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ABSTRACT

Estimates of when the Samaritans finally separated from the Judaeans vary widely. I argue that there are reasons to date that separation only to the period when it was possible to see the Samaritans as religiously and politically distinct from the Jews.

In many respects the Samaritans of the first century were a Jewish sect, but we can trace a gradually changing relationship between Judaeans and Samaritans. It was only in the generation after Judah ha-Nasi, following the Bar Kokhba revolt, that we see the development of anti-Samaritanism in a series of negative statements by the rabbinical teachers, culminating in the ruling that the Samaritans are unquestionably to be considered as Gentiles. Likewise there is evidence from the church fathers that in the first and second centuries the Samaritans were regarded as Jews.

One obvious cause of the increasing tension between the Samaritans and the Judaeans of the Second Temple period was the fact that the Samaritans had a temple of their own on Mt. Gerizim, which was a serious rival to the one in Jerusalem. However, rivalries were kept within bounds until both the Samaritans and the Judaeans lost their temples. This gave full play to other complex factors which led to an irreconcilable breach. The trigger for the schism might well have been the development of heretical, rather than schismatic, Samaritanism, with a separate Pentateuch which included the specific characteristics that we have come to recognize as Samaritan, the development of a chain of synagogues, and the establishment of a liturgy and a series of midrash schools for the development of the Samaritan halakhah. These developments took place in the third century CE.

Estimates of when the Samaritans finally separated from the Judaeans vary widely, with dates ranging from the period of Ezra and the restoration of Jerusalem to the destruction of Jerusalem in CE 70. It is argued here that there are reasons to redate that separation to a period after the great revolt in 130–135 CE. In discussing the schism between the Samaritans and the Judaeans we need to take cognizance of the Jewish traditions about the origin of the Samaritans. However, we need not dwell too long on the
interpretation of the various biblical sources, for while such critical analysis might be of some use in helping us to appreciate the veracity of mutual claims and recriminations about origins, it does not actually clarify the matter of when the Jews and the Samaritans reached the point of no return in their mutual relationships, i.e., when it was possible to see the Samaritans as religiously and politically—perhaps also ethnically—distinct from the Jews. Instead, we should rather consider the views that Samaritans and Judaeans had of each other in the critical period, for their relationships were governed by their perceptions of each other, and especially by the Judaean perception of Samaritan origins. The breach which created two distinctive peoples stemmed from those perceptions in that period.

The current Samaritan view of their own origin is reasonably clear. They state in many of their polemics with the Jews that they are the true Bene Yisra'el—the biblical Israel—and that they are not Samaritans, that is, not שֶׁמֶרְפָּה, "Samarians," but שֶׁמֶרְפָּלִים, "guardians." The Samaritans use the name שֶׁמֶרְפָּה to imply that they are the true guardians of the law, the preservers of the genuine text of the Torah which the Jews have corrupted. In their claim they come close to the current scholarly view as put forth recently by Rita Egger that the term "Cutheans" in the rabbinic literature often refers not to the people to whom Mt. Gerizim was the holy place but to the Samaritans, the settlers in Samiritis for whom the temple at Samaria established by Herod was the central place of

---

1 If the Samaritans can be termed Israelites with little hesitation by observers, there is clearly either something amiss with the account of Samaritan origins in 2 Kings 17, or else in the time elapsed since the exile the Samaritans had been able to convince others of their claim. This is not the place for a thoroughgoing analysis of that passage. Suffice it to refer the reader to a recent reexamination of Samaritan origins in the biblical tradition by C. S. Chang, "Samaritan Origins and Identity in the Light of Recent Scholarship" (Ph.D. diss., Sydney University, 1990).

2 R. Egger, "Josephus Flavius and the Samaritans," First International Conference on Samaritan Studies, Tel Aviv, April, 1988. The paper is printed in the proceedings of the conference. See also her Josephus Flavius und die Samariter (Freiburg, 1986). See also Jean and Louis Robert ("Bulletin épigraphique, no. 369: une synagogue samaritaine à Thessalonique," Revue des études grecques 82 [1969]: 477-478) who point up the difficulty of making a distinction between the colonists and the Samaritans if the only identifying factor is the name Samaria. The terminology used by Josephus is highly variable and cannot be utilized reliably.

3 AJ 15.296.
worship. There is no doubt that we must be very wary about accepting the term Samaritans or the epithet Cutheans as invariably indicating the people in whose religious ideology Gerizim was central.

The Samaritan claim about the meaning of their name is not a new development: it clearly has ancient antecedents. A comment of Jerome indicates that he accepted this Samaritan interpretation of their name, and Bar Hebraeus calls them Shomrayye; we also note in Origen's Commentary on John an appreciation of the meaning of their name in line with the Samaritans own self-assessment.

We must note in support of the Samaritan claim that the writers of the Delian inscriptions which are dated to the second century BCE apparently thought that the Samaritans were Israelites. In his study of these inscriptions Bruneau presented a lengthy discussion of the term "Israelites," and it is clear that despite the fact that the Samaritans of Delos had their own synagogue, they were regarded as differing from the Jews on the island only because of their affinity for Mt. Gerizim and not because of any other distinguishing characteristic which defined them as Samaritans. Like the Judaeans they are called Israelites in those inscriptions. This particular series of inscriptions is of great value, for it permits us to differentiate between Samarians and Samaritans and serves to point up the nature of the problem which we face in dealing with other accounts, where the centrality of the name Samaria is a source of confusion of identity between Samarians and Samaritans. In effect, this inscription cautions us to be wary of using the terms "Samaritans" and "Jews"; rather we should speak of Samarians and Judaeans, inasmuch as others saw the Samaritans as a variety of Jews, hence a Jewish sect. It is reasonable to speak of the Jewish view of Samaritan origins only when we deal with polemical materials.

The more extreme post-biblical view of Samaritan origins is equally clear, for it is stated by Josephus in a simple form and

4 Chapter 20.
6 Of course, there is always the possibility that the authorities at Delos were taking the Samaritans at their own estimation rather than reflecting a common understanding of their origin.
perhaps even originated with him.⁷ It is based on the account in 2 Kings 17 of the total depopulation of Samaria and the transportation of the Israelites to Assyria, with a subsequent replacement of the population by a somewhat mixed bag of people who were of syncretistic tendencies. It is worth recording Josephus’ words, for they represent a stage in the Judaean perception of the Samaritans. Josephus puts the matter very clearly in his account:

As for the Chuthaioi who were transported to Samaria. . . . These same rites have continued in use even to this day among those who are called Chuthaioi (Cuthim) in the Hebrew tongue, and Samareitai (Samaritans) by the Greeks; but they alter their attitude according to circumstance and, when they see the Jews prospering, call them their kinsmen, on the ground that they are descended from Joseph and are related to them through their origin from him, but, when they see the Jews in trouble, they say that they have nothing whatever in common with them nor do these have any claim of friendship or race, and they declare themselves to be aliens of another race.

In fact, Josephus appears to give us two explanations of Samaritan origins, for he also sees them arising out of a post-exilic schism in the Persian period when Cuthaeans and renegade Jews were working together to build a rival temple.⁸ They seem to have been regarded as homoethnoi.⁹

As indicated, we need not pause to evaluate either of these claims. The fact is that the Samaritans of the first century spoke

---


⁹ AJ 11.322.
the same languages as the Judaeans, had similar life-styles based on the commandments and moral values of the Pentateuch, and after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE, they tended to participate with the Judaeans in the political struggles against the governing powers even though they were moving apart in religious matters. While this does not ex post facto make them an offshoot of the biblical Israelites or yet a first century sect of the Jews, there is enough evidence for us to see that in many respects they were a sect of the Jews and we should understand their rituals, beliefs, practices, and relationships with the Jews from this standpoint.

The tannaim were certainly divided on this issue, and this division should in itself provide substantial clues to guide us in evaluating our meager information about Samaritan practices and beliefs in that period. Status within or without the Jewish people was determined by halakhic definitions inside various tannaitic texts.

---


11 The term “sect” is being used in the sense of a religious subgroup of a main religion that remains so close in belief and practice that it cannot be regarded as a different religion. Nor do the practices of the subgroup differ so much from the accepted practices of the main group that they are regarded as heretical. It must be suggested that while Samaritanism has the appearance of being Jewish, it is heterodox even in terms of what we see of pre-rabbinic Judaism, and we might be better arguing the case for the Samaritans as a pre-rabbinic Jewish sect. Support for this view might be found in the matter of circumcision among the Samaritans and in the light of several other rites. The Samaritans practice circumcision without peri'ah, the rending of the corona (I am indebted for this information to Reinhard Pummer) whereas the Jews do rend the corona. Yet recent researches into talmudic prescriptions for circumcision (by N. Rubin of Bar Ilan University to whom I am indebted for this information) have led to the conclusion that the Jewish practice of peri'ah is a secondary development and that the Samaritans have conserved a more primitive form of the rite. The Samaritan Sabbath is marked by few of the relaxations introduced by the Pharisees. The 'erub is not permitted. No warm food is eaten: neither candles nor other lights were permitted (though nowadays an electric light may be left on all night) and the distance traveled on the Sabbath is more tightly controlled than among the Jews.

