

between Nehemia's age and 200 B. C. But in their present state they give room only for speculation. Reference may here be made to Hölscher, *op. cit.* 30, "Die Juden nach Nehemia," who argues that the Book of *Judith* in its geographical data assumes the Jewish control of Samaria in the late Persian period, and that the symbolic act, in *Zech.* 11, 14, of breaking the staff to portend the breaking of the brotherhood between Juda and Israel, refers to the schism. Hölscher would date this event about 300, but the date of *Deutero-Zecharia* is too obscure to be the basis of chronology. In 1 *Ch.* 9, 3, there is an obscure reference to people of Ephraim and Manasse resident in Jerusalem, a family of Shilonites being specified, v. 5. These were doubtless northern Israelites who persisted in devotion to the Jewish sanctuary. To the Chronicler the northern territory is never Samaria, but always the land of Ephraim, ii, 25, 7, or of Ephraim and Manasse, ii, 30, 1. If such Psalms as *Ps.* 80 are to be attributed to the Post-exilic age, some interesting problems present themselves. Cheyne has interpreted the "libations of blood" in *Ps.* 16 of the superstitious practices of the Samaritans, but there is no proof for this against them (see his *Jewish Religious Life*, 29). In *Ps.* 60, 8-14 (*Ps.* 108, 8-14) scholars from Theodore of Mopsuestia down to Cheyne and Duhm have found a reference to John Hyrcanus's capture of Shechem in the words: "I will divide Shechem, mete out the valley of Succoth"; but the friendly reference to Manasse and Ephraim in the following verse militates against this historical interpretation. I may take opportunity here to note the excellent characterization of the Samaritan schism in Stade's most recent work, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, § 147.

## CHAPTER V.

THE SAMARITANS UNDER THE HELLENIC EMPIRE.<sup>1</sup>

At the end of the last Chapter probable references to the relations between the Jews and the Samaritans in the Hellenic age have been anticipated. When we turn now to the political history of Samaria under Hellenism, we find few further data concerning the sect until the age of the Maccabees. It is true that the land of Samaria figures constantly in the wars of Alexander and of the Diadochi. Its capital Samaria rebelled against the conqueror and received exemplary punishment;<sup>2</sup> Eusebius also reports that the city was rebuilt by Perdiccas and subsequently, in 296-5, was again destroyed by Demetrius Poliorcetes.<sup>3</sup> But these facts throw no light upon the Samaritan sect, although it may be presumed that it sorely suffered under the harryings of the land, and that its members, men of the hardy Hebrew blood, were often found among the rebels.

Josephus describes the calamities brought upon Syria and upon Juda in particular by the wars of the first Ptolemy, and records that this monarch carried off many captives from the hill-country of Juda, and the places about Jerusalem, and Mount Gerizim.<sup>4</sup> The result of these Ptolemaic

<sup>1</sup> See Juynboll, *Hist. Sam.* 93; Schürer, *GVV* i; Appel, *Quaestiones de rebus Samaritanorum*, c. i.

<sup>2</sup> Quintus Curtius, *Hist.* iv, 5, 8; Eusebius, *Chron.* ed. Schoene, ii, 114. The statement is rejected by Niese, *Griechische Geschichte*, i, 88, n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Niese also denies this latter datum; *op. cit.* i, 355, n. 6. It may be long, however, to the famous Syrian campaign of 311.

<sup>4</sup> *AJ* xii, 1. Despite the doubts of Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, 43, Josephus is corroborated by Diodorus, *Hist.* xix, 86, who reports

wars and conquests was the connection made between Egypt and the Jews and Samaritans, which brought many of both sects, partly as captives, partly as willing immigrants, to the flourishing land of the Ptolemies and its new metropolis, Alexandria. Josephus also reports that Alexander levied Samaritan troops for service in Egypt.<sup>5</sup> We have thus to date from this period the beginning of the Samaritan Diaspora in Egypt, which enjoyed in the new home a like history, on a minor scale, to that of the great Jewish colony. The historical data for this Samaritan Disapora are given in a subsequent Chapter.<sup>6</sup> Both Jewish and Samaritan records contain accounts of the quarrels which arose in Egypt between the two sects. Josephus, after describing their common emigration to that land,<sup>7</sup> narrates the contentions arising between them as to the proper destination of the sacrifices, whether Jerusalem or Gerizim; probably the remittance of the royal temple-gifts was the cause of dispute. Josephus also gives a legend concerning a disputation between the rival sects held before Ptolemy Philometor (182-146).<sup>8</sup> The spokesman for the Jews was Andronicus ben-Meshullam, the advocates of the Samaritans Sabbæus and Theodosius.<sup>9</sup> The former, who spoke first, argued so convincingly that the king accepted the Jewish plea, and put the Samaritan orators to death. A similar story, evidently borrowed from the Jewish legend, only with fortunes of

that after the battle of Gaza (312) the Egyptian ruler captured the strongholds of South Syria. Abu'l Fath, p. 93, tells of this Ptolemy that he sent one Urudus to seize the temple treasures at Shechem, but that he desisted upon being shown a charter from Alexander the Great ordering those funds to be expended for the priests, widows and orphans. Juynboll, *Hist. Sam.* 98, has rightly identified Urudus with Alexander's brother, Arrhidæus; see further Clermont-Ganneau, in *Journal des Savants*, 1904, Jan., p. 37.

