

## The Samaritans (*el-Sāmiriyyūn*) and Some Theological Issues Between Samaritanism and Islam

FEHRULLAH TERKAN  
DR., ANKARA Ü. İLAHİYAT FAKÜLTESİ  
e-mail: fterkan@uchicago.edu

### özet

İslam tarihini yeniden yapılandırmaya çalışan revizyonist ve indirgemeci yaklaşım, İslam'ın bazı teolojik esaslarının Yahudilik ve Hıristiyanlık'ın yanısıra Samiri inanç esaslarından etkilenecek vazedildiğini iddia etmektedir. Bu makale, Samirilik ve İslam'ın itikad ve ibadetlerinden bazılarını mukayese ederek, ortaya atılan iddiaların teorik ve mantıksal kısa bir tahlilini sunmaktadır. Makale, son tahlilde, İslam'ın Samirilik'ten etkilendiği şeklindeki düşüncenin teorik ve tarihsel açıdan sıkıntılı olduğunu, kesin ve tutarlı bir şekilde kabul edilemeyeceğini, ve etkileme yönünün tersten okunmasının daha savunulur olduğunu ileri sürmektedir.

### anahtar kelimeler

Samirilik, Yahudilik, İslam, Samiri-Yahudi Çatışması

"A Samaritan is like a full Jew."  
N. Schur

### *I. Introduction*

After a period of classical western perspective of Islam and its holy book, we witness a new variety of approaches in modern western scholarship toward Islam. Such approaches sometimes concern themselves only with theological aspects of Islam, or argue against the authenticity of the Qur'ānic creed while seemingly accepting the historicity of it, or question the historicity of this "newfangled" faith altogether. This last one is basically a historical standpoint that investigates Islamic origins either through the Islamic sources with 'fair' criticism, or --harboring significant doubts about them-- through non-Islamic sources contemporary to the rise of Islam. Such works try to underline the Jewish and Christian factors in the development of Islam, while others prefer to see it as a heretic offspring of the former two. Few scholars attempt to better understand the nature of this new religion by studying its

historical and cultural background as well as its internal dynamics. Some scholars utter the fact that the volume of the extra-Islamic sources at the time of Islamic emergence is not that sufficient to reconstruct the history of Islam.<sup>1</sup>

One of the classical claims made about Islam is that Islam has been influenced by Christian and Jewish doctrines. Apart from these two, especially in such works as *Hagarism*, another candidate has been introduced to have influenced Islam: the Samaritans or Samaritanism. This is a very interesting case in that it can only have any bearings to the point only if one accepts the assumptions made in that work.<sup>2</sup> In this book, Muslims are

<sup>1</sup> For example, F. Donner states that the majority of them are "neither contemporary with the events nor consistent in what they say." F. M. Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1997), 3. Donner classifies those who think that non-Islamic sources should be taken as a basis to do such a reconstruction under the category of revisionists. This category includes such scholars as J. Wansbrough, P. Crone, M. Cook, etc. As a result of this approach which tries to "step out" of the Islamic tradition to get a better vision of it, they seem to have filled the blanks caused by the scarcity of contemporary external sources with presuppositions. See Wansbrough, *Qur'anic Studies* (London, 1977); P. Crone and M. Cook, *Hagarism* (Cambridge, 1977); Crone, *Slaves on Horses* (Cambridge, 1980). This is not the place to discuss and criticize these approaches, but a general criticism would be the lack of support for their assumption that the external sources are sufficient and reliable. For a detailed criticism, see Donner, *Narratives*, 25ff. For a systematic criticism of *Slaves on Horses* by Crone, see Donner's review of this book in the *JAOS*, vol. 102-2 (1982) pp. 367-371. According to F. Rahman, Crone and Cook suppose their work on Wansbrough's thesis as established truth (*Major Themes of the Qur'an* (Chicago, 1982), xv.) It is also important to note van Ess' perspective: "We should not forget that these texts ... only show how the new phenomenon was seen, not how it was actually was." Joseph van Ess, "The Making of Islam" (Book Review) *The Times Literary Supplement* (Sep. 1978), 997. Hoyland, in his *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It* (Princeton, 1997) p. 593, n.5, tries to question this fair statement in a footnote by employing a practically irrelevant philosophical issue of existence; however, he is right when he says this statement needs qualification, What van Ess says doesn't necessarily mean that they should be discarded. Yet it actually urges one to be as cautious about them as one should be about Islamic sources. After all, "... like the Islamic sources, they were in most cases compiled under the pressure of religious and political forces..." (Donner, *Narratives*, p. 3). Accordingly, we witness in the external sources an unfriendly attitude toward Islam because of possibly tendentious inclinations. In many works, they placed it, for example, in the apocalyptic writings and saw Muhammad and Islam as one of the eschatological signs in the Bible; the Visions of Daniel: the four beasts are Greeks, Sassanians, Kingdom of the North, Gog and Magog, and finally Kingdom of Ishmael (cited in Hoyland, 534). Also for the Seven Visions of Daniel (Armenian version), see M. Gaster's "Introduction" to the *Asâtîr, the Samaritan Book of the "Secrets of Moses"* (London: RAS, 1927), pp. 51-52. The point being made here is that they often appear to be as much hostile against Islam as the Muslims may have been eager to crystallize their history.

<sup>2</sup> Crone and Cook basically suggest that Islamic creed and institutions as we know them were developed after the conquest of Syria. This line of thinking considers as if the pre-conquest period had hardly existed. Since the Arabs interacted with Christians and Jews in and around Jerusalem, they somehow started syncretizing their creed and institutions to form their religion. Here I am not assertive enough to refute *Hagarism's* claims, nor do I intend to. Since they can be challenged only from a historical point of view, it is my contention that as long as they replace the lack of

viewed as syncretistic in that they only accepted and adopted whatever fits in their mindset. Judging by certain seemingly identical or similar beliefs and practices, they claim that among the other faiths Muslims borrowed also from Samaritanism, whose identity is still at issue among the historians of Semitics. The Samaritans have been considered by some scholars as the adherents of a heretic sect of Judaism, which favors the Jewish point of view. Others have seen Samaritanism as a different version of Israelite religion, of Judaism, but justified as well. Some others thought that they are the descendants of those who were formerly pagans and later Judaized people of Cuthah, which is suggested in the Bible. Regardless of who they were, in the present time, when one examines the Samaritan doctrines and observe them perform their rituals, one can easily be bewildered by the striking similarities between Samaritanism and Islam. However the problem is what these similarities amount to, if anything. Their history is very complicated and controversial, and their belief system has been charged by others of being syncretistic and being a product of “borrowing” from other systems, especially Judaism, and to some extent from Christianity and Islam.

In this paper, I will present a brief historical background of the Samaritans and then discuss the most conspicuous characteristics of Samaritanism. Using the Samaritan and other data, I will discuss characteristic Samaritan beliefs on theoretical and logical basis. Since Judaism is another sea to plunge in, I will try to avoid Jewish Orthodox beliefs except when necessary. Secondly, I will argue that there are some theological and religious<sup>3</sup> similarities as well as some irreconcilable differences between the Muslim and Samaritan creeds. Giving first a brief introduction about Samaritan identity and the development of this belief system, I will deal with the theological issues comparatively.

## *II. Brief historical background*

a) *Origin*: The identity of the Samaritans has been long discussed by the scholars, yet no agreement has been reached. There is still a controversy over who they were, and whence they come. What is the content of their relation to the Jews? Since both parties claim to have the original Pentateuch, how did they fall apart, and what is the reason behind the schism? First of all the Samaritans have their own history conveyed by their chronicles which date

---

sufficient ‘historical evidence’ by big assumptions, their claims can only be criticized methodologically, for which Donner’s attempt would be an example.

<sup>3</sup> By which I mean the doctrines taught specifically in the Qur’ān.

back to various times, mostly to the post-Islamic period up until 19th century. According to the Samaritan account, they are a totally distinctive people and they had their own traditions, beliefs and practices not stolen from Judaism as some thought. They claim to be the descendant of the ancient Joseph tribes and the Levitical priests who have lived in Shechem and its surroundings since the Israelite settlement in Canaan.<sup>4</sup> They were one of the two surviving branches of the Israelite nation, the other being the Jews; but only the Samaritans have remained true to the Mosaic faith as given in the Torah.<sup>5</sup> This is the main claim of the Samaritans, and the differentiating character, according to them, is their supposedly authentic Pentateuch as opposed to the Jewish Pentateuch, which is charged by the Samaritans of being distorted by the Jewish prophets and rabbis.

On the other hand, Jewish view of the Samaritans' origin presents a completely different story. Their account is grounded mainly on a Biblical basis (2 Kings 17:14-41), which was elaborated by the Jewish historian Josephus, who is known for his hostile position toward the Samaritans. According to 2 Kings 14:17-41, after the Assyrian conquest of the region, in 722 the king replaced many of the Israelites by some people from the Mesopotamian cities such as Cuthah, and others,<sup>6</sup> who were pagans at that time and brought their pagan tradition along. These people, who were referred to as Kutims by the Jews, were settled in Samaria, and later would become the Samaritans. In time, these people, for some reason or another, started worshipping YHWH,<sup>7</sup> but by mixing with their original pagan beliefs.<sup>8</sup> Later on, they claimed to have been from the Israelite nation for

<sup>4</sup> For a brief sketch and evaluation of different interpretations, see J. D. Purvis, "The Samaritans and Judaism" in R.A. Kraft and G.R. Nickelsburg (eds), *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986). Also see T.H. Gaster, "Samaritans" *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York, 1962) 191. Another book to check about the discussion of the Samaritan origin is J.E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (Tübingen, 1985), especially the Introduction.

<sup>5</sup> Purvis, "Samaritans and Judaism," 83. N. Schur argues that from a historical aspect, this is an untenable position. See his argument in *History of the Samaritans* (Frankfurt: V.P. Lang, 1989) 29.

<sup>6</sup> See Josephus' account in W. Whiston (ed), *Works of Josephus* (New York, 1885), ii, pp. 147, 182. Also *Syriac Chronicle Known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene* (London, 1899), p. 231; cf. J. Mann, "A Polemical Work against Karaite and other Sectaries," *JQR*, v.12, p.145.

<sup>7</sup> See 2 Kings xviii. An interesting reason is the attacks of lions, for which they are called 'lion converts' by the Jews. For comment on this see I. Munro, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and Modern Criticism* (London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1911), p. 5: The Lord sent lions among them, which killed some people in the region. Upon request, the king sent there a few priests to teach them the religion. See Gaster, *Samaritans*, p. 11. Also see Schur, p. 19; cf. Mann, pp. 145-146.

<sup>8</sup> Against the charge of dove worshipping, see Nutt, *Fragments of a Samaritan Targum* (London: Trubner, 1874), p. 44. For the same argument and evidence of coins, see Schur, 56-57. For the

political reasons and to have had the genuine Pentateuch.<sup>9</sup> Between the two accounts a huge unbridgeable gap can be easily seen. But no matter what or who they were, or at last who they claim to have been, the obvious problem is the fact that both claimed that they have the original Torah which leads to another claim of being the true descendants of the Israelite nation.<sup>10</sup> The point of interest here is that they both believe to have true Mosaic faith. Although whose position is justifiable is not a matter of concern in this paper, from the Qur'ānic point of view they both can be allied with certain Qur'ānic understanding of Judaism in one way or another, which will be taken up in due course. Ultimately, according to Macdonald, Samaritanism is not a variant of Judaism, neither is it heterodox or unorthodox Judaism. It is an Israelite religion.<sup>11</sup> They did not even borrow from Judaism.<sup>12</sup>

b) *The word "Samaritan"*: the English word "Samaritan" is originally derived from the Greek,<sup>13</sup> occurs only at 2 Kings 17:29. The Hebrew word is

---

critics of the pagan influence on the Samaritan *Halachah*, see I. R. Boid, *Principle of Samaritan Halachah*. (Leiden, 1989), p. 7. A. Löwy says that the claim is based on the discovery of images, and the Samaritans are right in their protest against this charge in the Talmud, since their literature does not contain a single trace of pagan belief. See "On the Samaritans in the Talmudical Writings" in *SBA* (1979-1980), p.13.