The Passover ritual is a pilgrimage and a sacrificial rite of the type prescribed in the Pentateuch and it lasts but one day. Immediately after the feast of the Passover begins the feast of matzot which is an independent feast lasting seven days. In other rites, such as the mezuzah, the Samaritans have not achieved the stability of rabbinic Judaism, for the mezuzah may be inside or outside the house, it may be a tablet of stone containing the Deacologue, or it may hold the Shema' (Deut 6:4–9).
The Samaritans appeared to be neither in nor out, and their identity and legal status continued to perplex the tannaim who could not decide whether the Samaritans were to be considered as Gentiles or as Israelites until at least the fourth century C.E. The view generally pertaining was that the Samaritans were not Jews by origin but that they were to be considered as true proselytes and therefore Jewish. There is adequate evidence from the mishnaic texts that Samaritans were treated as Jews by the first generation of the tannaim. Thus, in mKet 3.1–2 the fact that a Samaritan girl requires a monetary fine of fifty shekels from her seducer puts her on the same level as a Jewess, whereas non-Jewish girls are excluded from this law. This text is instructive, for one can trace the levels of development of the law, and it is clear that until the mid-second century the Samaritans are considered to be Jews in the halakhah pertaining to marriage. However, within the general attitude one sees a range of particular viewpoints. Simeon ben Gamaliel, the father of R. Judah ha-Nasi, took the view that a Samaritan is like a Jew in all respects, whereas his son Judah took the view that a Samaritan is to be considered a non-Jew. On the other hand, a tanna of the previous generation, Eliezer ben Hycanatus, was uncertain of the status of the Samaritans and put them in the class of people of doubtful status for the purposes of tithing and marriage law. R. Akiba, whose life bridged the generation between Hycanatus and Simeon ben Gamaliel, argued that the Cutheans were true proselytes and that the priests who were mixed with them were true priests. Yet a disciple of Akiba, a

---

12 For a recent and worthwhile study of the tannaitic attitudes toward the Samaritans see L. H. Schiffman, “The Samaritans in Tannaitic Halakhah,” *JQR* 75 (1985): 323–350. Schiffman draws attention to the fact that the hostility to the Samaritans expressed in some halakhot is rather late and can be shown to be interpolated into the various texts. See p. 330: “The listing of the three doubtful classes in Qid 4.3 is the final stage in which a later redactor has glossed the traditions in order to clarify them, thus adding the Samaritan to a set of traditions which originally did not concern him at all.”

13 Note also mBer 7.1, “If three ate together they must say the Common Grace... if [one that ate was] a Samaritan, he may be included [to make up the number needed] for the Common Grace.”

14 “Every precept which the Cutheans have adopted, they observe it with minute care even more than the Israelites.” See the discussion of the status of Samaritans in bQid 75b–76a.

15 tDem 5.21–24 (Erfurt ms).

16 mQid 4.1.
tanna of the third generation, Simeon ben Yoḥai, is more positive about the Jewishness of the Samaritans in the matter of tithing and states that the Samaritan is to be compared with a Jewish 'am ha-‘ares and can be relied upon not to replace tithed produce with untithed produce.

As I show below, it was only in the generation after Judah ha-Nasi, following the Bar Kokhba revolt, that we see the development of anti-Samaritanism in a series of negative statements by the rabbinic teachers culminating in the ruling (bḤul 6a) that the Samaritans are unquestionably to be considered as Gentiles.

It was not only the tannaim who were uncertain of the status of the Samaritans. There is also the clear evidence from the writings of the early church fathers, who were concerned with the heresies of their day, that they regarded the Samaritans as Sadducees, as did the tannaim on occasion. It is not impossible that the Samaritans had a cordial relationship with the Sadducees and that there

17 Schiffman ("The Samaritans," pp. 336–337) argues that it was Judah ha-Nasi himself who added anti-Samaritan matter to the Mishnah during the process of redaction. His arguments have considerable merit in the matter of the growth of anti-Samaritan accretions in the Mishnah but are not convincing in identifying the Mishnah's redactor as the culprit in making these changes.

18 Cf. Epiphanius, Haeres 14. The fact that the Samaritans attributed canonical status only to the Torah out of all the Scriptures should not be taken as implying that they had no knowledge of the other biblical works. In view of their analogy to the Sadducees who emphasized the sanctity of the Torah, the restricted extent of the Samaritan canon is no guide to the date of the Samaritan schism though this fact has often been used in this context. If the Sadducees are not to be dated according to their reverence for the Torah, why should the Samaritans be so dated? It is evident from the report of the discussion between the Patriarch of the Sadducees and R. Meir (bSanh 90b) that the Samaritans knew the Psalms. There is no reason to doubt the talmudic discussion at this point (pace J. S. Isser, The Dositheans [Leiden, 1976], p. 145), for we find the Samaritans in the same situation as other Jewish sects of the period. We must refute the patently erroneous statement, often made, that the Samaritans were not acquainted with the rest of the Old Testament. It is very clear from their eschatological and other writings that they knew the Old Testament well. One must also note that Photius and others spoke of the Samaritans' knowledge and use of the book of Joshua.

19 mNid 4.2. "When the Sadducee women follow the customs of their fathers they are like the Samaritan women."

20 See Purvis, "The Samaritans and Judaism," p. 83 for a brief introduction to this problem. Purvis fails to note the account in the Samaritan chronicles about the relationship between Hyrcanus and the Sadducees, which matches in part the account in Josephus (see below).
was some degree of cooperation between the Jerusalem and Gerizim priests, as has been argued by Coggins and Montgomery before him. Be that as it may, the fact that some of the Fathers identified the two sects with one another speaks for the Jewishness of the Samaritans and the nature of their practices. Among these we must include the observance of the Sabbath in the manner of the Sadducees rather than of the Pharisees.

While the Gospel of John seems to be able to differentiate between Samaritans and Jews, that differentiation should be seen in the light of both the composition history of that Gospel and the fact that John 4:21 seems to suggest that the Samaritan God is the Jewish God. It may not be unreasonable to assume that in an age of sectarianism it was difficult for observers, Jewish and Gentile, to determine whether the Samaritans were Jews within the meaning of the halakhah.

Perhaps at this stage we should remind ourselves of a few basic data about the Samaritans. They were spread across the center of Palestine in a pale of settlement in Samaria, which seems to have extended quite far to the south towards Jerusalem (Acts 8:25). Josephus provides us with a brief description of the province of

---

23 The identification of the Samaritans with the Sadducees may account for the discrepant statements about the Samaritans not believing in the resurrection of the dead. The Tibat Marqe (ed. Z. Ben-Hayyim, [Jerusalem, 1988]) indicates that the Samaritans did believe in the resurrection of the dead. It is stated almost casually in the context of the discussion of the Day of Vengeance in Deut 32:35 that the dead will be raised for judgment. The lack of any discussion of this statement in the context of the passage leads us to assume that the dogma was well entrenched in Samaritan beliefs.
24 However, because one sees parallel features in the Qumran literature one can legitimately interpret this rigor as the tradition of Judaism before pharisaic activity ameliorated the more difficult features of the Sabbath, and there may be no need to associate the Samaritans with the Sadducees on this score.
25 The date of John’s Gospel is uncertain, but because Eusebius places John’s death in the reign of the emperor Trajan on the evidence of Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, it may well belong in the period of the written Samaritan-Jewish polemic. At least one scholar has found reference therein to the fall of the Jerusalem Temple and perhaps even to the Bar Kokhba revolt (see W. H. P. Hatch, “An Allusion to the Destruction of Jerusalem in the Fourth Gospel,” Expositor, 8th ser. 17 [1919]: 194–197). The oldest fragments of John’s Gospel date to the first half of the second century (cf. A.M. Hunter, According to John [London, 1968], p. 11).
Samaria\textsuperscript{26} which he sees as a very heavily populated province stretching from the valley of Esdraelon in the north to about nine miles south of Shechem.

Though Shechem was replaced on another site after its destruction in the second century BCE,\textsuperscript{27} the Samaritan diaspora began to grow rapidly. It spread across the sea to Egypt, Greece, North Africa, Italy, Sicily and south into the lands adjacent to the Red Sea; in fact we may assume that it was almost coextensive with the Jewish Diaspora. In Palestine the Samaritans took over some of the territory which was formerly Judean, aided by the failures of the Jewish revolt and perhaps with the help of Herod, who was married to a Samaritan wife,\textsuperscript{28} fortified Samaria, built a temple therein, and regarded that as a safe center in times of disturbance. There were substantial concentrations of Samaritans in the larger cities, as we learn from all the sources. The Samaritans were well represented in Gaza, Antipatris, Ascalon, Nicopolis/Emmaus, Scythopolis/Beth Shean, and the whole of the coastal strip from Castra Samaritanorum southwards.\textsuperscript{29} If we may rely on the Palestinian Talmud, they formed about one third of the population of Caesarea, and this was by far the largest Samaritan community

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{BJ} 3.48f.