<sup>5</sup> *AJ* xi, 8, 7.

<sup>6</sup> Chapter VIII, § 2.

<sup>7</sup> *AJ* xii, 1.

<sup>8</sup> *AJ* xiii, 3, 4.

<sup>9</sup> Traditional heresiarchs of the Samaritans; see Chapter XIII, § 1.

course reversed, is told by the Samaritan writers.<sup>10</sup> Doubtless such theological disputes were frequently carried on in Egypt, and at times, as when property rights were concerned, the secular courts must have been appealed to.

As for their native land, the Samaritan sect did not possess the numbers and influence enjoyed by the Jews in Juda, and were little able to oppose the Hellenization of Samaria. This tendency was working rapidly enough in Juda, but must have been far more extensive in the North. Hence it is especially necessary from this time on to draw the distinction between the religious sect of the Samaritans, a comparatively small and scattered body, and the citizens of the land, mostly Pagan, those who were civilly Samaritans. The term Samaritan does not necessarily refer to the subject of our present study.

The Samaritan sect at last comes forth into the clear light of day in the Maccabæan period, for which we possess the abundant Jewish sources. The Samaritans played no part in the brilliant war for liberty fought by their Jewish brothers against Antiochus Epiphanes. But of their position toward this struggle we have no certain knowledge. That the mad passion of Antiochus, "the Evident God," affected the northern sect appears from the statement of 2 *Mac.* 6, 2 that the tyrant established not only the cult of Zeus Olympios in Jerusalem, but also that of Zeus Xenios, the Hospitable Zeus, on Mount Gerizim.<sup>11</sup> Josephus gives

<sup>10</sup> *Abu'l Fath*, 94; *Chron. Adler*, 38. Here the Ptolemy is a composition of Philadelphus and Philometer, as Lévi points out, *ad loc.*; he procured translations into the Greek from the learned men of both sects, Eleazar (he of the Aristeas-legend) representing the Jews, and Aaron with Symmachus and Theodotion (the authors of the Greek versions!), the Samaritans; the king's observation of the discrepancies between the two texts of the Law causes him to inquire further, and the Samaritans succeed in convincing him that they are the legitimate body.

<sup>11</sup> According to the usual rendering this epithet was given because of the hospitable character of the natives. (Could the epithet have been suggested by the first syllable of Gerizim, *ger*, i. e., stranger?)

a much more extensive story.<sup>12</sup> He relates that the Shechemites, i.e., the Samaritan sect, under the name of Sidonians,<sup>13</sup> sent a petition to Antiochus, in which, after denying all relationship with the Jews except in the matter of the observance of certain religious customs of the land, they asked the king to allow them to name their temple, "which at present has no name," after Zeus Hellenios. This boon the king granted. On the other hand an obscure statement of 2 Mac. 5, 23 relates that Antiochus placed a governor "in Gerizim," the fact being recorded in connection with the account of the officials sent to suppress the Jews.<sup>14</sup> From this it would appear that the king expected resistance from the Samaritans, so that Josephus's story appears somewhat gratuitous.<sup>15</sup> That the Samaritans took no part in the immortal struggle of the Maccabees is without doubt a fact; probably they bowed before the storm in silence if not with acquiescence. It must be borne in mind that the trouble which came upon the Jews was contributed to by their own factions, and that Antiochus's innovations were a response to the Hellenizing party which had control in Judæa. Nor could we expect that the northern sect would have gone to the assistance of the Jews. But this point is clear that the Samaritans preserved their faith through these troublous times.

But Willrich, *Judaica*, 139, comparing Josephus's narrative, is probably right in translating *ἐρύχσανον* by "they obtained their request."

<sup>12</sup> *AJ* xii, 5, 5.

<sup>13</sup> See Additional Note B.

<sup>14</sup> It is uncertain whether "in Gerizim" refers to a citadel on the mountain, in which case it would be the predecessor of the fortifications constructed there by Christian emperors; or whether it means the district of Shechem in general.

<sup>15</sup> On Josephus's attitude towards the Samaritans, see Chapter IX. De Sacy correctly remarks, *N. et E.* 3: "Il est même certain que si le culte des idoles eût été établi alors parmi les Samaritains, ils n'auraient en rien à appréhender de la fureur d'Antiochus, et n'auraient pas craint de se voir confondus avec les Juifs." That the Samaritans were in opposition to Epiphanes is the view also of the Jewish scholar Appel, *op. cit.* 38.