<sup>9</sup> Josephus confirms in his *Antiquities* that they were formerly pagan people who converted to Judaism and established a syncretistic heresy, which was designated in the rabbinical tradition as Kuthims (Cutheans), (pp. 147, 256, 299). According to T.H. Gaster, there is a confusion and "telescoping" in Josephus' data. Furthermore, he claims that even if the biblical account is confirmed, it does not prove that the Jews are right in regarding the Samaritans as the offspring of the colonists. There is in fact much to support the Samaritan claim ("Samaritans," p. 191). Cf. L. Nemo's "Al-Qirqisāni's Account of the Jewish Sects and Christianity" *HUCA*, v. 7 (1930), p. 325; cf. R.J. Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews, the Origin of Samaritanism Reconsidered* (Atlanta: J. Knox Press, 1975), pp. 2-3; Ben-Zvi, *The Exiled and the Redeemed* (Philadelphia: JPSA, 1957), p. 123; Jaffe, pp. 135-136; Macdonald, *The Theology of Samaritans* (London: SCM Press, 1964), p.21. In other Jewish literature, the Samaritans were classed among the gentiles with regard to the legal issues. See Macdonald, "The Discovery of Samaritan Religion," *Religion*, v.2, p. 144. For examples, see also Mishna: Yevamoth ch. 2; Kethuboth, 3; Nedarim, 3; Gittin, 1; Oholoth, 17; Niddah, 4; Yadayim, 4; Rosh Hashanah, 1&2; Bechoroth, 1. In Philip Blackman (ed), *Mishnoyoth* (Gateshead: Judaica Press, 1983). Moore's comment on Isaiah 59:57, 3-13 etc. See his *History of Religion* (New York, 1949), pp. 146-147.

<sup>10</sup> So for the Samaritans, Purvis says, Judaism is an Israelite heresy that was derived from the schismatic action of Eli when he established a rival sanctuary at Shiloh ("Samaritans and Judaism," 83).

<sup>11</sup> Macdonald, *Theology*, p. 456.

<sup>12</sup> Macdonald, *Theology*, p. 452. Cf. His "Islamic Doctrines in Samaritan Theology," *Muslim World*, v. 50 (1960), p. 279: Even if there is anything, it is extremely difficult to discover reliable evidence of it. Also he goes on to say that any claim for Samaritan borrowing from Judaism is nonsense (*Theology*, p. 29). Cf. His "Introduction" to *the Samaritan Chronicle no. II* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1969), p. 10; and his "Samaritans under the Patronage of Islam," *Islamic Studies*, v. 1 (1962), p. 92.

<sup>13</sup> Coggins, 9.

“*shômrônîm*” and it is rendered as “the Samaritans” in the biblical verses. However, the notable Samaritanist scholar Macdonald strongly refuses this rendering: “on linguistic grounds, it is ... clear that the word *Shômrôn* (the normal Hebrew spelling for the ‘city of Samaria’) in the plural here means ‘the people of Samaritans.’ Thus the text speaks of the people of Samaria, i.e., the inhabitants of the Province of Samaria.”<sup>14</sup> Hence we find no connection between the people of Samaria and the religious group named the Samaritans.<sup>15</sup> What then does the word ‘Samaritan’ mean? Relying on the Samaritan appropriation, Macdonald asserts that their name, as they claim, comes from the Hebrew word *shmārîm*, the ‘keepers,’ or ‘the observer,’ i.e., of the true faith, or of the true Pentateuch, or of the promise given to God, after Eli’s ‘defection.’<sup>16</sup> Likewise Coggins asserts that the Samaritans are to be associated not with Samaria but rather with Shechem, their sacred city; because they make a clear distinction between their own forefathers and the people of Samaria.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, in that name no ethnic or political connotation, as opposed to rabbinical tradition, should be looked for.

### c) Samaritan-Jewish Conflicts:

*The Pentateuch:* The problem of the different copies of the Bible, in the Samaritan case only the Pentateuch, and mutual accusation of distorting it is seen as the major cause of sectarian break-off depending on the position one

<sup>14</sup> J. Macdonald, “Discovery,” 143.

<sup>15</sup> By removing this linguistic misunderstanding, says Macdonald, we can “dissociate from the Samaritans the severe criticisms voiced in the related biblical verses, on which has been a polemic literature written by Jewish and Christians” (“Discovery,” p. 143). For another discussion about the name, see Bruce Hall, *Samaritan Religion from John Hyrcanus to Baba Rabba* (Sydney, 1987), pp. 17-19. As for the famous parable ‘Good Samaritan’ (Luke 10;29-37) Jaffe thinks that this parable is a figure chosen to shame people with pretensions to being righteous before God. The parable simply means that even a Samaritan could fulfill a simple commandment of the Torah; because the Samaritans were regarded with great contempt by the Jews at the time (“Early,” p. 135).

<sup>16</sup> Macdonald, “Discovery,” p. 143. Also for the split among the people after Eli, see his *Theology*, p. 17. See also Y. Kutluay, *İslam ve Yahudi Mezhepleri*, (Ankara, 1965), p. 42: “They are those who did not follow Eli and thus observed the true path and the Law.” See also Gaster, “Samaritans,” p.191. According to Purvis, the name comes from *hassamcrîm*, ‘the Guardians’ (i.e., of the Law), which is designed to avoid the negative association of “*shômrônîm*.” See “The Samaritan Problem: A Case Study in Jewish Sectarianism in the Roman Era” in B. Halpern and J. D. Levenson (eds) *Traditions in Transformation, Turning Points in Biblical Faith* (Winona Lake: Eisenbraun, 1981), p. 329. Also for the Samaritan self-designation, Coggins, p. 11.

<sup>17</sup> Coggins, p. 9. “This distinction is characteristic of the Samaritan Chronicle II.” Also see Gaster, “Samaritans,” p. 192. He offers a plausible conclusion: after the year 722, “the local population consisted of two distinct elements living side by side –viz., (a) the remnant of the native Israelites; and (b) the foreign colonists. For tendentious reasons, however, the Jewish version ignores the former; the Samaritans, the latter.”

can hold in terms of authenticity. It is generally agreed that there are some 6,000 minor textual variants even between the two Torahs,<sup>18</sup> otherwise there are a few specific alterations, yet they seem to be crucial as to their implications.<sup>19</sup> In other words, major distinctions are few in number but they are what make the chief cultic characteristics so radically different. The Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) is otherwise basically the same as the Jewish Torah, argue some, but these significant differences served as the ground for the Samaritans as a separate sect.<sup>20</sup> From the Jewish point of view, the Samaritans changed the Law by inserting in the SP some passages justifying their own religious contents, like Mt. Gerizim.<sup>21</sup> For such passages do not exist in the Hebrew text (HP). According to Purvis, the Samaritans produced by deliberate textual manipulation an edition of the Pentateuch in which their theological legitimacy was declared, and by doing so they also declared the tradition of Jerusalem illegitimate.<sup>22</sup> The Samaritans were thus charged by rabbis with doctoring the Pentateuch, but this charge was actually a retaliation for the Samaritan accusation of the Jews with the same thing; because initially the Samaritans attacked the Jews for falsifying the Law.<sup>23</sup> This could mean either inserting changes in the Torah text itself, or, as the majority sees, by attaching extra writings to the Torah.<sup>24</sup> The uncertainty over the date of the split between the Jews and the Samaritans and the latter's having a copy of the real Pentateuch leaves this point unclear. But their claim of the possessing a copy<sup>25</sup> written by Aaron's grandson remains certain. Bowman renders this as an attempt to justify the authenticity of their text,<sup>26</sup> which differs from the Hebrew text in terms of significant grammatical and

---

<sup>18</sup> I. Ben-Zvi, p. 127. See also, R. Pummer *The Samaritans* (Leiden. E.J. Brill, 1987), p. 6; cf. Jaffe, p. 137.

<sup>19</sup> Purvis, "Samaritan Problem," p. 335.

<sup>20</sup> J. Bowman, "Introduction" to *Samaritan Documents*. Ed. J. Bowman (Pittsburgh, 1977), p. i.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Ben-Zvi, p. 126; Purvis, "Samaritans and Judaism," p. 89; M. Gaster, *The Samaritans, their History, Doctrines and Literature* (London, 1925), p. 125.

<sup>22</sup> Purvis, "Samaritans and Judaism," p. 89; Cf. Gaster, *Samaritans*, p. 125; cf. Pummer, *The Samaritans*, p.7.

<sup>23</sup> While M. Gaster says that the Samaritans were the first to accuse the Jews of tampering, Finkel objects that the Samaritans were the originators of the textual controversy. "Jewish, Christian, and Samaritan Influences in Arabia" in *The Macdonald Presentation Volume* (Princeton: Univ. Press, 1933), p.162.

<sup>24</sup> However, that the Samaritans denounce Ezra for this falsification would point to the insertion theory.

<sup>25</sup> See Bowman, *Documents*, pp. i-ii. Cf. Mas'ūdī, *Murūj al-Dhahab* (Beirut: J. al-Lubnāniyya, 1966), p. 69: "The Samaritans claim that the Torah in the hands of the Jews is not the Torah that was given to Moses. It was distorted, changed and altered."

<sup>26</sup> Bowman, *Documents*, pp. i-ii.

orthographic differences.<sup>27</sup> However, some people consider SP to be more accurate than the HP in some points that will be mentioned later.<sup>28</sup> In any case, one thing is certain and paradoxical: the Samaritans claim the authenticity of their tradition by accusing the Jews of doctoring the Law, while the Jews rests their legitimacy on the claim that they are the orthodox, questioning, with the similar charges, the legitimacy of the Samaritan tradition as a sect.

As was mentioned before, Samaritan accusations of Jewish alteration and falsification could also be based on the later writings. This could be a reason for the Samaritans' rigorous attachment to the SP. Yet this devotion also implies, on the assumption that both parties had their own copies almost simultaneously, that rabbis may have made some textual changes on the HP.<sup>29</sup> Whether the Jewish alteration caused the Samaritans to split, or that the Samaritan charges made the Jews so furious as to excommunicate them is a matter of uncertainty. Moreover, there seem to have been other groups, like Sadducees and the Jews of Alexandria, who gave the Torah alone a canonical status,<sup>30</sup> which upholds the Samaritan position. In any case, each party took a separate path: the Samaritans emphasized the Torah in such a way that they totally refused to accept later books as canonical -- so much so that they did not develop extra-Torah writings like Mishnah or Talmud.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Munro cites eight kinds of variations in the Samaritan Pentateuch, which were compiled by Gesenius. According to him, the most striking characteristic of the SP is the thorough grammatical revision it has undergone. These variations range from the grammatical revisions through glossed explanation and conjectures and change of places. For the evidence and arguments, see pp. 12-15 and 18.

<sup>28</sup> For an example, see Munro, p. 10.

<sup>29</sup> For a possible dating of the Samaritan possession of the copy and the alteration, see the discussion in R. Pummer, "The Present State of Samaritan Studies-I" *JSS*, v. 21 (1976), pp. 44-45. Although the cause is not known for sure, according to the Samaritan account supported by some scholars, the reason is, Pummer claims, that "the Jews, at later stages, added the Prophets and the Hagiographa to the Holy Law, whereas the Samaritans retained only the Pentateuch." p. 45. Cf. Kutluay, p. 143: the reason was the false writings of the 'Sopherim.' On the other hand, Coggins warns, one must be cautious about the assumption of rejection by the Samaritans of the non-Pentateuchal books as being connected with their break from Judaism. Because the problem of the development of the Holy Book is still not completely solved. Therefore, he says, there could have been a period in which the writings were respected without being regarded as holy scripture. Coggins, p. 14. In addition, Nutt mentions another approach to this matter held by Jost, according to whom the Samaritans rejected all but the Pentateuch for the reason of their ignorance of them as being written in a character they did not understand. See Nutt, p. 41.

<sup>30</sup> Coggins, p. 155.

<sup>31</sup> Pummer, *The Samaritans*, p. 3; cf. Macdonald, "Introduction" to *Memar Marqah, The Teachings of Marqah-I*. Ed. J. Macdonald (BZAW, v.84: pt.1: the Text, pt.2: the Translation, Berlin, 1963), p. xliii.