\textsuperscript{27} See below, nn. 46, 47 on Sychar which clearly replaced Shechem. The name Shechem is mentioned so frequently in accounts of the Samaritans after the second century (even by Josephus) that it is clear that it was very soon replaced, not on its original site at Tel Balatlah but nearby at Sychar. We must assume that many observers confused Sychar with Shechem and/or that the Samaritans themselves regarded Shechem as in existence, having transferred either the name or the associations of the city, or both, to Sychar. It is difficult to find much sympathy for the narrow view of G. E. Wright, in his \textit{Shechem, the Biography of a Biblical City} (New York and Toronto, 1965), p. 184, “With this destruction the biography of Shechem comes to its end. The Samaritans moved elsewhere.” What the Samaritans did was to move Shechem elsewhere, transferring the name to another site close to one of their sacred places, Jacob’s well. In the same way they later transferred the name to yet another town, closer to the foot of the mountain, Neapolis.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{AJ} 17.20. Archelaus, who became ruler of Samaria after Herod’s death, appears to have been the son of the Samaritan mother (cf. \textit{AJ} 17.20 with \textit{AJ} 17.317ff., where Archelaus’ brother is Antipas in both cases). If Herod thought that this might bring stability to Samaria he appears to have been mistaken. Josephus records that Archelaus treated the Samaritans harshly (though at the beginning of his reign their tribute was cut by a quarter apparently by Caesar rather than Archelaus) and was eventually deposed and moved to Vienne in Gaul (\textit{AJ} 17.341f.).

outside of Samaria.\textsuperscript{30} Smaller Samaritan populations are reported in Tyre, Acco/Ptolemais and Lydda.\textsuperscript{31} Yavneh, which had a small Samaritan population in the first century was almost entirely Samaritan by the third century (according to Peter the Iberian). In the village areas they were involved in intensive agriculture, and some parts of central Samaria were controlled by them almost completely.\textsuperscript{32}

When we examine the crucial era, between the second century BCE and the second century CE, we can trace a gradually changing relationship between Judaeans and Samaritans. At least one source relating to the second century BCE suggests that hostility between Samaritans and Judaeans was virtually unknown. It is true that 2 Macc 6:2 appears to support Josephus’ account (\textit{AJ} 12.258–261) of the Samaritans calling themselves Sidonians, but as Doran has pointed out,\textsuperscript{33} that support is based solely on a twentieth-century emendation of the text to make it coincide with Josephus’ account. In fact, as Doran further demonstrates, 2 Maccabees indicates that the people who worshiped at Gerizim were Jews, for they were included in the definition of the Jewish nation (2 Macc 5:22–23):

But [Antiochus] left high commissioners to plague the nation (τὸ γένος) in Jerusalem, Philip, a Phrygian by race and by nature, more barbarous than the man who appointed him; on Mt. Gerizim, Andronicus, and besides these, Menelaus, who lorded it over the citizens.


\textsuperscript{31} See Nathan Schur, \textit{History of the Samaritans} (Berlin, 1989), pp. 54–55, and my “The Samaritan Diaspora,” in A. D. Crown, ed., \textit{The Samaritans} (Tübingen, 1989), pp. 195–217. Schur disputes my estimate of the number of Samaritans in the country in the first century. On the expansion of the Samaritan population after the Bar Kokhba rebellion see Yaron Dan, \textit{The City in Eretz Israel During the Late Roman and Byzantine Periods} (Jerusalem, 1984), pp. 44f. We can name more than ninety sites with Samaritan associations and there must have been many more.

\textsuperscript{32} For a study of the settlement pattern in Samaria see Y. Ben-Arieh, “The Uniqueness of Settlement in Samaria,” in \textit{Eretz Shomron} (Thirtieth Archaeological Convention, Israel Exploration Society; Jerusalem, 1972), pp. 121–138. See also S. Dar, \textit{The Spread of Settlement in Western Samaria in Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine Times} [Hebrew] (Ph.D. diss., Tel-Aviv University, 1982).

Furthermore, it is evident that Judas Maccabeus and his followers were easily able to take refuge in Samaria, and wherever Samaria or Gerizim is mentioned there is no evidence of Samaritan hostility. In 2 Maccabees, in contrast to 1 Macc 1:20–52 the Samaritans, as Jews, suffer with their Judaean brethren.

It is clear that the situation changed but not in the dramatic way envisaged by some. Before 70 CE Galilean Jewish worshipers bound for the Jerusalem temple from their homes in the north had to either go around Samaria or cross it. The accounts of incidents between Samaritans, Samarians, and Galilean Jews during the crossing from Galilee are instructive, for they show that while there had developed some endemic prejudice between Jews and Samaritans, that ill-feeling was fanned into open hostility only under the extreme provocation of hotheaded action, and the public authorities tended to preach restraint. The evidence is against the outright bitterness in the first century between Samaritans and Jews, that is spoken of in Josephus and the later rabbinical sources.

It is evident from the accounts in John 4:3–4 and Luke 9:52 that the crossing of Samaria was a regular occurrence and that it could be unpleasant if it was clear that the traveler intended to go on to Jerusalem. However, open hostilities were rare enough to have been recorded. For example, apart from the failure to find food

---

34 The villagers of Sychar receive Jesus on his way to Jerusalem (John 4:3–4), but the words of v. 4. “And he had to go through Samaria,” surely express a reluctant frame of mind rather than a geographical routing. There are a number of references in the New Testament which make it seem that the more common route was that across Samaria.

35 M. Gaster (The Samaritans [Schweich Lectures, 1923; Oxford, 1925], pp. 36–37), speaks of the bitterness between Jew and Samaritan but fails to examine his sources carefully. The most recent follower has been Schur, who observed (without noting the time scale) that the Samaritans panned on the name of the temple in Jerusalem, Bet Miqdash, as Bet Maqdash, “house of shame.”

36 Yet note Matt 10:5. O. Cullmann (“Samaria and the Origins of the Christian Mission,” in The Early Church, Historical and Theological Studies [London, 1956], pp. 185–194) uses this passage to equate the Samaritans with the Gentiles. The statement in Matthew is at variance with the views expressed in John and Luke. The latter account does not record the saying reported in Matthew. Acts regards the mission to Samaria as a preparation for the mission to the Gentiles. Cullmann regards this as the first Christian mission in a community which was not fully Jewish. However, his discussion of this point stretches the evidence by arguing that the purpose of the writer of Acts was to demonstrate that the preaching of the
and lodging, pilgrims might be killed, as indeed happened during Cumanus' day (48–50 CE) when a Galilean pilgrim was murdered. The account of the incident is instructive, for we see that our prime source, Josephus, exaggerates the incident out of his known hostility to the Samaritans. A single pilgrim was killed and threatening crowds gathered on both sides, but tempers cooled down and no immediate riot occurred. We do not know the circumstances in which the murder occurred but Josephus implies that the cause was some sort of religious prejudice, for when the matter was reported in Jerusalem a crowd of hotheads, ignoring the restraining advice of the rabbinical authorities, marched on southern Samaria and butchered a substantial number of people. The end result was a hearing by the Roman authorities at which the Samaritans were exonerated, but in a subsequent hearing the Jews were placated by the death of a Roman tribune.

Another episode to which Josephus points in his attempts to show the hostility of the Samaritans for the Judaeans is the raid on Judaea in the reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes (ca. 218 BCE) and the seizing of Judaeans and destruction of Judaean towns. In this account the Samaritans are described by Josephus as Σαμαρεῖος.

Gospel beyond the Jewish people actually began with Jesus in Samaria. We have no direct evidence of the purposes of the writer of Acts. It is as safe to assume that Jesus continued his mission of preaching among Jews by going to Samaria.

38 There are two accounts of this incident: BJ 2.232f. and AJ 20.118. In the latter account the number of those killed would appear to have been exaggerated by Josephus, quite deliberately. It is possible that Tacitus' account (Annales, 12.54) of the situation at this time is also dependent upon Josephus (see the discussion in M. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism [Jerusalem, 1980], 2:77–80). Tacitus indicates that Judaea and Samaria had long been at variance, but his statement that "their animosities were now under the less restraint" indicates that they had been restrained until that time.

39 Tacitus (Annales 12.54) seems to imply that the Roman authorities were in some way implicated in the problems between Samaritans and Jews at this time. Whether this is a shorthand reference to the sequel of the affair in Josephus' account is not clear.

40 The account in Josephus gives the distinct impression that the authorities deliberately sacrificed one of their men to try to avoid a large-scale disturbance.

41 AJ 12.154–156.

42 The same name is used in AJ 13.73–77, where the Samaritans who worshiped in the temple are the subject of discussion. Note that in the Greek of the passage in 12.256–260 (p. 132), where Josephus is clearly speaking of the Samaritans because of their temple to the God Most High, he uses the term Σαμαρεῖτα.
a term which he appears to reserve for the Greek colons of Samaria in the part of his work relating to this period, and it is likely that these were not Samaritan Jews but Greek settlers in Samaria who were pro-Ptolemaic. 43 However, we must recognize that at times Jews and Samaritans came to blows though this was rare rather than the norm. Indeed, even in the Babylonian Talmud (a work not normally favorably disposed to the Samaritans) a tanna of the late third century remarked that one could be alone with a Samari-
tan without fear for his life. While one could not sell the Samaritan an offensive weapon, it was not for fear that he would use it against a Jew but so that he might sell it to someone who would. 44

The Rehob mosaic supports the view that while the relationship between Jews and Samaritans was not one of friendship it was such that passions were generally controlled and cooperation was the norm. This mosaic, which deals with produce that was for-bidden to Jews in the seventh year, 45 shows us that the religious Jewish pilgrims were assured that they could find ritually clean victuals in the small country towns away from the centers of population, and this tradition is underscored by several New Testa-
ment references. Jesus had to pass through Samaria and came to the city of Sychar (John 4:50) where the disciples went to buy food (John 4:8). Though the Gospel would have us believe (John 4:9) that Jews had no dealings with Samaritans, the so-called group of Hellenist apostles who had been working among the Samaritans before Jesus clearly testify to the lack of truth in the reported statement. 46 It is likely, as some of the versions indicate, that these words should be omitted, or at best, that they are an explanatory gloss that should be translated as the NEB would have it, 47 as a

43 See AJ 12.156, n. f (p. 81).
44 bAZ 15b.
45 A convenient study and text is that by J. Sussmann, “The Inscription in the Synagogue at Rehob,” in L. I. Levine, ed., Ancient Synagogues Revealed (Jeru-
47 The NEB translates this verse as “Jews and Samaritans do not use vessels in common.” In the notes to the verse the NEB draws attention to the fact that since this phrase is missing in some sources it might be better omitted. The Syriac version (Lamsa’s translation) limits the matter of “dealings” to “social intercourse.” See the discussion of this verse in C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London, 1955), pp. 194–195.
statement referring to sharing utensils which might not be ritually clean. While we might accept this opinion as the nature of the relationship with Greek-speaking Samaritans, it was certainly not true of Judean relationships with Samaritan Jews. We may also accept this as true of the larger towns—Sychar was eventually replaced by Neapolis, but we must assume that at this time it functioned as the principal town in the vicinity of Gerizim in place of Shechem—but as the Rehob mosaic demonstrates, this could scarcely have been true of the smaller towns and the villages.