In the early part of the Maccabæan wars for independence the land of Samaria appears to have been generally avoided by the Jewish armies; it contained the Gentile stronghold of Samaria, while all the classes of the population were antagonistic. Only in the southern districts, where the Jews seem to have settled in the course of their notable expansion, was any part of the land favorable to the new Jewish state. Finally after the conclusion of terms with the Syrian king Demetrius II, three cantons of Samaritan territory were formally annexed to Judæa, Ephraim, Lydda and Ramathaim, *circa* 145. This considerable acquisition pushed the boundary of Judæa far into the interior of Samaria, the limit of Borkeos, which Josephus describes as the boundary in his day, marking probably the extent of the annexation.<sup>16</sup>

With Judæa's outposts now thrust far up into the ancient territory of Joseph, the second generation of the Hasmonean house found itself strong enough to invade the remainder of Samaritan soil, and not only to pay off old scores with the degenerate Syrian kingdom, but also to take vengeance on the weakened Samaritan sect. In the year 128 John Hyrcanus captured Shechem and Mount Gerizim, and subdued the Kuthæan sect,—so Josephus relates,<sup>17</sup> adding the comment that now their temple was devastated after an existence of 200 years. "The Day of Gerizim" commemorated in the Jewish Fast-Roll, the date being Kislew 21, is to be connected with this signal triumph of militant Judaism over its competitor.<sup>18</sup> This success

<sup>16</sup> For the limits between Judæa and Samaria, see Chapter VIII, § 1, and for the annexation of the three cantons, see below, p. 144. To this event is due the legend of Pseudo-Hecateus, quoted by Josephus, *C. Ap.* ii, 4, that Alexander gave the Jews the land of Samaria free of tribute.

<sup>17</sup> *AJ* xiii, 9, 1; *BJ* i, 2, 6.

<sup>18</sup> The Fast-Roll, or *Megillat Taanit*, is given by Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, 439; Dalman, *Aramäische Dialektproben*, 1. The former scholar, pp. 41, 72, hesitates concerning the reference of the

against the Samaritan sect was later followed up by the conquest of the Pagan capital. An expedition under Hyrcanus's sons Antigonus and Aristobulus captured the city of Samaria after a year's siege, and attempted to obliterate even the traces of the city's existence; this happened not long before 107.<sup>19</sup> The conquest was completed by the capture of Scythopolis, which dominated the northern border of Samaria.<sup>20</sup>

Once again the drama of Jewish history operated on Samaritan soil. About the year 88 Alexander Jannæus met the forces of Demetrius III, supported by the rebellious Pharisaic party, in the neighborhood of Shechem, and was there routed.<sup>21</sup> In Josephus's narrative of Alexander's later conquests, after the abatement of the civil strife, the land of Samaria is omitted, so that it is to be inferred that the district still lay under Jewish control. This supposition is confirmed by the fact that when Pompey subjugated the Jews, in the year 63, he greatly reduced their territory; the city of Samaria was specifically detached and annexed

celebration; the glossator to the *Megillat* refers the anniversary to the visit of Alexander to the Jews and Samaritans.

<sup>19</sup> *AJ* xiii, 10, 1-3; *BJ* i, 2, 7; Schürer, *GJV* i, 267.

<sup>20</sup> Abu'l Fath gives more than usual information about this period, p. 102. He relates Hyrcanus's capture of Samaria, but denies that he took Shechem. There is also a confused recollection of the attempted interference in the war by Ptolemy Lathyrus, which was opposed by his mother, Cleopatra, as Josephus relates; but she is confused with the last Cleopatra. (See Vilmar, *Abul Fath*, p. lxiii; Juynboll, *Hist. Sam.* 110.) But the chronicle's most original contribution to the history is that Hyrcanus at the end of his life became persuaded of the legitimacy of the Samaritan cult, and sent to Gerizim tithes and sacrifice, p. 105. This is an evident allusion to the desertion of Hyrcanus by the Pharisaic party and his alliance with the Sadducees. The legend bears a correct recollection of the ancient affinity between the latter party and the Samaritans, and it is a plausible hypothesis that the preservation of the northern sect during this period of absolute Jewish control of Samaria was due to the liberalistic policy of the Hasmonæans to use the Samaritans as a counterweight to the Pharisaic rigorists. Thus it may be inferred that the despised northerners played their part in the fatal internecine strife which now began to rage in the south to Juda's undoing.

<sup>21</sup> *AJ* xiii, 14, 1-2; *BJ* i, 4, 4.

to the new Syrian province.<sup>22</sup> This liberation of Samaria, which, it appears, had arisen from its ashes, involved the release of the greater part of the district from the Jewish usurpation. From this time forth the Samaritan sect is forever free of the hated domination of the sister-sect.

<sup>22</sup> *AJ* xiv, 4, 4; *BJ* i, 7, 7.