

soming of a rich liturgical activity, which has continued to our own time but with accelerating degeneracy. As late as the XVIIIth Century theological literature flourished; we may instance the commentary of Gazal ibn Abu(1) Sarur. Since that time no important work has appeared, a cessation which is symptomatic of the moribund condition of the community.

In the Arabic period the priestly family at Nablus was a school of learning, at least of that very conservative order which perpetuates meagre annals; it was also the home of liturgical composition. But the real intellectual centres of the sect were in Egypt and at Damascus. While the *Toledas* are of native origin, the *Book of Joshua* hails from Egypt; the version ascribed to Abu Said also seems to have been of Egyptian origin.⁸² To Damascus doubtless belonged the grammarian Ibrahim ibn Faraj, at least his scholastic connections would assign him to that city; there also flourished Munajja and the several physician-theologians. This famous centre of Islamic culture became the centre of Samaritan science, as Egypt had been of the Midrashic literature of the sect.

⁸² Juynboll, *Orientalia*, ii, 116; Bloch, *Sam. -arab. Pentateuchüber-*
setzung, 16.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

A. THE NAME "SAMARIA."

The Assyrian form of Shomeron, שֹמֶרֶן, is Samerina, appearing first in Tiglath-pileser's inscriptions (Layard, 66, 18); the Aramaic is Shamerain, the Greek Σαμαρία Σαμαρεία. The relation of the Hebrew form to those given by foreign sources has not yet been explained. The Hebrew *o* in the first syllable is certainly secondary, the foreign renderings preserving the original vowel *a*. As for the final syllable, both *-ain* and *-on* (also *-un*) are frequent terminations in Palestinian place-names, and the two suffixes may be understood as original alternatives of the name. Or *-on* may have arisen from *-an*, the latter by distraction also undergoing a parallel change into *-ain*, *-en*. Winckler has suggested that *-on* (= *-un*) and *-ain* are related to one another as case-endings.

As for the foundation of the city, it must be assumed that the hill of Shemer was an ancient settlement, and that Omri bought from the clan inhabiting it the land he required for his buildings and fortifications; see Stade, *Der Name der Stadt Samariens und seine Herkunft*, ZATW v, 165. Compare David's transaction with Arauna the Jebusite, 2 *Sam.* 24. Shemer seems to have been a widespread clan-name, appearing as a clan of the tribe of Levi, 1 *Ch.* 6, 31, and of Benjamin, 8, 12, while Shimron is a family of Issachar, *Gen.* 46, 13, etc., and a town in Zebulun, *Jos.* 11, 1, etc. This is vocalized in *Jos.* 12, 20 by Cod. A. as Samron (cf. 19, 15), which would be the same as the original form of Omri's foundation. Thus more than one town "Samaria" existed on the early map, while

a number of places with the same root are found in the Old Testament and on the modern map, e.g. Shamir, the modern Sumra, in Juda. The name then is more probably a derivation from a widespread tribe-name, than a local designation, as G. A. Smith suggests, rendering Shomeron as *Wartburg*, Watch Tower (*HG* 346). The Greek form recognizes the unessential and variable character of the last syllable in the Hebrew word. Only in some MSS to 1 *Ki.* 16, 24 and 2 *Esdras* 4, 10, do we find the Massoretic form imitated.

B. THE NAMES OF THE SAMARITANS.

The Samaritans usurp for themselves the theocratic name of Israel. They allow themselves to be called Samaritans only with a play upon the word. The word they use is *Samerim*, not the Old Testament *Shomeronim*, 2 *Ki.* 17, 29, which they never employ. Doubtless the word is the ancient gentilic for the place of Shemer; cf. the origin of *Σαμαρεία* from the latter, not from Shomeron. *Samerim* is the Samaritan equivalent of the Hebrew *shomerim*, "observers," and it is in this sense the Samaritans use the word of themselves; thus, "We observe the holy Law and are called Observers," *N. et E.* 163 (175), or because they "observe" the Sabbath, *ibid.* This interpretation is ancient. There is a reference to it in the Jewish antagonist's assertion that "there are no keepers of the Law here" (*Chol.* 6a; above, p. 191), and possibly in 2 *Chron.* 13, 11. It is frequently alluded to in the Fathers; e.g. Origen, *Homil. in Ezech.* ix, 1 (Migne xiii, 73); Eusebius, *Chron.* ii, ann. 1270; Jerome, *Epitaph. Paulæ*, 6 (M. xxii, 887); Epiphanius, *Hæres.* i, 9; etc.

Perhaps because of this interpretation the Jews rarely call their rivals Samaritans; exceptions are found in *Aboda Zara Jer.* 44d; *Bereshit R.* c. 32, etc. But they apply to them the opprobrious term *Kuthim*, as though they were

identical with the colony imported from Babylon. No satisfactory explanation has been given for the choice of this special name; the *Kuthites* may have been the most important colony, *Sanballat* may have been of *Kuthite* origin (so *Josephus*), etc. The Samaritan explanation of this Jewish epithet is that their ancestors, returning from exile, came into a certain valley named *Kutha* (*Abu'l Fath*, 81).