One obvious cause of the increasing difficulty between the Samaritans and the Judeans of the Second Temple period was the fact that the Samaritans had a temple of their own on Mt. Gerizim, their holy mountain. Although it was destroyed before the first century BCE (by Hyrcanus in 128 BCE according to Josephus) and was never rebuilt, we cannot be certain that the sacrificial rite was not continued on the mountain in the ruined temple, and certainly what we know of that temple and its sacra has to be taken into

48 Neapolis seems to have been built on the site of the village of Mabartha or Mamortha. A brief discussion is found in E. M. Smallwood, The Jews under Roman Rule (Leiden, 1981), pp. 342–343, n. 46.

49 Some of the commentators writing before G. E. Wright’s excavation of Shechem were puzzled as to why Sychar plays a role in this story that we might expect to have been played by Shechem. Various arguments have been offered to account for the appearance of the name Sychar, including the suggestion that Sychar is a misreading of Sychem or that it is a play on the word 'וגל as a commentary either on the Samaritan religion or on Christianity. Before the building of Neapolis and after the destruction of Shechem it would have been logical to concentrate the center of the priestly administration in some town adjacent to Gerizim and near the Samaritan sacred sites to which the sacred associations could be transferred. Of all the towns available to the Samaritans we do not know why Sychar was seen as the logical substitute for Shechem. The site of Askar, about half a mile from Jacob’s Well, might have been selected both because it has a reasonable water supply, a spring, but also because of its association with the sacred place. It is also astride the road from Galilee to Jerusalem. For older but instructive views see Cheyne and Black, “Sychar,” Encyclopaedia Biblica (London, 1903; 2d ed. 1907).

50 See Massekhet Kutim, ed. R. Kirchheim, Sheva’masekhtot Qetano Yerusalmiyot, p. 35.6 and the comments by Kirchheim. Kirchheim understood the reason for waiting for three bakings in the villages before buying bread from them after the Passover to be that the villagers were in no way suspect of lack of care between leavened and unleavened bread but that they might have celebrated Passover a day earlier or later than the Jews. The wording of the passage makes it clear that the villagers were more conservative than the townsfolk.
account in considering the relationship of Samaritans with Judeans. The simple fact of the existence of the temple at Gerizim was probably a challenge to Jerusalem. Although there was at least one other Jewish temple in existence—that at Leontopolis in Egypt, which served the needs of the local Jewish community until 73 CE, and possibly several others, we may assume from Josephus’ report of Demetrius’ concession to Jonathan that these other temples were a thorn in the flesh of Jerusalem and had been promoted by the Greek rulers as a counter to the authority of Jerusalem. However, unlike the Leontopolis temple and the one at ‘Araq el-Amir which were outside Palestine, and under Greek patronage, the Gerizim temple was almost certainly seen as a dangerous rival to the Jerusalem temple, since it was proximate to an ancient sacred city, Shechem, and its claims to a Jewish temple were not dependent upon Greek patronage. The temple at Gerizim was evidently a source of considerable friction between Jews and Samaritans even in Egypt, and on occasion in Palestine, although we cannot be sure that the friction was continuous in view of the alleged friendship between the Sadducees and the Samaritans. According to Josephus the Samaritan temple lasted

51 See E. F. Campbell, Jr., “Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods,” in F. M. Cross, ed., *Symposia Celebrating the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Schools of Oriental Research (1900–1975)* (Cambridge, MA, 1979), pp. 159–167. Campbell discusses the various Jewish temples which he knows of, including that at ‘Araq el-Amir, Tell-el-Yehudiyyeh/Leontopolis, and perhaps Lachish, and concludes that these temples simply speak for the multifaceted nature of Judaism in the pre-Christian centuries.

52 *AJ* 13.54. In the statement that the High Priest had the power to limit the worship of Jews to a single temple in Jerusalem there is an implication that the presence of other temples had been a matter of some concern to the Jerusalem priestly authorities and had been fostered by the Seleucids as a matter of policy. There may well have been an attempt to keep the immediate Diaspora from supporting the efforts of the Jerusalem authorities to gain their independence. There is also an implicit recognition that the other temples under consideration were Jewish temples.

53 A writer of the period, Theodotus, not certainly a Samaritan (cf. Pummer, “Genesis 34”), despite claims that his description of Shechem, preserved by Alexander Polyhistor and quoted in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica*, indicates authorship by a Samaritan, made the statement in his poem, *On the Jews*, that Shechem was a holy city. In his views of Shechem Theodotus seems to espouse the Bethel=Shechem equation. If this claim was indeed made by a non-Samaritan, it underscores the intensity of the rivalry between Jerusalem and Gerizim.

54 See n. 21, above.
for some 200 years from the time of its building by Sanballat until its destruction by John Hyrcanus in 128 BCE. We may suspect that Josephus’ chronology is not strictly accurate. While he attributes the building to Sanballat, the father-in-law of the priest Manasseh, a contemporary of Nehemiah, he places Sanballat in the lifetime of both Darius (presumably III) and Alexander, and indeed has Sanballat seek permission from the latter king to build the temple. Yet, in another passage speaking of Sanballat and Alexander, Josephus implies that the Samaritan temple was already standing when Alexander invaded Palestine.55

The claims of Gerizim and the temple thereon for preeminence over Mt. Zion and the temple at Jerusalem was not based on the respective ages of the temples but on their location. The Samaritans argued that their temple stood on a site made sacred by the sacrificial activities of the Patriarchs and by the fact that the first sacrifice in Canaan (Deut 27:4) took place thereon, since it was the Mount of Blessing. There are ample indications that the equation Gerizim=Bethel=Moriah was already made by the Samaritans in the second century BCE (and probably before). This was the basis of their claim for Gerizim being the sacred mountain.56 In the matter of the sanctity and centrality of Mount Gerizim the Samaritan belief may be more primitive than innovative. If indeed one reads the patriarchal accounts with a critical eye, Bethel and Shechem seem to be the same, or at least proximate, places. The association of Bethel with all the events in the patriarchal accounts linked with Bethel, Shechem, Moriah, and Gerizim can be made directly from the Torah.57 The Septuagintal reading of Shiloh instead of Shechem (Josh 24) and the statement in the Testament of Joseph (2:6) that Joseph was buried in Hebron rather than near Shechem suggest that the Jewish authorities were already troubled by Samaritan interpretations of the sacred writ in favor of Shechem and Mt. Gerizim. There is also the clear evidence from the polemics

55 AJ 11.342. Josephus’ words leave us in no doubt that the temple on Gerizim was already built at the time that Alexander came to Palestine.
56 We must also assume that it was the reason for Ben-Sira’s sour note about the foolish people who live in Sichem. Their foolishness was doubtless their exegesis of the Pentateuch which linked the sacred sites of the patriarchs with Gerizim.
between Eliezer ben Simeon and the Samaritans over their reading of Gen 12:6 that by the mid-second century CE the Samaritan claims about Shechem were proving irksome to the tannaim.

In addition to the textual evidence utilized by the Samaritans to justify their claims that Shechem was a sacred city and that Gerizim was the sacred mountain on which God dwelt, the traditional sites of the tombs of some of the priests, such as Abisha and Pinhas, are near Gerizim at Awerta, and of course Joshua was said to have been buried at Timnat Serah (or Kfar Haris) in the same region. Jacob's well is traditionally located at the Helqat ha-Sadeh, the parcel of ground near Shechem, and Jacob is also held to have been buried near Shechem. Though our Samaritan textual evidence (other than in the Samaritan Pentateuch) for the claim of equivalence between Bethel and Gerizim dates at the earliest in the fourth century CE, it is fairly clear from the evidence presented that this association was made during the period when the temple was standing and in operation, and we can see in such a claim an additional basis for the rivalry between Jerusalem and Gerizim, a basis that did not exist for the other Jewish temples of the period.