*Sacred Place:* No matter who caused the split, these allegations could give us a hint on the matter of alteration. Whose allegation is historically more reasonable is not to be discussed here. The Samaritans acknowledge as the chosen place for the altar Mt. Gerizim as opposed to Mt. Moriah, the site of the Temple Mount.<sup>32</sup> It is all grounded on the related verses in Deuteronomy<sup>33</sup> in the HP. Deut. 11:29 reads “the place which the Lord thy God will choose,” implying that the sacred place for worship will be determined later. In contrast, in the SP it reads “... thy God has chosen.”<sup>34</sup> So it is alleged by some that the Samaritans changed the tense in all 21 occurrences in Deut.<sup>35</sup> Macdonald maintains that perhaps the most influential factor for the rivalry between Mt. Moriah and Mt. Gerizim as the ‘chosen place’ was this difference of textual reading.<sup>36</sup> But, as he points out, some scholars consider the Samaritan reading the original one. Moore, for example, argues that if exclusive claims were made for Jerusalem, a different case could be made out for Gerizim. Deut: 12 requires that the Israelites should bring their sacrifices “to the place which Jehovah, your God, shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there.” What place was meant here, continues Moore, might be learned from Deut: 11, 29f; 27, 12f; Josh. 8. 30ff; that is, it was Gerizim. It appears that Jerusalem is not so much as named in the Law after all. In fact, in Moore’s view, it is a mistake to think that the Jews in Persian and Greek time regarded Jerusalem as the only sacred place, since the Jews had a lot of temples in different cities: “The Deuteronomic Law could reasonably be interpreted as applying to Palestine only, and was, in fact, so understood.”<sup>37</sup> Afterwards, accordingly, on the assumption of the

---

<sup>32</sup> In this respect, says Ben-Zvi (p. 126), they oppose not only to the Jews, but Christians and Muslims. On the traditional view, narrated by Josephus, the temple was erected by Sanballat, the governor of Samaria, for his Son-in-law, Manassch, a renegade brother of the Jewish high priest Jaddua. It was during the time of the last Persian king and the beginning of Alexander’s rule in Syria; Moore, p. 47; also see Gaster, *Samaritans*, p. 192. Cf. Purvis, “Samaritans and Judaism,” p. 87. They built an altar at Shechem on Mt. Gerizim, argues Purvis, to relate themselves to the most ancient of Israel’s traditions in order to maintain the support of the native population. See also, Pummer, *The Samaritans*, p. 8.

<sup>33</sup> Or from the other point of view, they changed it that way to legitimize their sectarian breakup.

<sup>34</sup> According to Samaritan claim, Shechem has thus been chosen in Abraham’s lifetime.

<sup>35</sup> Purvis, “Samaritan Problem,” p. 336: “the differences between the two readings is of only one letter –the presence or absence of the *yod*-prefix on the verb *buhar*, to choose.” See also Nutt, p. 41.

<sup>36</sup> Macdonald, “Discovery,” p. 152.

<sup>37</sup> Moore, p. 47. So he claims that what made the Jews hate the Samaritans was not the mere existence of the temple at Shechem by the temple in Jerusalem rather it was the pretension of Gerizim to be the sole legitimate temple (p. 48). Cf. Munro, p. 60, where he asks “where is Jerusalem in Deut.?” He answers: “Nowhere. The name is absent.” From the same vein, he infers

Samaritan insertion, they inserted the SP tenth commandment after Exodus 20:17 MT (Masoretic Text) and Deut. 5:18 MT, by reckoning the Jewish Ten Commandments as nine.<sup>38</sup> The Samaritan tenth commandment refers to the selection of Mt. Gerizim as the holy place and mount.

*The Priesthood:* The priesthood in the Samaritan community has a very high status, declares Marqah, the Samaritan exegete of late antiquity, in his *Memar*,<sup>39</sup> which is the most important book after the SP and Targum. According to Marqah, Moses was magnified in his prophethood, and Aaron was glorified in his priesthood by God.<sup>40</sup> The two were united in their mission to the Pharaoh, but Aaron was not commissioned at that time to the priesthood, but only after the Israelites were delivered.<sup>41</sup> In another place, Marqah claims that Aaron occupied two statuses, namely, prophethood and priesthood.<sup>42</sup> Here a little ambiguity is found. On the one hand, in order to underpin his 'priesthood,' Marqah cites (Exod. VII, 1; Targ.) "Aaron your brother shall be your prophet,"<sup>43</sup> which was told to Moses by God, or "Go and meet your brother for you are about to become his prophet,"<sup>44</sup> which is a direct address to Aaron; on the other, he claims that Aaron was not commissioned as a priest until after the deliverance. However, as was pointed out, he is also asserted to have been commissioned as a prophet too. Moreover, it is known and accepted by the two traditions that both Moses and Aaron were sent to the Pharaoh, which is also supported by the Qur'ān.<sup>45</sup> Whether Marqah used these two concepts interchangeably becomes disputable from his deliberate differentiation between the two statuses of Aaron. Furthermore, there is some confusion as to which is prior in the *Memar*. However, if Marqah's account of Aaron's becoming a priest after the

---

that "both Hebrew and Samaritan Pentateuch *unite* in signally honoring the district of Schechem, ... embracing Ebal and Gerizim." See also, pp. 60, 64.

<sup>38</sup> For the Ten Commandments, see Löwy, p. 12.

<sup>39</sup> *Memar Marqah*, p. 91.

<sup>40</sup> *Memar*, p. 87.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> *Memar*, 88.

<sup>43</sup> In another place, Marqah states that 'God called to Moses from the midst of the cloud and established Aaron in the priesthood' (*Memar*, p. 88).

<sup>44</sup> *Memar*, p. 14. The translator points to the Samaritan interpretation of the word 'prophet' here as 'spokesman,' which would partially agree with the Qur'ān. See also p. 12 Arabic word for the prophet, the Qur'anic *wazir* is given by the translator. In the *Memar*, there is a Qur'anic parallel: about Aaron God addresses Moses: "his tongue is more practiced than yours" (p. 12); and "listen and repeat them to your brother. He will address the Egyptians," (p. 20). But that Aaron threw down the rod (p. 20) differs from the Qur'ān.

<sup>45</sup> The Qur'ān, 7/121, 10/75, 19/53 (prophet), 20/25-35&63, 23/45-46, 25/35 (as a *wazir* to Moscs), 26/47.

deliverance is taken as accurate, then we can infer that he was commissioned as a prophet first, which would agree with the Qur'ānic position. On the other hand, *Memar* ascribes the establishment of the priesthood to God: "And you shall be to me a kingdom of priest and a holy nation" (Exod. xix, 6).<sup>46</sup> This difficulty may be said to have arisen from the fact that the Samaritans, for some reason, appear to have emphasized the priesthood more than prophethood. It is therefore directly related to their belief that there is only one true prophet, i.e., Moses. This emphasis may have overshadowed the prophethood of Aaron.<sup>47</sup>

In any case, Aaron is believed to be the high priest that was commissioned by God, and Marqah asserts that "Aaron and his sons were vested with the priesthood and were specially appointed to it."<sup>48</sup> Thus the whole tribe of Levi were reared for the priesthood as Moses taught.<sup>49</sup> From this line, says Macdonald, the priesthood descended from Aaron through his grandson Phinehas (or *Finehās*).<sup>50</sup> In accordance with this account, the Samaritans further claim that Eli, who is the reason for the era of Divine Disfavor,<sup>51</sup> has sinned by coveting the high priesthood for himself. That's why he, in his ill intentions moved to Shiloh, and there he set up a sanctuary in rivalry to the one on Mt. Gerizim. Thus the Israelites had two sanctuaries and two priesthoods for a long time and consequently they split up.<sup>52</sup>

#### *d) Samaritans in Some Muslim Sources*

The Muslim views of the Samaritans (*el-sāmīriyyūn*) are varied in the exegetical works and the chronicles. In the *tafsīr* tradition, mention of the Samaritans is generally made when the commentators deal with the verse of

---

<sup>46</sup> *Memar*, pp. 13, 15, 87.

<sup>47</sup> According to Nutt, while Exod. xi.31 "ascribes the priestly functions to Moses, the Samaritans altered the text so as to ascribe them to Aaron alone, and thus heighten the dignity of the latter." p. 37. Cf. For the Qur'anic position of Aaron (apart from being a prophet) as a *wazīr* to Moses, 25/35.

<sup>48</sup> *Memar*, p. 87.

<sup>49</sup> *Memar*, pp. 87, 181.

<sup>50</sup> Macdonald, *Theology*, p. 16. Gaster, *The Samaritans*, p. 24. Over the centuries, according to N. Nosceda, the Samaritans continued to have some institutions that were no longer existing in Judaism. In 1624, the last Samaritan high-priest Phinchas died and was replaced by another priestly family. See his article "al-Samira" *EI* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), pp. 1044-1046. About the social life of a priesthood, see Nemoy, "Al-Qirqisānī's ..." p. 362 [46]. Nutt, p. 39.

<sup>51</sup> The era of Divine Favor is from entering Canaan until the apostasy of Eli.

<sup>52</sup> Macdonald, *Theology*, p. 17. For a discussion of Samaritan deriving of priesthood from the Jerusalem cultus, which is reported by Josephus' 'prejudicial' account, see Purvis, "Samaritans and Judaism," p. 88. See also Nosceda, pp. 1044-1046. About the conflicts over the high-priesthood, see Jaffe, p. 40. Also see, Coggins, p. 11; cf. Macdonald, "Discovery," p. 144.

Golden Calf in the Qur'ān, Sūrah 20-Tāhā, verses 85 through 98. Since the word 'al-sāmirī' that occurs a few times in the Qur'ān is problematic and requires another study, and since the related discussion about it does not directly concern our topic, we shall pass by it.<sup>53</sup> As for the Muslim chroniclers, they give some different information about the Samaritans. All of them basically see them as a Jewish group or sect, which differs from Judaism in some respects. Balādhurī (d.892) states that the Samaritans were Jews and they split into two sects: Dūstān and Kūshān.<sup>54</sup> He also reports that when Mu'āwiyah conquered Caesaria, he found there 30,000 Samaritans along with 200,000 Jews.<sup>55</sup> He further talks about Yazīd b. Mu'āwiyah levying on the Samaritans 5 Dinar tax, but later upon the Samaritans' complaints, Mutawakkil 'alā Allāh reduced the tax to 3 Dinars.<sup>56</sup> In his chronicle Ṭabarī (d. 923) cites the story of 'the Sāmīrī' from his exegetical work, and gives a few different accounts for al-Sāmīrī in the Qur'ān.<sup>57</sup> As for Mas'ūdī (d. 956), he basically reports the major Samaritan claims: they broke up from Jews by rejecting the prophethood of David and the others after Moses.<sup>58</sup> They also claimed that *Nablus* (Shechem) is the 'Bayt al-Maqdis',<sup>59</sup> and the genuine Torah is the one with them.<sup>60</sup> Mas'ūdī then speaks about the Samaritan sects; Kūshān and Dūstān, which he says are opposed to each other.<sup>61</sup> Al-Baghdādī lists the Samaritans among the "People of the Book."<sup>62</sup> Shahrastānī (d.1153) gives us a little more detailed information.<sup>63</sup> According to his description, the Samaritans are the people who dwelled in the 'Bayt al-Maqdis' and its environments and were more meticulous about cleanliness than the rest of the Jews. They believed in the prophethood of Moses, Aaron

<sup>53</sup> Ṭabarī, *Zamakhsharī*, Baydāwī, Ibn Kathīr, F. Rāzī; all relates more or less the same story detailed in Ṭabarī. In these sources, al-Sāmīrī is considered as an appellation, and his real name is Mūsā b. Zāfar. G. Sale mentions a certain Selden, who thinks that this person was no other than Aaron; because he was called Sāmīrī from the Hebrew word *Shamar*, 'to keep,' and he was the keeper of the Israelites during his brother's absence. See Sale's translation of *The Koran* (Philadelphia, 1870) 260. It is clearly open to question.

<sup>54</sup> Balādhurī, *Futūḥ al-Buldān* (Beirut, 1957), p. 216.

<sup>55</sup> Balādhurī, p. 192.

<sup>56</sup> Balādhurī, 216.

<sup>57</sup> Ṭabarī, *Annals (Tārīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk)*. Ed. M.J. DeGoeje (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964); Translation: *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, by W.Brinker (New York: SUNY, 1991), v. 1, p. 489. (Trans., v. III, p. 72). For further reports from Ibn 'Abbās, see pp. 493ff (Trans., pp.72, 75).