The name preferred by *Josephus* for the sect is, very appropriately, *Shechemites*. In this connection may be discussed the name which *Josephus* alleges was used by the Samaritans of themselves in the time of the Antiochian persecution, *AJ* xii, 5, 5,—that of *Sidonians*. *Michaelis* would derive the connection from an assumed *Kutha* near *Sidon* (*Juynboll, Hist. Sam.* 35). I would suggest that the name arose from the attempt of Pagan Samaritans or renegade members of the sect to dissociate themselves from the unpopular *Israelites*, by connecting *Samaria* with the Phœnician *Çimura* (*Çumur*, *Simirra*; perhaps modern *Sumura*), appearing in *Gen.* 10, 18 in the gentilic *Çemari* and in the Greek thereto as *Σαμαρείος*.

C. THE FIRE-PURIFICATIONS OF THE SAMARITANS.

In *Lib.Jos.*, c. xlvii, *sub fin.*, the plea is made to *Hadrian* that the Samaritans "are accustomed to kindle a fire wherever a stranger has passed." An interesting illustration of this is given by *Clermont-Ganneau* (*Journal des savants*, ii, 41), who adduces the following quotation from *Antonin de Plaisance*, circa 600 A. C. (*Gelzer, Itinera Hierosolymitana*, 164): *Descendentes per campestria, ciuitates uel uicos Samaritanorum; et per plateas, unde transuimus siue nos siue Iudæi, cum paleias (sic) vestigia nostra incendentes; tanta illis est execratio utrisque.* A reference to the same custom is doubtless contained in the imperial prohibition against the Samaritans burning or destroying anything with fire, cited above, p. 112. This is the most

unique custom the Samaritans possess, and I cannot trace its origin except to the universal idea of the purifying power of fire; cf. *Is.* 4, 4; *Mt.* 3, 11. According to Biruni (de Sacy, *Chrest. arabe*, i, 305) the Samaritan religion is a compound of Judaism and Magism; the latter imputation may refer to these fire-practices, but probably better to the legend of Simon Magus. Taglicht adduces (*Die Kuthäer*, 8) a Talmudic passage, *Taanit*, 5b, where the Kutim are called fire-worshippers, but he holds that the context demands כְּתִיִּים, "the people of Kittim."

D. THE ALLEGED DOVE-CULT OF THE SAMARITANS.

The leading question in the early investigation of the Samaritans concerned the ancient allegation of the Jews that the Samaritans worshipped a dove on Gerizim. Huntington's inquiry on this point was regarded as an insult by the Samaritans; upon the beginning of the de Sacy correspondence Jewish informants still made the same charge against the sect (*N. et E.* nos. i and ii; see in general de Sacy's introduction to the volume, and Friedrich, *De Christologia Samaritanorum; Appendicula de columba dea Samaritanorum*). The accusation is now generally regarded as a sheer calumny, and the question has become one chiefly of archæological interest: What could have been the origin of the charge?

The Talmudic assertion of the accusation belongs to the IVth Century (see above, p. 169). In the interpretation given by *Sanhedrin*, 63b, of the deities worshipped by the colonists of 2 *Ki.* 17, no reference to the dove is found, although the deities are all zoologically explained. The Fathers are entirely silent on this score. The only point in Samaritan tradition which is in the least degree pertinent is the legend, *Lib. Jos.* c. 1, concerning a brazen bird placed by the Romans on Gerizim, which on the approach of a Samaritan cried *ibri*, i.e. "Hebrew," thus warning the

guards. But this is a tradition concerning some mechanical oracle, of a kind witnessed to for antiquity. Reland, in his dissertation *De monte Garizim*, has carefully examined all the evidence concerning the ancient dove-cult. Selden, *De dis Syris, syntag.* ii, c. 3, *sub fin.*, made the happy suggestion that the cult must have been that of the goddess Semiramis; cf. *Diodorus Sic.*, ii, 20; Lucian, *De dea Syria*, c. 14; also Tibullus i, 8: Alba Palæstino sacra columba. Ronzevalle has recently followed up Selden's theory with a very interesting identification. In his article, *Inscription bilingue de Deir el-Qala'a*, in *Revue archéologique*, 1893, p. 29, he has put forth much evidence for the existence of a goddess, Sima or Shima, whom he identifies on the one hand with Semiramis, on the other hand with the Ashima of 2 *Ki.* 17. He suggests therefore that the Jewish accusation against the Samaritans may go back to the actual cult of the Hamathite deity Semiramis, under the form of a dove, practised by the Hamathite colony in Samaria. On the other hand this cult may have been introduced much later, in the age of Hadrian or subsequent syncretizing emperors. But to sum up, there is nothing to show for the legend that the Samaritan sect itself ever worshipped the dove.

ADDENDUM.

To p. 19. W. Max Müller thinks it probable that Shechem (*Skmm*) should be read in the narrative of a Syrian campaign of Useratesen III. of the XIIth Dynasty; see *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung*, 1903, col. 448.