There must have been an additional basis for the rivalry between the temple at Gerizim and that at Jerusalem in the nature of the structure itself and the similarity of the sacrificial rites at the two sanctuaries. We are told several times by Josephus that the Gerizim temple was built on the model of the Jerusalem temple. That this was the case we can infer from the events reported in AJ 12.8–10. Here he reports the controversies between the descendants of the Jewish and Samaritan settlers taken to Egypt by Ptolemy I. The Jews and Samaritans fought with each other over the destination of the sacrifices from Egypt. The Jews argued that they should go to the temple in Jerusalem and the Samaritans asserted that they should go to Gerizim. The story, though brief, is most informative. It tells us directly that the Samaritans offered sacrifices in their temple, and it implies that there was nothing to choose between

---

58 In the edition of the Memar Marqah published by John Macdonald (Berlin, 1963), the association between Gerizim and Moriah is readily apparent (see vol. 2, p. 74). Unfortunately the passage is missing in Ben-Hayyim's edition of Tibat Marge in which the author has been careful to omit the younger and secondary material. The fourth century dating, of course, excludes the evidence of the Samaritan Hellenistic writers. If we take Theodotus' evidence into account we are certainly looking at early implications of the Bethel=Shechem equation.
these and the sacrifices at Jerusalem that would clearly distinguish them from each other. In other words, the Samaritan sacrificial rites were clearly considered as equivalent to the sacrifices offered at Jerusalem. This is what we would have expected on the basis of the Samaritans’ strictness in observing the tenets of the Pentateuch that the rabbis describe so frequently. We must assume that Samaritan temple offerings were based on the Pentateuch and their rituals and routines paralleled those of the Jerusalem temple, at least those which were derived solely from the Mosaic legislation in the period of the foundation of the Gerizim temple. Despite the speculations of scholars that the Gerizim temple was served by a non-Zadokite priesthood,59 the evidence points to a Zadokite priesthood officiating, for the priest initiating the ritual was Manasseh, a scion of the Jerusalem priesthood. We assume on the basis of Josephus’ own testimony (see below) that Manasseh introduced no innovations in the sacrificial rites or in the nature of the officiating personnel but followed the established routines of Jerusalem.

Josephus freely admitted that the Samaritan temple was the “temple of the God Most High” in a passage where he accused the Samaritans of trying to hide this fact during the Antiochan persecutions.60 He quotes a letter that they wrote to Antiochus in which,

59 This is the view propounded by J. D. Purvis, “The Samaritans and Judaism,” p. 88. However, John Bowman, in a series of studies from 1959 to 1975 has indicated the connection between Gerizim and the Zadokites. See his “Is the Samaritan Calendar the Old Zadokite One?” PEQ 91 (1959): 23–37; idem, The Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism, and Early Christianity (Pittsburgh, 1975). Bowman’s view was espoused by Purvis but later dropped.

60 AJ 12.256–260, referring to the year 168 BCE. Josephus reported that the Samaritans asked that their temple, hitherto unnamed, be named the Temple of Zeus Hellenios. 2 Macc 6:2 links the renaming with the enforced pollution of the temple in Jerusalem, and indicates that the temple was renamed after Zeus Xenios, “after the manner of the local usage,” perhaps, as suggested by Montgomery (Samaritans, p. 77), because the name Mt. Gerizim indicated such a name (i.e., the local usage). Cleodemus-Malchus (fragments of whose writings are preserved in a quaternary form in the text of Eusebius’ Praeparatio Evangelica, where he quotes [apparently via Josephus, though his words do not make it clear whether he was checking Josephus’ version with a direct copy] Alexander Polyhistor’s history, Concerning the Jews, in which are embedded extracts from other authors), who may have been a Samaritan, observed that the association between Hercules and the descendants of Abraham via his concubine Keturah was derived from an
according to Josephus, they said that they were being persecuted by the royal officers because their practices were the same as those of the Jews.  

Josephus’ account of the debate between the Jews and Samaritans before Ptolemy Philometer not only serves to strengthen our view that the Gerizim temple had a sacrificial ritual parallel to that in Jerusalem but also leads us to believe that the temple was structurally in imitation of the tabernacle and shrine of the temple in Jerusalem though surely on a smaller scale. Josephus’ account clearly indicates that the objection to the Gerizim temple was based not on arguments against its ritual or style but that it was simply acknowledged by all to be secondary (and by implication, inferior) to that in Jerusalem.

We are in a position today to describe the Samaritan temple (or at least the sanctuary central to the temple) more closely than has been done before, for we see likenesses of it on the numerous oil-lamps that have currently been identified as Samaritan. We see that the cult objects that we know to have been in use in Jerusalem—the menorah, shofar, etrog, mahtah/fire shovel, perpetual light, shewbread table, two heaps of twelve loaves each, 

equation of Hercules with Zeus Xenios and Zeus Hellenios at the temple on Gerizim. Dexinger ("Limits of Tolerance," p. 105) discusses Josephus’ account of the Sidonian/Samaritan equation but it is difficult to support his argument. Josephus’ statement about the temple of the God Most High might have been made in ignorance of the association made between Melchizedek, priest of the God Most High and Shechem. See Heinemann, “Polemics,” for a substantial discussion of the Melchizedek debate. E. Bickerman ("Anonymous Gods," in Studies in Jewish and Christian History [Leiden, 1986], 3:280–281) makes clear that the attribution of a Greek name is not the mark of a creation of a syncretistic cult but merely confers a Greek name on a deity hitherto anonymous.


63 From this perspective it does not matter whence Josephus drew his account and whether it was fanciful. Josephus accepted the view that the Gerizim temple was in the authentic tradition of the Old Testament, which is what we would expect of the Samaritans.

64 See Varda Sussman, “Samaritan Cult Symbols as Illustrated on Oil Lamps from the Byzantine Period,” Israel, People and Land, Eretz Israel Museum Yearbook, 4 (22) (1986–87): 133–146. After some doubts about her identification of lamps as Samaritan it now seems evident that Sussman is correct. I am indebted to Suzanne Jorgensen of the Department of Semitic Studies at the University of Sydney for her detailed examination of these lamps to test Sussman’s conclusions.
musical instruments, and a knife (perhaps used for slaughtering animals)—were also in use at Gerizim. The style of these objects is identical with what we see depicted on the mosaic floors of the Jewish synagogue at Bet Alpha and of the Samaritan Synagogue at Beth Shean. Even the facade of the temple is almost identical with the building familiar to us from Jewish silver coins with a tetrastyle facade on the obverse which is now identified as the entrance to the temple with the sacra showing within the portico. On the basis of these pictorial representations we must take literally Josephus’ observation that Sanballat was to build a temple similar to that in Jerusalem.

We cannot be certain of the immediate effect on the Samaritans of the destruction of their temple. In the short term it is probable that after a brief lapse the pilgrim festivals which were normally observed on the mountain continued to be observed. If there had been a considerable hiatus in such observance it is likely that the tradition of the pilgrimage would have been lost, yet the Passover pilgrimage and the sacrifice of the lambs is still observed today, and the Succoth pilgrimage in its original form was observed until Byzantine days. Only under later political stress did the form of that pilgrimage change. The Samaritan Chronicle, admittedly a late document, fleshes out Josephus’ account of Hyrcanus’ quarrel with the Pharisees by indicating that Hyrcanus’ support of the Sadducees extended to the Samaritans and that he restored the pilgrimages to the sacred mountain and even went so far as to provide tithes, votive offerings, and gifts. However, the archaeo-

---


66 AJ 11.310–312. It is interesting to note that a recent reconstruction of the Samaritan temple, based on the excavation results at Gerizim, made no attempt at all to come to terms with the visual evidence from the Samaritan oil lamps. See Y. Magen, “The Samaritans in Shechem and on the Blessed Mt of Gerizim,” in Z. H. Ehrlich, ed., Shomron u-Vinya’im (Jerusalem, 1987), pp. 177–210. Magen reproduces a drawing by Ritmyer without comment.

67 For an English translation of the thirteenth-century Kitab al-Ta‘rikh Abū’l Fath, see P. Stenhouse (Sydney, 1985).

68 AJ 11.293–297.

69 J. Bowman (Samaritan Documents Relating to Their History, Religion and Life [Pittsburgh, 1977], p. 135) implies that Hyrcanus himself tried to make the
logical evidence leaves us in no doubt that the Samaritan τέμενος was overbuilt by Hadrian and their temple site lost to them.\textsuperscript{70}

It is likely that from time to time, whenever it was possible, they continued an abbreviated form of sacrificial rite in the ruins of their temple, for as noted, the site itself was not lost to them until the time when Hadrian’s engineers used the foundation structures as the platform for his new temple.\textsuperscript{71} An episode recorded by Josephus would speak for such a continuity.

Josephus relates\textsuperscript{72} that during the revolutionary wars in July 67, a substantial group of Samaritans ascended Mt. Gerizim. The Romans interpreted this gathering as a hostile threat, surrounded the mountain, and after a “siege” of two days, put the gathering to death, killing nearly twelve thousand men. It is apparent that the Samaritans were unprepared for war; while they were armed, they had neither supplies nor water. We are informed that some of them died of thirst. The day of the gathering, the thirteenth of July, cannot have been a holy day, for the only day of such nature which falls in July is the ninth of Av.\textsuperscript{73} We must assume then that Josephus is correct in attributing a hostile intent to the Samaritans and in stating that they ascended the mountain for some sort of religious ceremonial, perhaps a sacrificial rite, before going into battle, and were caught before their preparations were complete. In support of this view we must note that there is no identifiable trace of a Samaritan liturgy developing until the time of Amram Darrah in the fourth century CE, yet a liturgy would surely have developed in the five centuries between Hyrcanus’ destruction of the temple and Amram Darrah if there had been no sacrificial worship on the mountain.