<sup>58</sup> Mas'ūdī, p. 66.

<sup>59</sup> Mas'ūdī, p. 67.

<sup>60</sup> Mas'ūdī, p. 69.

<sup>61</sup> Mas'ūdī, p. 67.

<sup>62</sup> Al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*, p. 148.

<sup>63</sup> Shahrastānī, *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*. Ed. by W. Cureton (Leipzig, 1923), pp. 170-171.

and Joshua, and denied the others.<sup>64</sup> Their Qiblah is the mountain called Gerizim between Jerusalem and Nablus. They believed that God commissioned David to build a 'Bayt al-Maqdis' on this mountain (Ṭūr) on which God spoke to Moses. But he disobeyed the command of the God.<sup>65</sup> About the Samaritan schism, he mentions Dustāniyya, or Alfāniyya, which is the liar sect, and the Kūsāniyya, which is the truthful community. For the latter believes in the hereafter, reward and the punishment, while the former claimed that the reward and the punishment is in this world. Yāqūt (d. 1229) gives more or less the same story with the addition that the known "Bayt al-Maqdis" is so cursed for them that when one of them passes by the sanctuary, he would pick a stone and throw at it.<sup>66</sup> On the other hand, Qalqashandī (d.1418) first claims that the Samaritans were Jews and are the followers of the Sāmīrī in the Qur'ān. Then he reports the fact that the Karaites and Rabbinites deny their being Jewish.<sup>67</sup> After repeating the same beliefs, he mentions their adherence to the text of the Torah and forbidding the interpretation of it, something that the Rabbinites did.<sup>68</sup> As for Maqrīzī, he reports that the caliph al-Mutawakkil required the Samaritans to wear red turbans, along with the Jews wearing yellow and the Christians blue turbans.<sup>69</sup> Muslim chronicles thus seem to have copied the same basic Samaritan version of the story with some additional details. Interestingly enough, they didn't touch the Jewish version of the Samaritan story. But they mainly saw them originally as a Jewish sect, although they accept that they are totally different from them.

### *III. Similarities Between the Samaritan and Islamic Theological Issues*

The task of explaining Islamic origins has been conducted by almost all western scholars in reference to the existing mainstream traditions, namely, Judaism and Christianity. Judaism was often made to father the Islamic

---

<sup>64</sup> According to this account, they said that the Torah has heralded a prophet after Moses, who will affirm their Book and will judge according to it.

<sup>65</sup> See also Qalqashandī, *Subḥ al-A 'shā* (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Sultāniyyah, 1918), p. 269: "... and he built it in Jerusalem ..."

<sup>66</sup> Yāqūt, *Marāsīd al-Ittilā'* (Lexicon Geographicum). Ed. T.G.H. Juynboll (Leiden, 1854), v. III, p. 188.

<sup>67</sup> Qalqashandī, p. 268.

<sup>68</sup> Qalqashandī, p. 268.

<sup>69</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-Sulūk* (Cairo, 1939), p. 912. Cf. Pummer, *Samaritans*, p. 17; A.J. Montgomery, *The Samaritans, the Earliest Jewish Sect* (Philadelphia: J.C. Winston, 1907), pp. 27, 129. According to E. Ashtor, it was the Mamlūks who decreed that. See his "Dhimma" in *Encyclopædia Judaica*, v. 5, p. 1605.

tradition and sometimes Christianity was seen as the other parent. But the fact that Qur'ānic stories often contradict the Biblical accounts gave way to a few interpretations that explain this predicament away: It could be that Muhammad was not so good a borrower to have produced accurate stories conforming to the Bible; or it could be that the people with whom Muhammad interacted received the distorted stories. But, in any case, it is Muhammad who compiled them in a book. Given the fact that there were Christians around Mecca and Jews in and around Medina, and given the scarcity and insufficiency of historical data, it would only require one to see the cultural and geographical connection to explain the origins of Islam. Accordingly, the latter view has been held by Finkel who maintains that "the mentality of the Jews living in Arabia in the time of the prophet was anything but typical of that of Talmud-trained Jews."<sup>70</sup> As a result, their institutions, customs and language were Arab rather than Jewish; so they should not be expected to have had '*disciplina Talmudica*.'<sup>71</sup> Considering the possible time of the Jewish migration<sup>72</sup> to the region, the Talmudim, the Midrashim, maybe even the Mishna, would not have been compiled at that time. Hence their Jewish tradition, he reasons, could have been handed down only from mouth to mouth, and perhaps a dense growth of material would have been pruned during recording for the purposes of standardization or for moral or religious reasons which fit the opinion of the redactor. According to Finkel, that is why "the so-called Rabbinic tradition, as embodied in the Qur'ān, is often, to say the least, not in perfect accord with ... the Talmud and Midrash ..."<sup>73</sup> However, it should not be considered strange but natural and unavoidable. Moreover, to him, perhaps some Arabized Jews also performed the Ḥajj to Mecca, therefore, when Muhammad "made Abraham lay the foundation of Ka'ba, he probably reiterated what already had been a recognized tradition

---

<sup>70</sup> Finkel, p. 148.

<sup>71</sup> Finkel, p. 148.

<sup>72</sup> Margoliouth argues against this theory of migration: If these tribes were migrants from Palestine, they would not have names with Arabic characteristics. Even if they were converts to Judaism, it is surprising that they should not have called themselves by something indicative of their adopted faith. See his *The Relation between Arabs and the Israelites prior to the Rise of Islam*, (London, 1924), p. 70. Similarly, L. O'Leary asserts that there was an outspread of Judaism into Arabia in the centuries immediately before the rise of Islam. But he questions their identity; he thinks that they may have been Edomites or northern Arabs who adopted Judaism. For the discussion and the colonies, see O'Leary, *Arabia before Muhammad* (London, 1927), p. 171-173. Cf. Crown, "The Samaritan Diaspora," in Crown (ed.) *The Samaritans* (Tübingen, 1989), pp. 209, 212.

<sup>73</sup> Finkel, p. 149.

with some sects in Arabia.”<sup>74</sup> But what is strange to him is the Abrahamic connection; because unlike Ishmael, Abraham is never mentioned in the Bible as having visited Arabia. Nor do the later Jewish and Christian reports connect him with it. Finkel here tries to solve this puzzle by introducing the Samaritan connection. His line of reasoning goes as follows: “the mount of Moriah to which Abraham was commanded to bring his son as an offering is, in Jewish and Christian sources, the site predestined to bear the Temple, while according to the Samaritans, mount Moriah is no other than mount Gerizim ... Confronted with such conflicting aspects of the tradition, the Arabs —the pagan Arabs, Jewish Arabs and Christian Arabs— grew emboldened and tamper with it too, and in their eagerness to mold a natural religion, shifted the scene to Mecca.”<sup>75</sup> In this argument, aside from the fact that why Mecca has been chosen is still another controversial point, Finkel bases his assumption on another assumption, namely, the existence of the Samaritans or Samaritan idea in Arabia.<sup>76</sup> He seems to be aware of the fact that there is no sufficient evidence, --he admits that we have nothing<sup>77</sup>-- to presuppose their existence in Arabia during the time of the Prophet. Yet relying on the reports that they were persecuted by both the Jews and the Romans, he assumes that they must have migrated extensively to the peninsula,<sup>78</sup> which is also an attempt by him to explain the mystery of the so-called “Lost Ten Tribes.”<sup>79</sup> Consequently, in his view, this influx might have immensely influenced the region.

As far as Muslim sources are concerned, none of them makes any mention of the Samaritans living in that part of Arabia during Muhammad’s time or later. These sources present a lot of accounts about the existence of the Jews around the territory; even though they talk about the Samaritans only after the conquest of Syria as people different from the Jews, strangely enough they did not mention them during the time of Muhammad. Hence if we take Finkel’s assumption as plausible, it would require a unanimous plan by the Muslim sources not to make a word of them earlier. On the doctrinal

---

<sup>74</sup> Finkel, p. 158. See also 166: “With him therefore it was so much a question of rejecting or accepting novel information, as that of being the eloquent expounder of already established traditions.”

<sup>75</sup> Finkel, p. 159.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Pummer, “Present State of Samaritan Studies-II,” *JSS*, v.22 (1977), p. 45: “It lies in the nature of the sources material available to us that he [Finkel] does not go beyond inferences and guesses.”

<sup>77</sup> Finkel, p. 160.

<sup>78</sup> Finkel, p. 161.

<sup>79</sup> Finkel, p. 159.

level, the Qur'ānic view of the Samaritans agrees with the Jewish tradition – with, of course, some exceptions- more than with the Samaritans, to whom the Islamic view of the Prophet is diametrically opposed in terms of beliefs.<sup>80</sup> In connection with the Arabian context appears a story narrated by a 14<sup>th</sup> century Samaritan chronicler, Abu al-Fath, whose purpose is to show the strength of the Samaritan adherence to their religion. According to the story, three astrologers, a Jew (Ka'b al-Aḥbār), a Christian (ʿAbd al-Salām), and a Samaritan (Şarmāşa), see through their art the passing of the World-empire into Muhammad's hands. They visited him together and after the initial conversations, the Jew told him about his findings about Muhammad's coming in his holy Book. After the Christian did the same thing, the Samaritan asked him about the 'Seal of Prophethood' between Muhammad's shoulders, which is the sign of the new prophet. Then Muhammad took off his shirt and everybody saw the white seal. Upon seeing it, the Jew and the Christian converted to Islam. When asked, Şarmāşa said that he was pleased with his own religion, and he could not come to him; however he requested from him an *amān* and *dhimmah*, for his people and their property. Eventually, the Samaritan remained faithful, and Muhammad finally granted him a charter bestowing complete immunity and possessions upon the Samaritans.<sup>81</sup> Along with Montgomery, even Finkel too sees this as something that “has all the earmarks of a legend.”<sup>82</sup> Another connection of the Samaritans with Arabia is mentioned in relation with the famous Samaritan uprising in Zacharia of Mitylene's chronicle. He talks about a raid conducted in 538 AD by the Roman army and the Saracens of Arabia against the Samaritans and their being cut into pieces by the attackers.<sup>83</sup> But apparently this must be an Arabian tribe, the Ghassanids, living near the borders and allied with the Romans against the Persians. But it is not sufficient for supposing a possible Samaritan influence, which would not even make any sense in terms of the Arab tribe being the buffer state on the border away from the region of Muhammad, and the hostility toward the Samaritans as distinct from the Jews as seen by the Romans.<sup>84</sup> Consequently we do not

<sup>80</sup> He also uses the verse 2/102 about Solomon as evidence of Samaritan element in Arabia. I will discuss this later.

<sup>81</sup> Abū al-Fath, *Kitāb al-Tārīkh* (Gothae, 1865), pp. 172-176. Cf. Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, p. 126, according to which this belongs to a wide cycle of Muslim legend.

<sup>82</sup> Finkel, p. 160. Cf. Pummer, “Present Situation-II,” p. 45. “The sources are late and it is virtually impossible historical and legendary elements in this account.”

<sup>83</sup> *Zacharia Mitylenc*, p. 232.

<sup>84</sup> Finkel's comment on this, p.160.



seem to have any sources that could give us tangible evidence to paint the Muslim-Samaritan relations in that particular period. The sources have mostly the stories until the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> century. Strangely enough, no sources I checked have anything to tell about the Arab and Samaritan connections at the rise of Islam. Nor do the Jewish sources give enough information about the alleged migration. Apart from Finkel's attempt, Crone and Cook have tried to make sense of it, but their dating, as their assumption forces, is based upon the Muslim conquest of Syria. Further claims and assumptions will be examined in the next section.

