,
London, 1913.

COHEN, Rev. A.

The Teachings of Maimonides.
Routledge and Sons Ltd.,
London, 1927.

DUPONT-SOMMER, A.

The Essene Writings from Qumran.
(Translated by G. Vermes).
Basil Blackwell,
Oxford, 1961.

DAVIDSON, B.

The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon.
S. Bagster and Sons.
London.

EPSTEIN, Isidore

Judaism: A Historical Presentation.
Penguin Series; London, 1959.

ELIADE, Mircea

Myths, Dreams and Mysteries.
Harvill Press,
London, 1960.

ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA.

Articles.
London, 1950.

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM.

(New Edition). 5 Vols.

E.J. BRILL,

Leiden and Glasgow, 1960.

FRAZER . Sir James

The Golden Bough

(Abridged Edition)

Macmillan and Co., London, 1959.

FITZGERALD . Edward

Omar Khayyam; The Rubaiyat.

and Jami ; Salaman and Absal.

Collins; London and Glasgow.

FRIEDLANDER . M.

Moses Maimonides.

The Guide to the Perplexed.

(Translation from Arabic)

Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd..

GASTER . Theodor H.

The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect.

Secker and Warburg,

London, 1957.

GESENIUS . Guil.

Carmina Samaritana E Codicibus Londinensibus
et Gothanis.

Leipzig, 1824.

GREEN . L.C.

A Critical Edition and Translation of the
Samaritan Feast of Hag Ha-Succoth with special
reference to the Historical Development
involved.

Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leeds, 1958.

GINZBERG . Louis.

The Legends of the Jews. 7 Vols.

The Jewish Publication Society of America,
Philadelphia, 1912.

GRAY , Buchanan G.

Studies in Hebrew Proper Names.
Adam and Charles Black,
London, 1896.

GORE, Charles; Goudge Henry Leighton; and Guillame Alfred.
A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, including
the Apocrypha.
S.P.C.K.; London, 1928.

GIBBON, Edward.

The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.
6 Vols.
Dent. London. 1954.

GRANT , R.M.

Gnosticism and Early Christianity.
Oxford University Press,
London, 1959.

GROBEL , Kendrick

The Gospel of Truth.
Adam and Charles Black,
London, 1960.

GALLOWAY , George.

The Philosophy of Religion.
T. and T. Clark,
Edinburgh, 1914.

GREEN, Samuel G.

A Handbook of Church History.
Religious Tract Society
London.

GRAVES . Robert.

The Greek Myths.
Vols. i and ii.
Penguin Classics.

GOODALL . George (Ed.)
Scripture Atlas.

GUILLAUME , Alfred
Islam.

Pelican Book. A.311.

GASTER, Moses

The Hillukh

An English Translation.

John Rylands Library, Manchester.

GASTER, Moses

Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Tradition.

Vol. i, Eschatology.

London, 1931.

GASTER, Moses

The Samaritans.

(The Schweich Lectures, 1923)

London, 1925.

GASTER, Moses

Studies and Texts in Folk-Lore, Magic, Romances,
Apocrypha.

Vol. i.

GASTER, Moses

The Asatir.

(The Samaritan Book of the Secrets of Moses).

Oriental Translation Fund,

New Series, 1927.

GUILLAUMONT. A.; Puech. H.-Ch.; Quispel. G.; Till. W;
and Masih. Yassah 'Abd Al.

The Gospel according to Thomas.

London, 1959.

HEALING, C. Arnold.

The Old Testament.

Fletcher and Son Ltd.,

Norwich.

HAGUE, Dyson

Through the Prayer-Book.

Longmans, Green and Co.,

London, 1932.

HASTINGS, J. (Ed.)

Dictionary of the Bible.

Articles:- Calendar
Samaritans

Edinburgh, 1910.

HASTINGS, J. (Ed.)

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

Articles:- Samaritans
Mandaeans.

Edinburgh, 1920.

HUMPHREYS. Christmas
Buddhism.

Pelican Book. A.228

IRWIN, C.H.

The Universal Bible Commentary.

Religious Tract Society,
London.

JOSEPHUS, Flavius

Antiquities of the Jews.

(Translated by William Whiston).

G. Routledge and Sons,
London, 1940.

JOAD, C.E.M.

Guide to Philosophy.

Victor Gollancz Ltd.,
London, 1943.

JOAD, C.E.M.

God and Evil.

Faber and Faber Ltd.,
London, 1942.

JALALADDIN. Maulana, Muhammad i Rumi.

Masnavi.

(Translated and Abridged by E.H. Whinfield),
1898.

JUNG ,C.G.

Psychology and Religion.