We may also assume that the Samaritans looked for a restoration of their temple. Not being exempt from the eschatological currents which were wracking the Jewish world at the time, they

\textsuperscript{70} Cf. Campbell, Jr., “Jewish Shrines.”
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{72} BJ 3.307–316.
\textsuperscript{73} This festival is unlikely to have had much meaning for the Samaritans unless they had an annual day of rejoicing at the time when the Jews mourned the fall of the first temple. Such a festival could account for the Judeans keeping a “Day of Gerizim” as a day of celebration commemorating the fall of the Samaritan temple. According to Megillat Ta’anit the Day of Gerizim was the 21st of Kislev.
apparently saw the contemporary turbulence as part of the messianic pangs which preceded the restoration of Israel. They apparently saw that restoration as coming in the near future. Though some scholars see no reference to a messianic figure in the events of 35 CE,74 when Samaritans gathered at Gerizim in search of the sacred vessels, the episode must be seen in the light of the Samaritan belief expressed in later writings that the world’s history was structured in epochs of favor and disfavor. According to this theory the sacred vessels were hidden in the time of Eli, when the period of Divine Favor came to an end and the period of Divine Disfavor commenced. For the episode described to have happened indicates that the Samaritans had adopted a theory of the periodicity of the world in an eschatological connection that we note in other writings of the period.75 Though we see no trace in the early Samaritan eschatological writings of the specific terminology for the periodicity of the world and the श्राचर्गपन that we find in later Samaritan writings, there is ample evidence of their belief in Moses as a messianic figure in the Tibat Marqeh and his accompaniment by Aaron, Eleazar, and Joshua and the seventy elders when the Day of Vengeance comes.76 There is also clear evidence in John 4:24–25 of Samaritan messianic expectation, perhaps in some

75 See Geza Vermes, “The Damascus Rule,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (2d ed., 1975), p. 97. Vermes’ translation of the Hebrew הָבֶּל אֵל הוהי שְׁנֵי by “in the age of wrath” shows the eschatological flavor of the passage very well. While we must note that there is no trace of this periodicity in the earliest extant eschatological writings of the Samaritans, it is so well attested in other writings, such as 2 Esdras, the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, and the Apocalypse of Abraham, and it follows so closely upon the idea of the Day of Yahweh which is a form of the Yom Nagam of the Samaritans, that we can scarcely doubt that the Samaritans had the same tradition. J. Massingberd-Ford (“Can We Exclude Samaritan Influence From Qumran?,” VT 6.1 [1967]: 109–130), at p. 120, attempts to base a theory of periodicity among the Samaritans from Macdonald’s edition of the Memarr Marqah, pp. 38–39. Unfortunately the evidence does not support the conclusions drawn.
76 Ben-Ḥayyīm, in his new edition of Marqah (122a4) is at pains to draw our attention to the possibility of confusing ḫvhoṭeh and ḥvhoṭeh. When we examine the description of the Day of Vengeance there is no concept there of periods of Divine Favor and Disfavor. However, the tale of the sacred vessels indicates that some such concept was known to the Samaritans.
figures other than Moses. By the end of the first century there can scarcely be any doubt of the Samaritan messianic views and activities.

It is probable that the expectation of the restoration of their own temple prevented the Samaritans from sharing the ambivalence of the Essenes and of the Christians to the Jerusalem temple. While the Essenes turned their back on the Jerusalem temple but hoped for its restoration under a legitimate priesthood, and the early Christians gradually espoused the idea of a world without a physical temple, the Samaritans appeared never to have abandoned their hope of restoration. It is true that the loss of the temple may well have lead the Samaritans, like Essenes and Christians, in the direction of seeing themselves as a spiritual temple, but the tradition of themselves as a spiritual temple never became fully blown. We are aware that the Samaritans prayed facing towards Gerizim and that when they pronounced a blessing they did so in the name of Gerizim, subsuming to themselves a form of spirituality. However, the use of the name Gerizim shows that their attitude to their own temple never changed even after its destruction. On the other hand we can see that their view of the continued existence of a house of worship in Jerusalem was one of jealousy which led to hostility. They despised the Jerusalem temple and did their best to pollute it.

Contrary to the oft stated view that the Samaritans believed in no prophet other than Moses and were therefore different from the Jews, John 4:19 indicates that the Samaritans did assume that there were prophets other than Moses, unless the woman was being totally cynical in speaking with Jesus. Jesus’ statement in response to the woman would speak against such a cynical interpretation. Justin Martyr also noted that the Samaritans were expecting a Messiah. There had, of course, long been a tradition of sacred things being buried on the mountain, even though those things were idols. The tradition is based on the account in Gen 35:4 of Jacob hiding the teraphim stolen by Rachel from Laban under the oak which was by Shechem. Joseph Heinemann ("Polemics," pp. 57–69) draws our attention to the version of this verse in Midrash ha-Gadol, "And Jacob hid them under the terebinth which was by Mt. Gerizim." With such a long-standing tradition of sacra buried on the mountain it is scarcely surprising that there developed an eschatological association along the lines described.


bAZ 26b–27a.
We are informed of two incidents which demonstrate their exacerbation with Jerusalem. 80 Josephus 81 relates the story of the Samaritans who entered the temple on the eve of Passover and scattered human bones in it, thus rendering it unclean, and we must assume, contaminating the priests, who were unable to go near the dead for fear of contamination. The incident, which happened in the procuratorship of Coponius, may have been triggered by harsh treatment of the Samaritans, but the fact that the episode happened on the Passover suggests some sort of resentment of the fact that the Samaritan temple was gone, whereas the Jews were able to celebrate the Passover in their own sacred place. 82 The Samaritan Chronicle 83 relates that the Samaritans substituted rats or mice in a cage of doves being carried to Jerusalem as temple (freewill) offerings and that these rats polluted the temple. There is no verification of the story from any other source, but it bespeaks the hostility of the Samaritans to the Jerusalem temple. We must also note the account of the Samaritans interfering with the fire signals, 84 although it has been argued that this was not deliberate interference to confuse the Jews of Babylon as to the date of the festival but a Samaritan signal to their own diaspora that was misread by the Jewish community in Babylon.

The physical manifestations of the hostility of the Samaritans to the temple almost certainly arose from the jealous passions caused by the loss of their own altar and tabernacle and from their consciousness that Gerizim was a rival to Mt. Zion and Jerusalem. When the Jerusalem temple was lost to the Judaeans, and Judaean eschatological expectations were dealt a fatal blow with the death of R. Akiba and Bar Kokhba and the persecutions consequent on the failure of the revolt, we begin to note an increase in the polemical writings relating to the rivalry, that is, from the middle

80 We should be wary of adopting the view that attacks on the temple showed hostility to the Jews of Judaea. Rather, it shows no more than a particular attitude to the temple.
81 AJ 18.30.
82 Montgomery (Samaritans, p. 85) takes the difficult sequel in this story in Josephus to mean that the Samaritans were henceforth banned from the temple worship, whereas they had not been so banned before. Such a reading is entirely against the tenor of the opening words of the account that the Samaritans had admitted themselves by stealth.
83 Stenhouse ed. chapter 34.
84 mRH 1.3.
of the second century CE onwards. It is evident that the rivalry was kept within reasonable bounds until this period.

It is possible that the Samaritans saw a manifestation of divine activity in this second subjugation of Judaea (though they were not exempt from the suffering of the Hadrianic persecutions) when the Judaeans were placed on an equal footing with themselves. Their claim to superiority within the Jewish world might appear to have been justified by events. The personae mentioned in the aggadic polemics against the Samaritans all seem to have lived in the late second century. The intensity of the polemic has led some scholars to argue that the Samaritans took no part in the struggles against the Romans at this time or that they even supported the Romans against the Judaeans. This view is supported by the statement of R. Abbahu that "thirteen towns were absorbed by the Cutheans in the days of Hadrian's persecutions." The truth is that we do not know whether the Samaritans took part in that revolt or not, although there is every likelihood that the Samaritans did take up arms against the Romans independently of the Jews. We do know that Hadrian built a pagan temple on Gerizim, turned Neapolis into a πόλις, and forbade Samaritan Jews to perform circumcision. Eusebius points to Samaritan participation in the revolt in his *Theophany*, "These two mountains (Gerizim and Jerusalem) were destroyed and besieged in the days of Titus

---

85 The polemics are listed by Heinemann ("Anti-Samaritan Polemics") who attempts no chronological differentiation between matters recorded. However, analysis of the names of the tannaim in his study indicates that they were either survivors of the Bar Kokhba revolt or that they lived within the generation which followed.


87 The date of Abbahu himself is uncertain. In some of the older literature he is described as an amora of the third century, but 275–320 is generally accepted as his life span. In S. Lieberman’s "The Martyrs of Caesarea," *Annaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 7 (1939–1944): 345–446, he indicates that Abbahu died in the early fourth century (309). This dating would place the final Samaritan schism from the Judeans rather earlier in the third century than we might otherwise allow. Lieberman’s view was challenged by Sonné in a somewhat embittered exchange in *JQR* (1946–1947).

and Vespasian and in the days of Hadrian.” The evidence has recently been summarized in an attempt to show that the constant phrase that the “Samaritans became corrupted” refers to the relationships between Jews and Samaritans after the Bar Kokhba revolt.  