*a) Fundamental Samaritan Beliefs and Practices:*

Certain scholars mostly liken the basic Samaritan credos, for the reason that they are formulated in five tenets, to those of Islam. Their simplest statement of belief is "we believe in the Lord and in Moses his servant,"<sup>85</sup> which bears a similar pattern to the Islamic *Kalimat al-Tawhīd*. Furthermore, there is another statement by Marqah which contains three points: "We believe in thee (God) and Moses thy man and in thy Scripture."<sup>86</sup> According to Macdonald, to the beliefs are added one more later on, and their essential tenets have for so long contained four: (i) God, (ii) Moses, His servant, (iii) the Law, (iv) the holy mountain, Mt. Gerizim. The fifth belief, Resurrection and the Day of Vengeance, was attached later. The reason for this is the fact that "the Samaritan creed did not become fixed in form until later mediaeval times."<sup>87</sup> The implication of this is stated explicitly by Pummer. He ascribes the whole gradual development to the different sectarian teachings and borrowings from other faiths: So "this process was completed by about the 14<sup>th</sup> century."<sup>88</sup> With the last addition, the five-pillar system formed as the following: (1) the belief in God, and the Oneness of God, (2) the belief in Moses, being the first and the last prophet, (3) the Torah is the scripture revealed to Moses, (4) Gerizim is the sacred mountain for the temple, (5) the belief in Resurrection and the Day of Judgment, and paradise.<sup>89</sup> To the last one, one could add the belief in angels and *Mahdī* as the later beliefs. In short, their dogmas are summarized in Ben-Zvi's formulation: "My faith is in Thee, Yahve, and in Moses, Son of Amram thy Servant; and in the Holy law;

---

<sup>85</sup> Macdonald, *Theology*, p. 148.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Pummer, *The Samaritans*, p. 6.

<sup>89</sup> Pummer, 6; cf. H. W. Kahen, *Samaritan History, Identity, Religion and Subdivisions* (n.d, n.p) p. 15.

and Mt. Gerizim, Beth El; and in the Day of Vengeance and Recompense.”<sup>90</sup> As much as they resemble Islamic creed, there seem to be some radical differences and problems in their historical development. In the following section I will examine certain fundamental beliefs comparatively.

*Tawhîd* (oneness of God): Islamic emphasis on the notion of *Tawhîd* is generally accepted to be stronger than that of the other religions. As Macdonald points out, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all share the monotheistic view, but Islam by all means has an uncompromising belief in the oneness of God, and “Samaritanism is no less vociferous in proclaiming the same.”<sup>91</sup> Being aware of that, the western writers, searching for an external factor for why that is the case, mostly bring the Samaritan view to the fore. Macdonald deals with the subject in his article “Islamic Doctrines in Samaritanism...” as to the similarities and the direction of the influence. The Samaritan liturgist, he claims, repeats the phrase “There is only one God; there is no God but God (Lā ilāha illa’llāh)- La sharīka lahu ...”<sup>92</sup> Hence, among others, it was Macdonald who states that the Samaritan notion of *tawhîd* developed through the ages, whereby he entertains the possibility of Islamic influence, on this particular belief of the Samaritans. Coggins seems to agree with him on this point to some extent.<sup>93</sup> The origin of this notion is to be found in Deut. 6. 4: “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.” Marqah in his *Memar* takes up this verse several times.<sup>94</sup> Another verse that has the same cognate is Exod. xx. 2, 3 “I am the Lord... You should have no other God beside me,”<sup>95</sup> or “there is no god beside me,”<sup>96</sup> Marqah also gives his own interpretation and explanation together with similar expressions. Since the *Memoir of Marqah* is dated back to the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD, from the abovementioned verses, we are to assume that the direction of the possible influence must be from Samaritanism to Islam. Yet the problem is still there.

<sup>90</sup> Ben-Zvi, 129. This would remind one of the popular Muslim formulation : “*Āmantu bi Allāhi wa malāikatihī wa kutubihī wa rusulihī wa al-yawm al-ākhir...*” For a brief summary of the beliefs, see also T.H. Gaster, “Samaritans”, pp. 193-195.

<sup>91</sup> Macdonald, “Islamic Doctrines” p. 283. There are some allegations by the Jews which implies the Samaritans’ idolatrous worship in their temple. Later it was asserted that they worshipped a dove, which is supported by a Samaritan coin that has an image of a dove on it. For historical development, see N. Schur. Coggins (p. 133) finds these allegations totally baseless.

<sup>92</sup> Macdonald, “Islamic Doctrines,” p. 283.

<sup>93</sup> Coggins, p. 132. Cf. M. Heidenheim, “Einleitung,” in *Bibliotheca Samaritana* (Leipzig, 1896) p. xlv, where he claims Islamic influence on the Samaritan creed, especially on the view of God and eschatology.

<sup>94</sup> *Memar*, pp. 69, 91, 140, 160, 188.

<sup>95</sup> *Memar*, pp. 150.

<sup>96</sup> *Memar*, pp. 161.

I will not deal with the historical aspect of it, i.e., how this could have happened in history, since it is highly controversial. Instead I will try to deal with it theoretically. The verses (Deut: 6, 4; Exodus xx. 2, 3 and the like) that are cited by Marqah are supposed to come from the SP. However, the HP has the same verses in the same context. Then the monotheistic positions of both Judaism and Samaritanism are originally grounded on, or derived from, these and similar verses. Hence, we may infer that the extra emphasis of Samaritans on this notion does not stem from the SP itself, assuming, or accepting the fact, that Samaritans are more rigorous and emphatic about their belief in the oneness of God than the Jews. In fact, the *Memar* itself can verify this, because the emphatic expressions are found in the exegetical part of the book rather than the biblical quotations. Comparing their position with the Jews, we are but to conclude that this attenuation must be of external effects. Having established that, we should investigate what these factors could have been, excluding of course Christian trace, on account of the trinity of the Christians.<sup>97</sup> The only candidate remaining is Islam. Since Islam is a faith of later periods, it doesn't seem plausible to claim Islamic influence while accepting the *Memar* as a 4<sup>th</sup> century composition and Islam as a later phenomenon. The only possible situation at this point is to assume that the *Memar* was always edited throughout the centuries, a theory that was supported by some other theories about the development of the Samaritan creed, and maintained by some writers, such as Macdonald and Coggins.<sup>98</sup> In Gesenius' edition of the originally Arabic Samaritan prayer book, there are several expressions articulating the oneness of God: *la sharīka lahu, laysa ilāh illā wāḥid, wāḥid laysa laka ṣāḥib wa lā sharīk*.<sup>99</sup> These expressions are generally considered under Islamic influence, due to its later composition. Ultimately, it seems that the solution may be possible in Macdonald's approach, which maintains that the Samaritans are indebted to Islam for their uncompromising *tawḥīd*.<sup>100</sup>

In opposition to this standpoint, there are some views that claim an indisputable Samaritan influence on Islam. This position is championed by

<sup>97</sup> Keeping in mind, though, that there are some 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century Christian texts in which phrase like "there is no God but God, with no associates."

<sup>98</sup> Also see J.E.H. Thomson, *The Samaritans, Their Testimony to the Religion of Israel* (Edinburgh, 1919), p. 192.

<sup>99</sup> Gesenius, *Carmina Samaritana*, (Arabic and Latin) (Lipsiac, 1824), p. 19, 24, 25. Cf. T.H. Gaster, "Samaritans," p. 195.

<sup>100</sup> The idea that the concept of Tawḥīd was known at the time would partly help about its origin; but it would hardly work in this comparative framework, especially when considering the period of the development of the Samaritan beliefs and their being under the Islamic rule for a long time.

The *Qiblah* is more problematic, since the Muslims for a while shared Jerusalem as *qiblah* with the Jews. The Samaritans too turn to Mt. Gerizim, their *qiblah*, not Jerusalem, when they pray.<sup>117</sup> But on this point the Jews are more likely to be a candidate to influence Muhammad. Hence I will not go further in it.<sup>118</sup> Another similarity is the *wuḍū'* (ablution) before praying. Each Samaritan prayer is preceded by a ritual of *wuḍū'*, or after urination and defecation, after childbirth, sexual intercourse, nocturnal emission, and when they came into contact with a corpse.<sup>119</sup> Its rules are detailed in their Catechism (called *al-Kāfī*, Book of Prayer), which was written in Arabic. So the order of washing, or ablution, goes as follows: (1) hands, (2) mouth, (3) nose, (4) face, (5) ears, (6) right leg, and (7) left leg, and the ablution is accompanied by the biblical recitation.<sup>120</sup> As we can see, their *wuḍū'* is almost identical with the Muslim *wuḍū'*, which is defined in the Qur'ān, even though it did not explain the form of praying. The reason for that could be the tendency of the Qur'ān that it sometimes remains silent showing indifference to the source of the practices, as opposed to certain other cases where the Qur'ān redefines a belief or practice for Muslims or gives a brand new idea. Hence, it could be either that the Qur'ān presents a new way of preparing for praying, or it redefines and corrects after a possible corruption.

According to the Qur'ān,<sup>121</sup> there are four things to do before praying: washing the face, hands up to the elbows, wiping the head, and finally washing (or wiping) the feet up to the ankles. But Muhammad reportedly added a few more things which correspond to the Samaritan *wuḍū'*. Ultimately that doesn't mean Islamic imitation of the Samaritans, nor does the existence of instructions of the *wuḍū'* in the Qur'ān indicate that it was not an old practice. But, this still does not indicate the Samaritan influence on Islam. For their catechism-style books carry the signs of centuries-long development. Especially, considering the span of development process, which is between 4<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, and the language of the books of that kind, the originality, or the authenticity, of the Samaritan practices become disputable. Because the only book of pre-Islamic era belongs to the 4<sup>th</sup> century and it does not contain any information about ritual details. Especially the Book of Prayer mentioned above is a later product of post-

<sup>117</sup> Ben-Zvi, p. 127.

<sup>118</sup> For the discussion and arguments, see Wensinck, p. 78.

<sup>119</sup> Pummer, "Ablution" in *A Companion to Samaritan Studies* (Tübingen, 1993), p. 6; Boid, p. 272; Pummer, *The Samaritans*, p. 15.

<sup>120</sup> Pummer, *The Samaritans*, p. 15; Idem, "Ablution," p. 6.

<sup>121</sup> The Qur'ān, 5/6.

Islamic period. Therefore, the Islamic practice seems to be more likely to have an effect on the details of this particular practice of the Samaritans.<sup>122</sup>

*Belief in Resurrection and the Day of Judgment:* There seems to be a common understanding among the scholars of Samaritanism that the Samaritan eschatology is not an original belief, rather it was borrowed from others, most likely from Judaism. The 4<sup>th</sup> century Samaritan exegete Marqah talks very much about the Samaritan belief in resurrection and the Day of Vengeance and Recompense.<sup>123</sup> Hence even if it is not that early a belief, it is surely pre-Islamic. It became the fifth tenet of the formula, but it is not yet possible to say how early.<sup>124</sup> According to Macdonald, as a whole eschatology, it probably emerged mainly after Roman times, though there was a basic simple belief in a 'Day of Vengeance' sown by Marqah and his predecessors, and eventually it grew up into a doctrine.<sup>125</sup> In another approach, instead of the Massoretic text "Mine is vengeance and recompense," the Samaritans read "on the day of vengeance and recompense,"<sup>126</sup> which is the conceptual foundation of this belief.

However, determining the origin of the Samaritan eschatology gives much difficulty to the investigators. Certain it is that it finds its expression in the late Samaritan texts. But some complain about the insufficiency of the sources, including the *Mcmar*, to determine the age of those beliefs, even though they are older than the text. Because, Dexinger explains, "the present state of the editio of Samaritan text does not yet allow us to follow the lines of the historical development of every single element of the Samaritan eschatological creed even in later periods."<sup>127</sup> There are serious doubts about the Samaritan belief in resurrection. One of the rabbinic texts implies that the

---

<sup>122</sup> Boid argues that as the Samaritans are able to back up every detail from Scripture, and found the institution of *wuḏū'* on the Priests' preparation for offering sacrifices, the borrowing must be from the Samaritans or a Jewish group with the same tradition over to the Muslims. See Boid, p. 272. Regarding other details about their practices, like taking off shoes before entering a synagogoc/*masjid*, sitting and prostrating on a carpeted floor, having no benches in the *masjid*, see Thomson, p. 122; See Pummer, *The Samaritans*, p. 13, for women's going to synagogoc once a year is seen as a Muslim influence of much later periods.

<sup>123</sup> For instance see *Mcmar*, pp. 178, 180 ff. For various expressions for the Day of Judgment, see *Mcmar*, p. 182. For a similar naming, see the Qur'ān, 1/4; 2/4; 6/31; 30/65; 19/39; 28/85; 37/21; 42/7; 50/20 and *passim*. Cf. T.H. Gaster, "Samaritans," 195.