Vol. xi; West and East.

(Translated by R.F.C. Hull).

Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

KENYON ,Sir Frederic

The Story of the Bible.

John Murray, London, 1936.

KLEIST. James A.

The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and

St. Ignatius of Antioch.

Longmans, Green and Co. London, 1946.

LERNER ,I.

A Critical Investigation and Translation of
the Special Liturgies of the Samaritans for
their Passover and their Feast of
Unleavened Bread.

Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leeds, 1956.

LAKE ,Kirsopp

The Text of the New Testament.

Rivingtons,

London, 1949.

LIDDELL ,H.G. and SCOTT R.

A Greek-English Lexicon.

Oxford, 1864.

LEMAITRE ,Solange

Hinduism.

Burns and Oates,

London.

LOANE ,Marcus L.

Key-Texts in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Marshall, Morgan, and Scott,

London, 1961.

MARTIN , W.J.

Stylistic Criteria and the Analysis of the
Pentateuch.

The Tyndale Press,
London, 1955.

MOULTON . J.H.

An Introduction to New Testament Greek.

Epworth Press,
London, 1941.

MACDONALD . J.

The Muslim World.

Vol. I, No.4, pp.279 - 290, October, 1960.

Art: Islamic Doctrines in Samaritan Theology.

MONTGOMERY , J.A.

The Samaritans.

Philadelphia, 1907.

MACDONALD . J.

A Critical Edition of the Text of the
Samaritan Yom Ha-Kippur Liturgy with
Translation thereof and Comparison
with the corresponding Jewish Liturgies.
2 Vols.

Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leeds, 1958.

MACDONALD . J.

Memar Marqah.
6 Books.

MACDONALD . J.

The Samaritan Doctrine of Moses in Scottish
Journal of Theology.

Vol. 13, No.2, June, 1960, pp.149-162.

MOWBRAY . D.D.W.

A Critical Edition and Translation of Samaritan
Liturgies for the Zimmut Pesah and Zimmut Sukkot
and associated Semi-Festival Liturgies.

Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leeds.

MOORE . G.F.

Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian
Era.

3 Vols.

Harvard U.P.

Cambridge (Mass). 1927-30.

MACDONALD . J.

Comprehensive and Thematic Reading of the Law
Among the Samaritans.

IN Journal of Jewish Studies, June, 1960.

MATTHEWS , W . R.

The Purpose of God.

Nisbet and Co.Ltd.,

London, 1935.

MACKENZIE , John S.

A Manual of Ethics.

University Tutorial Press Ltd.

London, 1950.

MATHERS . S.L.MacGregor

The Kabbalah Unveiled.

London, 1957.

MARROV. Henri

Saint Augustine.

Longmans, Green and Co.Ltd.,

(Men of Wisdom Series).

London.

NUTT ,J.W.

The Samaritan Targum

with an Introduction.

Trubner and Co.,

London, 1874.

NEHER . Andre

Moses and the Vocation of The Jewish People.

Longmans, Green and Co.Ltd.,

(Men of Wisdom Series)

London.

NUNN , H.P.V.

The Elements of New Testament Greek.
Cambridge University Press, 1947.

OESTERLEY , W.O.E. and ROBINSON , T.H.

A History of Israel.
2 Vols.
Oxford, 1932.

OESTERLEY , W.O.E. and ROBINSON T.H.

Hebrew Religion.
S.P.C.K., London, 1930.

OTTLEY , R.L.

The Hebrew Prophets.
Rivingtons,
London, 1937.

OTTLEY , R.L.

The Religion of Israel.
Cambridge University Press,
1905.

OESTERLEY , W.O.E. and ROBINSON , T.H.

An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament.
S.P.C.K. London, 1949.

PAKUDA. Bachya b. Joseph Ibn.

Duties of the Heart.

(1) English Translation by Rev. Moses Hyamson.
Bloch Publishing Co.Ltd.,
New York.

(2) English Translation by Edwin Collins.
John Murray,
London, 1905.

PUECH , H.C.; Quispel. G; and Van Unnik. W.C.

The Jung Codex.

Translated and edited by F.L.Cross.
Mowbrays.

PARKES , James

A History of Palestine from 135 A.D. to
Modern Times.
Gollancz Ltd., London, 1949.

PFEIFFER. Robert H.

History of New Testament Times with an
Introduction to the Apocrypha.
Adam and Charles Black,
London.

PEROWNE , Stewart.

Hadrian.
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1960.

PIERCY. William C.

Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary.
John Murray, London, 1908.

ROLT , C.E.

Dionysius The Areopagite on the Divine Names
and the Mystical Theology.
S.P.C.K. London, 1920.