The Samaritan evidence, as the external evidence, supports Schiffman’s conclusions. The increase in polemic was due to the fact that they were again on a par with the Judaeans. Both groups had lost their temple, both were persecuted by the Romans, both were in straitened economic circumstances. Perhaps the Samaritans were in a slightly better position than the Judaeans for they still had immediate eschatological expectations which the Jews had not. The evidence points to this period as the time when they began to make additions to the Pentateuch text in order to emphasize their claim, an activity which Eleazar ben Simeon regarded as fruitless, for the texts spoke for themselves in favor of the identification of Gerizim-Bethel-Moreh.  

The evidence leads us to believe that it was the aftermath of the Hadrianic persecutions which led to the final breach between Judaeans and Samaritans. While Josephus speaks of the mutual

---

89 See Schiffman, “The Samaritans,” and Mor, “The Samaritans and Bar-Kokhhah.”
90 See M. Mor, “The Samaritans and Bar-Kokhbah,” p. 29.
91 Mor (ibid.) argues that the increase in polemic came form the Judaeans because of economic rivalry and because Hadrian redrew the frontiers of Judea adding towns to Samaria. There is no doubt that he is correct but there are other reasons, as noted here, for the increasing polemic between Judaeans and Samaritans.
92 Dositheanism, a heresy which is alleged to have developed in the wake of the activities of Simon Magus, was alive and well until the time of Eulogius of Alexandria in the late sixth century. Even if one refuses to accept the association between Simon Magus and Dositheus, a first century CE dating for his life is indicated. See Isser, Dositheans, pp. 106ff.
93 See Heinemann, “Anti-Samaritan Polemics,” and ySot III 7,21c.
94 However, note the conclusion in E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black (Edinburgh, 1973), 1:19: “Thus when in 64 BCE Pompey liberated Samaria from the Hasmoneans the Samaritan breach with the Jews was complete.” H. Mantel (“The Secession of the Samaritans” [Hebrew], Bar Ilan Annual 7–8 [1970]: 162–178) distinguishes between the Sadducees and Pharisees in establishing the chronology of the schism. He argues that the “Community of the exile” (the predecessors of the Pharisees) broke with the Samaritans in the early days of the Second Temple, but
antipathy of Samaritans and Jews, and later rabbinic sources confirm that there was a clear breach between them, there is reason to suggest that the cementing bond was stronger than the centrifugal force at least until the second century CE, and the ties were not broken until the third century. Throughout the first century the Samaritans were no less Jews than the Essenes and the early Christians, Jews bound by the Torah, both oral and written, and a form of the written Torah at that which was well established and is represented at Qumran (4Q Palæo ExM, 11Q Palæo Lev) among types of the MT and types of the LXX. Samaritan observance of the written Torah was both known and widely accepted though there was some suspicion of their oral Torah. That Samaritan oral law has considerable antiquity is made clear by the statement that where Jewish halakhah derives directly from the Torah the Samaritans would observe the halakhah in a similar way and their observance is reliable and is acceptable to the Jews. However, where Jewish halakhah is based only on oral tradition the Samaritan halakhah will deviate, as they too will have a tradition in this matter and it will be different. Implicit in these arguments is the clear fact that the Samaritan Torah version was regarded as a reliable source of halakhah and was not to be lightly set aside or viewed with the same suspicion as expressed by the amoraim, who spoke of the Samaritan version as being corrupt.

What caused this change of attitude to the Samaritan version and to the Samaritans themselves so that they were no longer accepted as Torah Jews? What caused the hardening of rabbinic attitudes to the Samaritans and their exclusion from the status of Jews?

In summary I argue that there was a complex of causes which sparked the final schism between Judaeans and Samaritan, but the trigger might well have been a single factor, namely, the development of heretical rather than schismatic Samaritanism with a separate Pentateuch which included the specific characteristics which we come to recognize as Samaritan, the development of a chain of synagogues, and the establishment of a liturgy and a series

that the severance from the Sadducees did not take place until the conquest of Shechem by Hyrcanus (see his English summary, p. xvii). The rabbinic evidence is clearly against both conclusions, and an alternative solution which accounts for the evidence is needed.
of Midrash schools for the development of the Samaritan halakhah. These developments, which were parallel with the work of the tannaim began under the aegis of the Samaritan hero, Baba Rabba.

It is the accepted truism in scholarly literature that Baba should be assigned to the fourth century, but the Samaritan Chronicles put him in the third century and make him a younger contemporary of Judah ha-Nasi, living at about the same time as Origen, whose Hexapla took note of the Samaritan Pentateuch.95 The events of the chronicles would seem to place the beginning of Baba's career in the interregnum in Palestine between 235 and 238 CE, when the country was threatened by border tribes, and it continued through the reign of Gordianus who fought the Persians in 243.96

The third century was a century of comparative and relative peace for the Samaritans, who seem to have used their military training in the middle of the century, in the period when the Romans had few garrison troops in central Palestine, to maintain their own standing force of about three thousand men at Neapolis. It was in this period that their great religious reformers worked, their liturgy began to take its shape and they began to formulate

95 The references here are to Abūl Fath's Chronicle. Cf. Paul Stenhouse, The Kitāb al-Taʾrīkh of Abūl Fath (Ph.D. diss., Sydney, 1980) 3 vols., and his translation of this work (see n. 67).
96 Cf. Stenhouse, Kitāb al-Taʾrīkh, 4:202–205. He suggests that Baba Rabba should be dated to the third century and achieved a more precise dating in his paper to the Table Ronde of the CNRS on the Samaritans in October 1986. Bruce Hall (Samaritan Religion) also sees Baba's career as falling within the third century. If we do not accept the timetable presented above for the events described by Abūl Fath we are forced to assume that the materials of the Chronicle are disordered and in need of rearranging. What is presented in the chronicle (fol. 148) as an invasion of frontier tribes is assumed to be the Persian incursion ca. 353 CE, whereas on the data provided above it falls into place in the period following the death of Alexander Severus.

That a reassessment of the chronology of Palestine in the third century is needed is becoming clear from the results of the work of Eric Meyers and his pupils. See Dennis E. Groh, "Jews and Christians in Late Roman Palestine: Towards a New Chronology," Biblical Archaeologist 51.2 (1988): 80–98. Groh presents a chronology which suggests that a new phase in Roman Palestinian history accompanied by substantial building activity should be reckoned from 250 CE lasting until 363 CE. The building activities of Baba Rabba and his followers would fit well into this period.
their masoretic tradition about the copying of the Pentateuch. We must also note some changes in the larger towns where the Samaritans had large minorities which caused the amoraim to change their attitudes toward them.

It was the Samaritan council which changed the face of Samaritanism in the period of Baba Rabba and allowed the Diaspora to expand. The Samaritan Chronicles make it clear that their function was not only to dispense justice and advise the people in the portion of Palestina Prima to which each counselor was allotted but also to guide the people in the interpretation of the halakah and to teach them the law.97 We are told that Baba sought out the members of the council who had survived the preceding troubled years under the Roman emperors and set about reconstituting the council.98 Abū'ī Fath's text states that there were seven counselors (ḥukamāʾ), of whom three were priests and four were laymen. These seven served as peripatetic instructors and notaries public to the Samaritan communities in the district which each of them supervised.99 The revival of the council by Baba was followed by the building of a number of synagogues in those parts of Palestina Prima in which there were strong concentrations of Samaritans.100

97 The role of the Samaritan council is discussed in detail in my “Samaritan Religion in the Fourth Century, NTT 41.1 (1986): 29–47 (pp. 42–44). In addition to that discussion one should note that there was a leader of the community, termed in bSanh 90a “the Patriarch of the Samaritans,” in a context which places him in the second century CE. We must assume that this Patriarch was the head of the Samaritan Council which existed in the time of Josephus and which was recognized by the Romans as having authority over the Samaritans.

98 Such a tradition seems to have a historical basis and speaks for the probability that Baba lived in the early part of the third century, otherwise there would have been no possibility of survivors in the interval since the Hadrianic persecution.

99 In the fuller, later, and more embellished Chronicle Adler and parallel chronicles the number of counselors is given as twelve, giving the impression that Baba's division of districts was an ideal rather than a real one. It would seem, however, that the tradition of an ideal division is secondary, depending upon an observation of Abū'ī Fath himself in which he contrasted the situation which had existed before the council was set up with that which existed in his day.

100 The nature of the Samaritan synagogue is discussed by Gottfried Reeg, Die samaritanischen Synagogen (vol. 2 of Die Antiken Synagogen in Israel [Wiesbaden, 1977]). Reeg examines the evidence from both textual and archaeological sources. Though his conclusions are often tentative there is evidence of an expanding group of synagogues in this period.
We may expect that a synagogue was also built in Beth Shean/Scythopolis in Palestine, where there was a group of officiating priests but no synagogue, and in Nebo/Siyagha in Moab, which was on the frontier of Palestina Prima. These synagogues were built not only as places of worship in the regions beyond the immediate reach of Mt. Gerizim but were also to serve as the centers of Samaritan scholarship and law-giving—they functioned like the local midrash schools of the Jewish synagogues, for according to Abūl Fath each of the synagogues had "a place . . . in the southern part . . . so that anyone with a personal problem could ask the ḥukamā' about it and be given a sound answer." In other words, the synagogue was to serve the local community for the interpretation of the law and the development of the halakhah. The counselor was in the position of the ḥakham (sage) in the rabbinic tradition of the period.