<sup>124</sup> Macdonald, "Discovery," p. 150.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>126</sup> Gaster, *The Samaritans*, p. 89. He also asserts that Deut. xxxii has become the basis of all Samaritan eschatological theories.

<sup>127</sup> F. Dexinger, "Samaritan Eschatology" in Crown (ed) *The Samaritans* (Tübingen, 1989), p. 267; cf. Pummer, *The Samaritans*, p. 6: He claims that belief in resurrection was not part of the older belief system represented by the priests.

Samaritans did not use to have that belief. In this post-Talmudic treatise called *Massaket Kutim* (Book on the Samaritans), it appears that the Jews were not willing to accept these proselytes among themselves, and the author asks: "When shall we receive the Samaritans?" the same author explains when: "When they renounce mount Gerizim and acknowledge Jerusalem and the resurrection of the dead,"<sup>128</sup> which indicates the possible Samaritan denial of the resurrection at time of the composition of this tractate.

Considering the fact that the Jewish hostility toward the Samaritans was probably due to this rival temple, it is understandable that they set a condition for accepting them; however, the mention of the denial of the resurrection among other controversial points seems to support the Jewish idea of the Samaritan origin, i.e., their pagan background. But one could argue about its being a product of the same hostility. The ambiguity and difficulty over this point is due to the uncertainty of the approximate date of acceptance of belief in resurrection in the Samaritan creed. Observing that the Samaritans were influenced slightly by Christianity and Islam and that the basic elements of the eschatology of all three faiths are similar, Macdonald claims that the Samaritan development of this belief was a matter of shifting emphasis.<sup>129</sup> Moreover, he accepts the eschatological expressions of belief in the *Memar* as evidence of the Samaritans believing in the resurrection. Dexinger is not so sure about this point, because of the "problems connected with the transmission of the text of the *Memar*," so "this is not immediately obvious."<sup>130</sup> This doubt supports the view that the Samaritan beliefs belong to the much later periods. Likewise, Isser in his book claims that the resurrection references in the pre-Islamic book *Memar* are late interpolations.<sup>131</sup> However, this could cause another set of problems regarding Samaritan origins. It also would certainly rule out the possibility of their being a Jewish sect, and affirm their alleged pagan origin. It would not do any good to the idea of their being a really Israelite people that have the real Torah. It is certain that the rabbinic Jewish writings consider them as formerly pagans. But here we are not away from problems. On the one hand, it is not obvious that by the pronoun "them," the Samaritans were referred to in the Bible and the Mishna. If Macdonald is right in his etymological

---

<sup>128</sup> M. Higger (ed) *Seven Minor Treatises* (New York, 1930), p. 46. Also as "Masseket Kutim" in Montgomery, *the Samaritans*, pp. 196-203. For comments also see Bowman, Introduction, *Documents*, pp. iv-v; Nutt, p. 40; Dexinger, p. 282.

<sup>129</sup> Macdonald, *Theology*, p. 456.

<sup>130</sup> Dexinger, p. 283.

<sup>131</sup> S. J. Isser, *The Dosithicans, A Samaritan Sect in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1976), p. 85.

analysis of the term '*shōmrōnīm* and *shāmerīm*', then they might well have been the 'Samaritans' rather than the Samaritans. Since this way of thinking would not give us any clue about Samaritan origins, we are then still to ask who the Samaritans are. This would lead us to another possibility entertained by Bowman.<sup>132</sup> According to him, if the above-mentioned tractate *Kuthim* is right, it may be speaking of different Samaritans from the Samaritans on behalf of which Marqah was talking about resurrection, which leaves another question to be asked about the other Samaritans. Hence, the unclearness of the historical development or origin of this belief cast some serious doubts on the Samaritan belief in resurrection.

The door of the Samaritan creeds being influenced from other sources is open. The sources of possible influence to be considered are Judaism,<sup>133</sup> Sadducees,<sup>134</sup> or Dositheans,<sup>135</sup> which are believed to be a Samaritan sect with belief in resurrection. Islam, on the other hand, is considered in this context as the contributor of the present level of strength to the belief of the Samaritans. This is held by Macdonald, who claims that there are elements in this belief that are typical of Islam. They found no such stress in Christianity and Judaism and early Samaritanism.<sup>136</sup> Hence, Islamic stress could have been a stimulus for this belief of the Samaritans, because the medieval writings on this matter have many Islamic aspects that Marqah does not have.<sup>137</sup>

As for expecting a *Mahdī*, the *Taheb*<sup>138</sup> in the Samaritan case, it must be of Judaic origin, except the name of the *Mahdī*. This belief is also controversial as to whence and when they adopted it. The reference is made to Deut. 18:18. According to Marqah, a messiah, the *Taheb*, or the Restorer, "will come in peace to repossess which God chose for those good people," and "to manifest the truth..."<sup>139</sup> He is seen sometimes as a prophet like

---

<sup>132</sup> Bowman, Introduction, *Documents*, pp. iv-v.

<sup>133</sup> Ben-Zvi, p. 129; Gaster, *The Samaritans*, pp. 87,89. Cf. Heidenheim, p. xvi.

<sup>134</sup> Nutt, p. 40.

<sup>135</sup> Purvis, "The Samaritan Problem," p. 341. Also see, Pummer, *The Samaritans*, p. 6.

<sup>136</sup> Macdonald, *Theology*, p. 39. For an idea of two-stage development of this particular belief, see Dexinger, p. 283. On the other hand, Crown in his article "Some Traces of Heterodox Theology in the Samaritan Book of Joshua" in A. Crown (ed) *The Samaritans*, claims that this was a result of the fact that the Samaritans were not homogenous in history and were torn by sectarian strife. The same thing is with Judaic eschatology. Every sect has its own solution of eschatological problem. p. 193.

<sup>137</sup> Macdonald, "Patronage of Islam," p. 101.

<sup>138</sup> For T.H. Gaster's comparing the meanings of Gospel, *Bushrā*, and *Taheb*, see "Samaritans," p. 195.

<sup>139</sup> *Memar*, pp. 33, 185-186, & *passim*.

Moses, and sometimes Marqah identifies him with Moses. Another distinction is the switching of the Messiah's family from Davidic origin to the tribe of Joseph to exalt the tribe against the Jews. As is well known, the idea of Mahdī is originally a Judaic belief, and the similar idea of *Masīh* in Islamic tradition, which is non-Qur'ānic,<sup>140</sup> must have generated later due to the Judaic influence. Hence, there is no point on comparing Islamic and Samaritan belief of Mahdī in terms of their origins.

Additionally the doctrine of Hell, a systematic doctrine of punishment through eternal burning as an extension of the belief in the hereafter, according to Macdonald, must have an Islamic source, since Judaism has no such teaching, nor has official Christianity, although non-official Christianity may accept such ideas. But it is certain that in Islam and Samaritanism there is a strong emphasis on the unbelief that leads to punishment and Hell.<sup>141</sup> As for the belief in Angels, some writers also question Samaritan

*Angelology*: According to Munro, where the HP omits "angel," the SP text has it,<sup>142</sup> which, in any case, affirms the Samaritan belief in angels. However, Nutt claims that the Muslim writers support the idea that the Samaritans deny the existence of angels.<sup>143</sup> Not only do some writers mention only a Samaritan sect that denies it, but also the reports about them are found somewhat contradictory. Furthermore, it is difficult, Gaster observes, to find a source even in the Jewish writings, for the assertion that they do not believe in angels.<sup>144</sup> However, it is believed that the latest form of this belief is different from the earlier one. Marqah ascribes some functions to angels, such as being with Moses in confronting Pharaoh<sup>145</sup> as messengers,<sup>146</sup> and during the death of Moses,<sup>147</sup> during the dividing of the Red Sea,<sup>148</sup> and carrying the Tablets.<sup>149</sup> And Gaster reports some elements represented by angels, the angel of fire, water, wind, etc. in the *Asāfir*, one of the Samaritan chronicles.<sup>150</sup> In short, one should accept that the Samaritans must have had

<sup>140</sup> The term *Masīh* does occur in the Qur'ān, but does not have any eschatological connotations.

<sup>141</sup> Macdonald, "Islamic Doctrines," p. 287. *Mcmr*, p. 160.

<sup>142</sup> Munro, p. 45-46; although he thinks that the alteration cannot be intentional because there are four cases that would not be otherwise left unaltered.

<sup>143</sup> Nutt, p. 46.

<sup>144</sup> Gaster, *Samaritans*, p. 78.

<sup>145</sup> *Mcmr*, p. 56.

<sup>146</sup> *Mcmr*, p. 120.

<sup>147</sup> *Mcmr*, p. 202.

<sup>148</sup> *Mcmr*, pp. 3, 42.

<sup>149</sup> *Memar*, p. 155. Cf. T.H. Gaster's comment on the belief in Angels, "Samaritans," p. 195.

<sup>150</sup> Gaster, *Samaritans*, p. 78.



this belief from the beginning, for the angels are expressly mentioned in the SP, and they are very eager to believe what is expressed in it.<sup>151</sup>

Finally, since the ritual of circumcision is not a religious matter in Islam, it is not our concern here. Moreover, due to the distant probability of Samaritan influence, I will not touch on pilgrimage and sacrifice.<sup>152</sup> Other than the major points above, there are some minor points that are regarded as products of influence from either side. Especially Macdonald sees most of them as consequences of Islamic dominance. Among them is a long hymn *al-Fātiḥa* named after the Qur'ānic *sūrah* with the same name.<sup>153</sup> Another phrase *b-ismi Allāhi al-raḥmān al-raḥīm* is supposed to be borrowed from the Muslim tradition, along with the expressions such as "*Allāhu a'lam*," "*inshā' Allāh*" that permeated the Samaritan circles.<sup>154</sup> Additionally, *taṣliyah* and *talbiyah* are listed among the minor points.<sup>155</sup> Last point would be the Samaritan naming of Moses as the "*khātam*" of the prophets, which is used in the Qur'ān (33/40) for Muhammad.<sup>156</sup>

#### b) Some Problematic Issues

Some of the Samaritan doctrines clearly contradict the Qur'ānic teaching and beliefs. This constitutes, in my opinion, a difficulty for the alleged Muslim borrowings from the Samaritans, since those contradictory beliefs mutually exclude one another.<sup>157</sup> Hence, even though on some assumptions Islam could be in agreement with Samaritanism on certain points, the former can in no wise be in the same line with the latter, for instance, in viewing the Prophets in general, and David, Solomon, and Ezra in particular.

---

<sup>151</sup> Gaster, *ibid*, p. 78. Cf. Dexinger, p. 289. According to Ben-Zvi (p. 129), this belief bears an influence from Christianity, Islam and Jewish Kabbala.

<sup>152</sup> See related chapters in Macdonald, *Theology*; Gaster, *Samaritans*; Pummer, *The Samaritans*.

<sup>153</sup> See Macdonald, "Patronage of Islam," p. 95, and "Arabic Musical and Liturgical Terms Employed by the Samaritans," *Islamic Quarterly*, v. 6 (1961), p. 53.

<sup>154</sup> Macdonald, "Patronage of Islam," p. 95; *Theology*, p.38; "Islamic Doctrines," p. 281. For the debate between Gaster's claim of the Samaritan origin of the *Basmala* and Finkel's criticism of it, see Finkel, pp. 161-162; cf. Pummer, "Present State-II," p. 45.

<sup>155</sup> Macdonald, "Islamic Doctrines," p. 281-284, where he claims that such benedictions exist neither in Christianity nor Judaism. For *Talbiyah* and antiphonal worship, see Macdonald, "Patronage," p. 95.

<sup>156</sup> Macdonald, "Islamic Doctrines," pp. 282-283 and 285 (for prophetic functions of Moses); "Patronage," p. 96.

<sup>157</sup> Of course, this probably would not be a problem when one sees Islam as a syncretistic composition.