ROTH , Cecil.

The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls.
Basil Blackwell,
Oxford, 1958.

ROWLEY , H.H.

The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls.
Oxford, 1957.

RYDER Smith, C.

The Bible Doctrine of Salvation.
The Epworth Press,
London, 1941.

ROBINSON , H. Wheeler

The Christian Doctrine of Man.
T. and T. Clark,
Edinburgh, 1947.

ROBERTSON . E.

Essay: Law and Religion Amongst the
Samaritans in Judaism and Christianity.
In Judaism and Christianity,
Vol. iii, Law and Religion,
E.I.J. Rosenthal,
London, 1938.

ST. ANSELM

Cur Deus Homo
Griffith, Farran, Brown and Co.Ltd.,
London.

STRACHAN , R.H.

The Fourth Gospel.
S.C.M. Press,
London, 1941.

SOUTER , Alexander,

The Text and Canon of the New Testament.
Duckworth,
London, 1948.

SANDAY,W. and HEADLAM.A.C.

The Epistle to the Romans.
T. and T. CLARK,
Edinburgh, 1895.

SUTCLIFFE , Edmund F., S.J.

The Monks of Qumran.
Burns and Oates,
London, 1960.

SCHONFIELD. Hugh J.

The Lost "Book of the Nativity of John."
T. and T. Clark,
Edinburgh, 1929.

SCHONFIELD , H.J.

The Bible Was Right.
Geo. Muller, London, 1958.

SPENGLER , Oswald.

The Decline of the West.
Allen and Unwin. London, 1932.

SCHAFF.

History of the Church.

- (1) Anti-Nicene Christianity.
- (2) Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity.

SCHAFF's

Religious Encyclopaedia.

SCHAFF - HERTZOG.

Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge.
New York, 1891.

SALE . George

The Koran

F. Warne & Co.Ltd.,
London and New York.

SLAUGHTER . Frank G.

The Thorn of Arithmathea
Jarrolds. 1960.

SCOTT. C.A.Anderson

Living Issues in the New Testament.
Cambridge University Press, 1933.

SOUTER. Alexander

Novum Testamentum Graece.
(Second Edition).
Clarendon Press,
Oxford, 1947.

THOMSON . J.E.H.

The Samaritans, Their Testimony to the Religion
and History of Israel.
London, 1919.

THOMSON . W.A.

The Land and the Book.
London, 1887.

THOMAS, W.H. Griffith
The Principles of Theology.
Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1930.

TENNANT, F.R.
Philosophical Theology.
Vol. i. The Soul and Its Faculties.
Cambridge University Press, 1935.

THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY,
Vol. iv.
The Eastern and Roman Empire.
Years: 717 - 1453 A.D.

TROTTER, R.J.F.
Did the Samaritans of the Fourth Century
Know The Epistle to the Hebrews?
Monograph Series No. 1.
Leeds University Oriental Society.
October, 1961.

TISDALL, Dr.
The Sources of the Koran.
S.P.C.K. London, 1905.

THE HEBREW BIBLE.
Buchdruckerei Des Waisenhauses.
Halle (Saale), 1937.

THE BIBLE.
The Revised Standard Version
Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.,
Edinburgh, 1957.
The Revised Version
British and Foreign Bible Society,
London, 1938.
The New English Bible.
Oxford University Press,
Cambridge University Press,
1961.
The Septuagint Version.
S. Bagster and Sons Ltd.,
London, 1896.

THE MALEF. E. Baguley. Dissertation, University of
Leeds, 1961.

THE ANALYTICAL GREEK LEXICON.

S. Bagster and Sons; London.

THE APOCRYPHA.

Oxford University Press,
S.P.C.K. London.

THE BRITISH ENCYCLOPAEDIA.

WARDLE . W.L.

The History and Religion of Israel.
Clarendon Press,
Oxford, 1936.

WAXMAN . M.

A History of Jewish Literature From The
Close of the Bible to our own Days.
Bloch Publishing Co.Ltd.,
New York. 1938.

WILSON . R.McL.

The Gnostic Problem.
Mowbray and Co.Ltd.,
London, 1958.

WEECH . W.N. (Ed.)

History of the World.

WHITHAM . A.R.

The History of the Christian Church.
Rivingtons,
London, 1924.

WATERHOUSE . Eric S.

The Philosophical Approach to Religion.
Epworth Press,
London, 1933.

WOODROFFE . Sir John

The Garland of Letters.
(Studies in the Mantra Shastra),
Madras, 1955.

WORDSWORTH . I. and WHITE . H.I.

Novum Testamentum Latine.
Clarendon Press, London and New York, 1911.