We may assume that part of the activity of the Samaritan sages was not only the fixing and teaching of the halakhah but also the establishing of a canonical text of the Samaritan Pentateuch and of the traditions by which it was to be copied. There is reasonable

---

101 See Sylvester J. Saller, The Memorial of Moses in Mount Nebo (Jerusalem, 1941), 1:43–44. Saller is apparently uncertain of the date of the synagogue which he found, but from the evidence that he presented one must assume that it was built as a Samaritan synagogue and was eventually taken over as a church and rebuilt in the Byzantine era.

102 A useful map of the changing definitions of Palestina Prima, Secunda, and Tertia is to be found in the Atlas of Israel (Amsterdam and Jerusalem, 1970).

103 Kitāb al-Taʾrikh 4.181.

104 Recent discussion of the halakhic activity of the Samaritan sages (see my "The Samaritans in the Byzantine Orbit," BJRL 69.1 [1986]: 111–112) has been extended by I. R. M. Boid, "Use, Authority, and Exegesis of Mikra in the Samaritan Tradition," in M. J. Mulder, ed., Mikra (Assen, 1988), pp. 595–633. There is a clear implication that the halakhic exegetical activity of the Samaritan sages included the fixing of the text. However, the evidence of what Boid terms "recension C" of Abūl Fath (p. 604) must be discounted. This recension belongs to the expanded version of the text of which numerous manuscripts exist. Stenhouse set aside these expanded versions in his edition of Abūl Fath because they incorporate so much late material that they obfuscate the state of the text in Abūl Fath's day. Without considerable exegesis to demonstrate the source and age of the expansion we cannot accept what they say if they enlarge upon Abūl Fath's text. However, Boid is correct in pointing to the need for an edition of the expanded material, and one is in fact in the course of preparation in the Sydney "School" of Samaritan studies.
evidence that some of the features of the arrangement of the Samaritan text which we regard as specifically Samaritan were established by the time that the great uncial manuscript, Codex Alexandrinus, was copied, perhaps in Caesarea.105

It is in Caesarea that we see another activity of the Samaritan Council which was creating tension with the Amoraim. The Samaritan leadership of that city, anxious to hold onto preferment as officials of the city, offered libations and sacrifices to the local gods when they could have escaped the need to do this by resigning.106 R. Abbahu and other amoraim took the view that the Samaritans, acting in a voluntary capacity (when Christians, for example, preferred martyrdom to idolatry), were demonstrating further their tendencies towards heresy which were moving them into isolation from the mother religion rather than returning to it. They were therefore to be outlawed and excommunicated by the Jews who were increasingly exacerbated by what the Samaritan Pentateuch implied about Samaritan relationships with the Judaeans.107

The real breach with rabbinic Judaism, then, seems to have come from a concatenation of circumstances but was marked by the development of a distinctive version of the Pentateuch with its 6,000 variants from the Masoretic text.108 None of the palaeo-Hebrew texts from Qumran which have similarities to the Samaritan version are at all close to the Samaritikon cited by Origen in

105 The evidence for this suggestion has been examined in my “Columnar Writing and the Samaritan Massorah,” BJRUL 67.1 (1984): 349–381. Note Lieberman’s words about scholarly cooperation in Caesaria at this time, “Martyrs,” p. 398.

106 See Lieberman, “Martyrs,” p. 408, for a discussion.

107 This interpretation is based on both Lieberman and Isaiah Sonne’s critique of his work in “The Use of Rabbinical Literature as Historical Sources,” JQR 36 (1946–1947): 147–169.

108 Dexinger (“Limits of Tolerance,” pp. 108–109) correctly points up the fact that the additional commandment making Mt. Gerizim the sacred mountain was the limit of tolerance for the Jews of the Samaritans. Purvis (“Samaritans and Judaism”) reaches a similar conclusion about the role of the Samaritan Pentateuch in forcing a breach with the Jews. His neat summary reads (p. 89):

At some time subsequent to the building of their temple the Samaritans produced an edition of the Pentateuch in which their theological legitimacy was decisively declared and through which the cultic traditions of Jerusalem were . . . declared illegitimate. This was accomplished by deliberate textual manipulation to underscore the sanctity (and necessity) of Shechem/Gerizim as
his *Hexapla.* It is clear enough today that the Samaritan variants relate to Samaritan hermeneutics and exegesis of the text. They are not merely the crystallization into a particular form of a series of text variants as one finds between the Septuagint and the MT. Furthermore, it has also been made clear in recent studies in Berlin

the divinely ordained center of Israel's cultic life. . . . It was this contention, not simply the existence of a Samaritan temple, which drove the permanent wedge between Samaritans and Jews.

It is clear from this summary that Purvis misreads the time scale of the deliberate changes in the text, though he tries to bring it down to or after the destruction of the Samaritan temple (p. 90) and takes no account of the integration of the changes within the reform programme which changed the nature of Samaritanism in the third century.

109 See Dexinger, “Limits of Tolerance,” p. 108. In his *Hexapla* Origen referred to the Samaritikon and a debate has been conducted since then as to whether this was simply a reference to the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch or to an independent Greek version. Glau and Rahlfs appeared to have settled the argument about the existence of an independent Greek version with their discovery of the Giessen papyri which preserved fragments of a Greek text of Deut 24–29 which they claimed was from the Samaritikon as it represented a tradition rather different from the Septuagint and apparently that of the Samaritans. The fundamental reason for the identification of these fragments as part of the Samaritikon was the reading of Gerizim in Deut 4 in place of Ebal, that is, the Samaritan version of this verse. In addition to this there is agreement in Deut 25:7–8 between the Samaritan Targum and these fragments in a form which seems to indicate that the Greek fragments were drawn from a Samaritan milieu. All things considered, Glau and Rahlfs date the text before the days of Origen on the ground that the *Hexapla* quotes the Samaritikon, but they indicate that the dependence on the Septuagint apparent in the fragments (though they maintain that the text is far enough from the Septuagint to indicate an independent translation) would argue for a text younger than the Septuagint. They decline to offer a more precise dating than this for they argue that the provenance of the fragments (which were found in Egypt) leads to no conclusion, because the translation itself may have been done elsewhere, where Greek and Samaritan lived in close proximity. Although Emanuel Tov has argued that the fragments represent a revision of the Septuagint rather than being drawn from the Samaritikon, Noja suggests that not only are the Giessen fragments part of the Samaritikon that they there may well be other fragments in existence that have been improperly identified and which will come to be identified as the Samaritikon in due time. Bruce Waltke supports Glau and Rahlfs’ conclusions and adds the additional argument that the Samaritan Pentateuch reached its final form before the time of Origen (on this date see below). At this time the evidence is inconclusive, and we cannot argue strongly that the Giessen papyri are parts of a Samaritan manuscript.
that the Samaritan tendency to remove anthropomorphisms in the Pentateuch came about under the influence of the fusion of Samaritan and Hellenistic cultures, and that their hermeneutic style developed in an Aramaic milieu and follows the Septuagint—it does not precede it. Macuch concludes that the Samaritan Pentateuch was fixed over a period that extended into the first Christian centuries. We might supplement Macuch’s conclusions with the observation that while the Samaritan Qumran materials may have been proto-Samaritan, they were not the Samaritan version in the forms in which it is now known. The Samaritan version took shape, to be formulated in the fashion in which we find it today, at some time after the Qumran site was deserted, for there is no other evidence from Qumran of this version. In other words, we are looking at the period between 135 CE and Origen’s citation of the Samaritikon which would put us squarely into the period of intensive activity in Baba’s lifetime. One contrary argument to these conclusions might be indicated by Stephen’s speech in Acts, which appears to draw upon the Samaritan Pentateuch, giving the impression that the Samaritan Pentateuch was in existence at that time. However, a recent reexamination of the evidence testifies against sion that the Samaritan Pentateuch was in existence at that time. However, a recent reexamination of the evidence testifies against

110 Cf. R. Macuch, “Les bases philologiques de l’herméneutique et les bases herméneutique de la philologie chez les Samaritaines,” in Rothschild and Sixdenier, eds., Études samaritaines, Pentateuque, et Targum (Louvain and Paris, 1988), pp. 149–158. John Lightfoot (Horae hebraicae et talmudicae, ed. R. Gandell [Oxford, 1859]) makes an interesting observation (p. 358) on the exchange of the names Ebal and Gerizim in Deut 11:29 and 27:12–13. Having drawn our attention to rabbinc complaints about the expansion of Deut 11:30, he suggests that the reason no complaints were heard about the exchange of Gerizim and Ebal is that these changes were made after the lifetime of Eliezer ben Jose, i.e., after the second century CE. The argument from silence is, of course, dangerous, but not without merit.


112 Cf. D. N. Freedman and K. A. Mathews, The Palaeo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (Winona Lake, 1985), where the term “proto-Samaritan” regularly indicates that the text is not the Samaritan Pentateuch. Judith E. Sanderson (An Exodus Scroll from Qumran [Atlanta, 1986]) seems to find 4Q Palaeo ExodM rather close to the Samaritan version but not identical with it.
Stephen having drawn on the Samaritan version. Before this time, especially the first century, the Samaritans were Jews. After Baba, Judaism reached its limit of toleration of Samaritanism because it had produced a Torah version at variance with that which was accepted as canonical in Judaea.

---


114 Albright and Mann (Acts, p. 298) indicate that Paul considered the Samaritans as Jews of the same ilk as himself.

115 Dexinger, "Limits of Tolerance," p. 112:

The fact that there are Samaritans shows that there are limits to the flexibility of Judaism. The breaking point comes when the divergent views of the two parties in question are equally furnished with exclusive claims.