*The Samaritan view of the "Prophets":* In their view, Moses is the first and the last prophet, he is the Word of God,<sup>158</sup> the Logos, and later identified as the pre-existing Moses.<sup>159</sup> Moreover, they ascribe to Moses some cosmic role: 'Moses was the first (man) whom God created' and he was involved in the creating the World, and hence all creation is in an order because of him.<sup>160</sup> He was the lawgiver and the true prophet. In the *Memar*, Marqah makes God say: "... were it not for your prophethood, I would not have revealed myself, and my voice would not have been heard..."<sup>161</sup> It seems certain that the restriction of the prophethood with Moses and such reverence for Moses are effects of external factors, such as Christian exaltation of Jesus as the son of God. Similar literature has been produced about Muhammad in the Muslim tradition, and the same exaltation, for instance, the story of the *mi'rāj* can be found in the *ḥadīth* literature. The fact that the Muhammad figure portrayed in the Qur'ān is nothing like the one in the *ḥadīth* literature should evince that the whole thing is a byproduct of the Muslim interaction with other faiths. It is probably the same stimulus, i.e. Christians' description of Jesus, that affected both the Samaritan and Islamic traditions in the same way.

In the Qur'ān, only Jesus was given the epithet 'the Word of God' (4/181), and even Muhammad had no such appellations. But it is a matter of inquiry whether this played a role in the Samaritan view of Moses. As for Moses being the first to be created, it cannot have anything to do with Islam, and it is something that can neither be transmitted from the Samaritans nor vice versa. The Samaritans, furthermore, consider pre-Mosaic prophets such as Adam, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, as patriarchs and ancestors. In the Samaritan chronicle *Asāṭīr*, the author talks about Abraham's crashing the idols,<sup>162</sup> his being cast into the fire,<sup>163</sup> and his accepting the covenant of

<sup>158</sup> Macdonald sees it ("Discovery," pp. 148 ff) as a Christian influence, since Jesus was the Word (John, 1.1).

<sup>159</sup> Macdonald, "Islamic Doctrines," p. 284; This was a Christian effect, since the Muslims could not identify Muhammad in such a way. Macdonald, "Patronage of Islam," p. 100; As for the Logos, it must be the Islamic teaching (the Qur'ān, 7/143-144) that is responsible for this. See *Theology*, p. 38. Here Macdonald doesn't seem to be clear when he sees the Word as a Christian, and the Logos as an Islamic influence. Also see T.H. Gaster, "Samaritans," p. 195.

<sup>160</sup> Macdonald, "Discovery," p. 148. See also Qirqisānī, p. 362. About the Samaritan Logos doctrine, and other related discussion, see Fossum, pp. 76 ff.

<sup>161</sup> *Memar*; also see Macdonald, "Discovery," p. 149.

<sup>162</sup> *Asāṭīr*, p. 250.

<sup>163</sup> *Asāṭīr*, p. 64. See also *Pitron, the Samaritan Commentary*, in the *Asāṭīr*, p. 225.

circumcision.<sup>164</sup> Moses' prophethood is not a matter of question, but this is not the case with Abraham, whom the Qur'ān praises very much as a '*ḥanīf*,' and whose prophecy was the basis of Islam and other monotheistic religions. As for Aaron (Hārūn), in the *Memar* he is presented as a priest primarily, but sometimes referred to as both priest and prophet. According to Crown, he was not a true prophet but as a spokesman for his brother, Moses. He is also seen as the vehicle for the atonement of the sins of Israel, and he represents the holy priesthood.<sup>165</sup> It seems that Crown probably does not take Marqah's claim seriously. Aaron, or *Hārūn* in the Qur'ān, is an important figure who helps Moses in his encounter with the Pharaoh. In the Qur'ān, he is also a prophet like Moses and is very eloquent in his speech, by which he helps Moses.<sup>166</sup> Since the notion of priesthood is alien to Islam, Aaron's being a priest does not find its expression in it at all. This would be an appropriate place to touch upon the alleged connection between the Samaritan priesthood and the Islamic *khalīfah*. The Samaritan priests have some prerogatives of which Marqah lists ten,<sup>167</sup> and which *khalīfahs* did not have: he is pure, free of defilement,<sup>168</sup> anointed, (especially) vested, gives the great blessings, begins and ends (in worship), gives judgment, and dwells in the holy place. Moreover, there are seven other priestly prerogatives that are equally great:<sup>169</sup> the consuming of what is holy, the offerings,<sup>170</sup> the faithful ministrations of the sanctuary and of all that pertains to God, testimony to the truth, receipt of statutory things, and the service of the place of worship. In addition, according to Marqah, the priest is supposed to speak with people "a word of advice that they may not stray from the way of the True One, and that every man may know his place and his actions according to it."<sup>171</sup> Keeping that in

---

<sup>164</sup> *Asāṭīr*, p. 260. Gaster states that in the Samaritan Book of Joshua, no reference is made to Terah, or the man somehow related to Abraham, as an idol-worshipper. Gaster, *Asāṭīr*, p. 244, n. 23: The reference to his being idolatrous is missing. According to him, the Qur'ān thus agrees more with the Samaritans inasmuch as neither consider Terah who is presented as Abraham's father (supposedly *Āzar* in the Qur'ān) idolater, contrary to Jewish tradition. This is a result of either ignorance or misunderstanding of the related verses in the Qur'ān, 6/74 and 19/42-57, where he is introduced as an idol-worshipper.

<sup>165</sup> Crown, "Aaron," in *Companion*, p. 1.

<sup>166</sup> The Qur'ān 7/22; 19/53; 23/45; 25/35; especially 20/25-37; 28/33-35; 26/13.

<sup>167</sup> *Memar*, p. 93. They distinguish him from other brethren.

<sup>168</sup> The high priest is not defiled by touching a corpse, nor by foreigners' uncleanness, which constitutes a defilement for a regular Samaritan.

<sup>169</sup> *Memar*, p. 93.

<sup>170</sup> Moses said: "They shall call people to the mountains... there they offer ... sacrifices (Deut. xxxiii, 19)." See *Memar*, p. 93

<sup>171</sup> *Memar*, p. 91.

mind, when we compare the *khilāfah* institution of Muslims and the priesthood of the Samaritans,<sup>172</sup> one can easily discern that the *khilāfah* was mostly politic-oriented, whereas the priesthood appears to be exceedingly religious-oriented. Furthermore, the *khilāfah* was not a religious institution, i.e., it was not established due to religious injunctions or needs.<sup>173</sup> Therefore, one would see some striking similarities between the priesthood and the Shiite doctrine of *Imāmah*, to say the least, both Imams and High priests being appointed by God.

Returning to the prophets, apart from Adam, whose prophethood is implicitly expressed, other figures until and including Moses are accepted as prophets, and they have to be believed according to the Qur'ānic tenets. However there is a problem with the post-Mosaic figures in both Islam and Samaritanism as opposed to Judaism. In the Qur'ān, the prophets whose names are mentioned count 23 in number, together with three others whose statuses are not explicit. Additionally the Qur'ān reports the existence of a number of unidentified prophets.<sup>174</sup> Among the twenty-three, only a few have their counterparts among the post-Mosaic prophets in the biblical sense of prophecy, which appears to be different from the Qur'ānic conception. Some biblical figures are also problematic as to whether they are prophets or not. For example, the prophethoods of David, Solomon, Ezra, Daniel, and Nehemia, are not certain in the biblical tradition; whereas David and Solomon are presented as prophets in the Qur'ān. Even though Ezra, or the Qur'ānic 'Uzayr according to Walker's identification,<sup>175</sup> is mentioned by name only once (9/30), the Qur'ān does not give any specification as to whether he is a prophet or not; so this causes further problems. Moreover, there appears an obvious difference between the so-called 'the Prophets' in the Bible and the ones that came before Moses, such as Abraham, Isaac, Jethro, Joseph, Lot, etc. Because of this distinction, definition of a 'prophet' is rather ambiguous. When we talk about the prophets in the Qur'ān, we have to think of them as the ones receiving revelations from God. Hence, beginning with Adam, almost every pre-Mosaic prophet is mentioned in the

<sup>172</sup> Cf. Crone and Cook, *Hagarism*, p. 26. Here it is not my intention to assert that the *Khilāfah* is exclusively Islamic, nor is it my contention.

<sup>173</sup> Even though we find the term *Khalifah* in the Qur'ān, due to the contextual irrelevancy, it cannot be interpreted as a divine reference to the *Khilāfah* institution.

<sup>174</sup> "And (We sent) apostles We have mentioned you before and apostles we have not mentioned to you." 4/164

<sup>175</sup> J. Walker, *Biblical Figures in the Qur'ān* (Paisley, 1931), p. 49; and also "Who is 'Uzair?'" *Muslim World*, v.19 (1929), p. 306.

Book. In this context, there are only three 'prophets that the Qur'ān reports, namely, Elias (Ilyās), Jonah (Yūnus), and Zacharia (Zakariyya). It is however unclear whether the rest of the prophets are implied among those about whom the Qur'ān says "... some We did not mention" (4/164).

On the other hand, the Samaritans refuse to believe these biblical 'prophets.' On this, one could say that the Qur'ān agrees with the Samaritans,<sup>176</sup> yet we have two impediments for such a conclusion: one, it is not clear whether they reject the prophets themselves, or the so-called prophetic writings due to the alleged alteration by them or by some rabbis. The problem is the Samaritan rejection of the post-Mosaic writings suffixed to the Torah in the Rabbinic tradition by the prophets. This rejection interdependently entailed the rejection of the Prophets on account of their being the perpetrator,<sup>177</sup> and vice versa. Even if we assume that they reject their prophethood, we should be aware that the Samaritan notion of prophethood is distinct from that of Islam. Secondly among the prophets they deny are three prophets that the Qur'ān recognizes. Hence we are not readily entitled to deduce such a conclusion. Furthermore, given the historic Samaritan opposition to the Jews, I could argue, on the account of the Jewish alterations, that they ended up denouncing those prophets as a result of their belief that the texts were altered, or more likely, because they witnessed the rabbinical alterations in the texts; then they denounced only these writings and eventually evolved into denying the prophets as well. Finally, as a byproduct, Moses has been exalted more than ever.

The Samaritan view of David is not compatible with the Islamic teaching about the prophets either. David was, for them, the main perpetrator that moved the capital from Shechem to Jerusalem to establish the temple. According to one Muslim chronicle, the Samaritans claim that David thus disobeyed God since He had commanded him the reverse.<sup>178</sup> This would not be a problem in the Samaritan-Jewish conflict, because the Jewish tradition sees David as a king, who conspired to kill one of his officers in order to

---

<sup>176</sup> In this context, Crone and Cook claim that "the way in which the great Judaic prophets scarcely figure in the Koran is perhaps the Islamic residue of this [Samaritan] doctrine." *Hagarism*, p. 15. Here they just assume that both biblical and Qur'ānic notions of prophecy are identical. Secondly, they did not see that the Jewish tradition sees most of them not 'great' rather 'minor' prophets. That the Qur'ān mentions three of the prophets by name appears to be insignificant for the authors of *Hagarism*.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. Gaster, *Samaritans*, p. 42. They were seen as sorcerers, wizards, heretics by the Samaritans. So they refused to recognize all the books of the Old testimony, along with the prophets and everything in any way connected with the Jews.

<sup>178</sup> Qalqashandī, p. 269.

have his wife, with whom he had committed adultery.<sup>179</sup> Moreover, the same line of thinking continues with Solomon, who is denounced as “born of a harlot” and as “an enchanter like Balaam” and as “rebellious and straying from the way of truth.”<sup>180</sup> The other charge was the use of black art, or magic to gain control over the satans.<sup>181</sup> According to Finkel, Muhammad tried to clear Solomon’s name in the verse that reads “and Solomon was not an unbeliever but the satans were infidels, teaching man magic” (2/96). So the indictment perfectly tallies with the charge of the Samaritans. What is interesting and strange is the claim Finkel makes: according to him the above-cited Qur’ānic verse clearly points to the presence of the Samaritans in the Peninsula. Because, he argues, the defense of Solomon’s piety and divine power could not be directed against anyone but the Samaritans.<sup>182</sup> Apparently Finkel ignored the fact that the Jews too did not look upon him that well. The Jewish historian Josephus even describes Solomon as a powerful sorcerer.<sup>183</sup> The Jews see him as inferior to David in ruling and piety. Flint even claims that during his reign, there was no prophet; because prophetic mission actually stopped; whereas during David’s reign Nathan was the prophet.<sup>184</sup> According to Josephus, Solomon abandoned his faith and became idolatrous.<sup>185</sup> This belief might have been in circulation among the Arabian Jews, and it is, I think, thus more meaningful to interpret this as a retort to the Jews already there, than looking for a Samaritan trace there through this verse.

The problem of Ezra, on the other hand, is more complicated. In the Jewish tradition, he is called priest, the priest-scribe, and only in one place the prophet; and his prophetic functions are not conspicuous.<sup>186</sup> He is the leader of the expedition of return to Jerusalem from the exile. He then reestablished the Jewish state. That is why he is important for the rabbis.<sup>187</sup> According to Walker, Ezra certainly played an important part in editing the Jewish scripture; but only the Samaritan sect held an extreme opinion of

<sup>179</sup> H.A. White, “David,” *A Dictionary of the Bible*, v. 1, p. 569. See also *the Samaritan Chronicle no. II*, p. 135.

<sup>180</sup> Finkel, p. 163.

<sup>181</sup> Cf. Finkel, p. 165. See also R. Flint, “Solomon” in *A Dictionary of the Bible*, v. 4 (New York, 1903), p. 560.

<sup>182</sup> Finkel, p. 165.

<sup>183</sup> Flint, “Solomon,” v.4, p. 560.

<sup>184</sup> Flint, p. 561.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. Flint, p. 568.

<sup>186</sup> L.W. Balten, “Ezra” in *A Dictionary of Bible*, v.1, p. 820.

<sup>187</sup> G.D. Newby, *A History of the Jews of Arabia*, (Columbia, 1988), p. 60.

him.<sup>188</sup> In the eyes of the Samaritans, Ezra had acted presumptuously by changing the old divine script. Therefore, he had acted as if he were authorized by God, or as if he were the son of God. Consequently they accused the Jews of following Ezra and accepting the new edition of the true Pentateuch.<sup>189</sup> Walker identifies Ezra with 'Uzayr in the Qur'ān, in which he is narrated as the one whom the Jews claimed to be the son of God apparently against the Christians who claim the same thing for Jesus (Qur'ān, 9/30).<sup>190</sup> This is the one and only mention of 'Uzair and no further information is given. He is not said to be a prophet, which could be rendered in harmony with the Jewish tradition. However, the fact that the Qur'ān did not specify whether he was a prophet or not and did not give any religious judgment about him causes further problems. Moreover, why he is claimed to be God's son is not given a clue either. The Jewish tradition available now does not seem to have any trace of such a belief, and this verse, therefore, attracts the doubts of historians.

Attempting to make sense of it, Walker claims that it should be the Samaritan accusation that Ezra acted like a son of God. Hence this slanderous charge, in the end, must have a Samaritan origin, which Muhammad used against the Jews to gain the support of the Samaritans.<sup>191</sup> How and where did then Muhammad get this idea? Either he acquired this information, speculates Walker, from the Samaritans during his journeying to Syria, or there might have been Samaritan offshoots in Arabia, although he admits no historical trace of such a thing.<sup>192</sup> In the same vein, Newby<sup>193</sup> continues that for the rabbis Ezra was the equivalent of Moses, he would have been the recipient of the Torah, but he was chosen to restore the forgotten Law. He is also credited with the introduction of the proper means of writing the Scripture, for which he was given the title of Scribe in extra-rabbinic literature. This appellation is given as "Scribe of the knowledge of the Most High" (4 Ezra, 15:50), which is usually attributed to one of several archangels, Elijah and Enoch.<sup>194</sup> Newby goes on to say that Ezra was a disciple of Baruch, who was taken by God to heaven while alive, which represents another point of correspondence with

---

<sup>188</sup> Walker, *Characters*, p. 49.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 49-50.

<sup>190</sup> "The Jews say, 'Uzayr is the Son of God'; the Christians say, 'the Messiah is the Son of God.' That is the utterance of their mouths, conforming with the unbelievers before them ...."

<sup>191</sup> Walker, *Characters*, p. 49; also see his article "Who is 'Uzair?," p. 306.

<sup>192</sup> Walker, "Who is 'Uzair?" p.306.

<sup>193</sup> Newby, *History*, p. 60.

<sup>194</sup> Newby, p. 60.

Elijah and Enoch. The equation of Ezra the Scribe with the Enoch the Scribe and their translations is most likely the solution to this problem.<sup>195</sup> Newby's approach sounds more possible, considering the possibility of extra-rabbinic beliefs in circulation among the Jews. It is also possible that there might have been a popular mix-up between Ezra and Enoch regarding his rising to heaven. On the other hand, the Qur'ānic verse which follows the one about Ezra, clarifies the reason for such a claim: "They have taken their rabbis and their monks as lords apart from God, and the Messiah, ..." This explanation does not require Ezra to have been a prophet or to have been regarded as the son of God. The Jews and the Christians are denounced for their excessive revering of Ezra, and deifying Jesus respectively. That could have been the possible reason for the Qur'ānic warning. What the Qur'ān suggests is that in the region it was revealed, there were such beliefs among the Jews and the Christians, there was no objection to this claim. In the Qur'ān, extreme reverence for anything is perceived as some kind of deification of it, from which Muslims are forbidden. In the final analysis, therefore, it is possible that either there may have been such a belief among the Jews around, or their excessive reverence for Ezra is interpreted as the deification of him. Because Ezra was so much honored, they could have taken him as a divine person.<sup>196</sup> We should take into consideration that the beliefs of the Jews in that area could have been somewhat different<sup>197</sup> from the rabbinic beliefs due to the distance to the centers of rabbinic Judaism, which is accepted by some scholars, and that we do not have a solid source regarding the Arabian Jews and their beliefs and practices.

Walker's perspective is based on a reductionist view, and his assumptions are not grounded. First of all, in the Samaritan history, even though they denounced Ezra, there is no evidence that they had such a claim about him to be a source for Muhammad to copy. Secondly, from the Qur'ānic position, there is no use for mentioning such a claim if there did not exist such a popular false belief in the least. Moreover, it does not make much sense for Muhammad to leave the Jewish support that was nearby and

<sup>195</sup> Newby, p. 60.

<sup>196</sup> Here again the verse 9/31 should be taken into account. Also 5/18 could suggest some hints about the Jewish usage of 'the son of God' very freely: "The Jews say, we are sons of God, and his beloved..."

<sup>197</sup> Qasṭallānī (d.923) implies the existence of a Jewish group who say that Ezra is the son of God, but it looks like that he inferred their existence from the verse. See *Irshād al-Sārī* (Baghdad, 1971), v. 8, p. 156. Also see Baydāwī's interpretation of the 'Uzayr verse (9/30) about the same suggestion. Cf. *The Holy Qur'ān*, Muhammad Ali's translation, pp. 391-392, n. 1050-1052.



seek the small amount of support that was very remote<sup>198</sup> to his region, which even politically sounds ridiculous. Finally, it also does not stand to reason to accuse the Jews with an imported idea, if there is no trace of such a false belief around. Seeing the Arabian Jewish context from the Jerusalem tradition thus forces one either to place the Samaritans in the Mecca-Medina region or to have the idea that somebody who is in need of support can seek a bit of support by importing ideas that do not fit the religious profile of the community. As a result, as far as the Muslim-Samaritan mutual influence is concerned, the problem of Ezra, or their rejection of Ezra, does not constitute a real problem in terms of mutual influence.

#### *IV. Conclusion*

It becomes evident that from the available materials on the subject that one can hardly claim any Samaritan influence on Islamic beliefs unless one makes some initial assumptions or takes the reductionist position. It is also certain that some of the Qur'ānic stories and historical names do not conform to those of the Bible. This fact appears to have made some western scholars of Islam claim that the Qur'ān is not consistent in its historical data. Eventually, they came to conclude that Muhammad's failure to convey the stories intact is responsible for this consequence. As we have seen in the preceding pages, according to these approaches, Muhammad sometimes seems to take the Samaritan side and sometimes the Jewish side by including their stories in turn to obtain their support. In fact, this would be absolutely inconsistent of Muhammad, if these allegations were substantiated truths.<sup>199</sup> As for the dissimilarities between the Biblical and Qur'ānic stories, unlike the Bible, the Qur'ān's aim appears to avoid classical biblical style of narratives. It always dwells on the lessons that the audience is expected to extract from the stories. That would explain partly the absence of detailed information that one finds in the Bible. Secondly, the Qur'ān explicitly accuses the Jews of doctoring their Book. Even if the scope of the allegations mostly covers the doctrinal texts, since the stories contain also religious teachings, they could have been affected by the distortion. That is why the Qur'ān claims to have the most correct versions of the stories, although it must be stated that there is

---

<sup>198</sup> On the account that there were no Samaritans in that region.

<sup>199</sup> Here I should remark about the Qur'ān's perspective of the matter at the expense of being apologetic. The Qur'ān's position is secure and consistent regarding these points. It does not claim to be a 'newfangled' faith. By clarifying its being the continuation of the previous revelatory tradition, it even expressly confirms the previous books and puts them among the Islamic creed.

scarce information about some figures and events. However, in the end, the Islamic perspective would be on the Samaritan side in rejecting the post-Torah writings, and it would extend the scope to both possibilities of inserting in the Torah and concealing the true revelations.

Yet there is a huge abyss of doctrinal oppositions between the Islamic and Samaritan traditions. I have tried to deal with such issues in this study, and the upshot that I concluded after the research consists of two major points: a) Samaritan history is not so clear that one can easily pick up the distinct characteristics of this tradition in its various stages. Even their real identity is still in dispute. It is possible that their religious development was affected throughout its historical existence. It seems also possible that this tradition might have been the original version of Judaism. But due to external political intervention and support or enmity, whichever takes the orthodox line excommunicated the other side; this idea had some counterpart in Islamic history. However, in the overall and current appearance, they are more likely a Jewish breakaway. b) Accordingly, their falling under Islamic rule did not help their already ambiguous history. It affected them in almost every way. After a while in which they held on to their literary languages, Hebrew and Aramaic, they were compelled to change it into Arabic.

These two findings are major standpoints held by the scholars to explain the current and general situation of the Samaritan religion. According to some, the Samaritans were only recipients, rather than the bestowers, of new ideas,<sup>200</sup> a judgment by Macdonald, based on the fact that their related literature is quite late. He welcomes this attitude of the Samaritans as a unique feature of them, as long as new ideas do not contradict their doctrinal formulae.<sup>201</sup> Likewise, Nutt thinks that the Samaritans, powerless to invent, were compelled to borrow from others.<sup>202</sup> Against this idea, Gaster argues that these assumptions are hastily made and claims that no trace of Samaritan dependence on Islam has yet been adduced.<sup>203</sup> There have certainly been new developments in Samaritan studies since Gaster's time, and so most scholars depend on the literal development when they assess this matter.

<sup>200</sup> Macdonald, "Islamic Doctrines," p. 280. But he refuses any Samaritan borrowings from Judaism. In this syncretistic context, Samaritanism is sometimes associated with Gnosticism. It is claimed that for a period of time it is believed to be under Hellenistic influence, and in a reverse fashion, it could have been influential on the origin of Gnosticism, because of Simon Magnus's being both Samaritan and the arch-Gnostic. For the arguments, see Pummer, "Present State-II," p. 27; Macdonald, "Patronage," p. 92; for detail, Macdonald, "Introduction," *Mcmar-I*, p. xxxviii.

<sup>201</sup> Macdonald, "Patronage," pp. 95-96.

<sup>202</sup> Nutt, p. 29.

<sup>203</sup> Gaster, *Samaritans*, pp. 45-46.

As was mentioned, there are two major books that belong to 4<sup>th</sup> century AD, pre-Islamic era: *Memar Marqah* and *Defter*, theological and prayer books of the Samaritans. These works, although early, are considered edited throughout the centuries. According to T.H. Gaster, the history of the text of *Memar* is not yet explored, and like other literature, it shows a constant process of adaptation and editorial manipulation. Hence we cannot be sure that it has not been subjected to Islamizing redaction.<sup>204</sup> Similarly, while Macdonald detects some syncretism in the *Memar*,<sup>205</sup> Pummer states that it is often not possible to assign definite dates to the various parts of a work due to the textual adaptation.<sup>206</sup> As for *Defter*, according to Macdonald, it contains some later material of the 14<sup>th</sup> century and reveals some terms that are not used even in Hebrew or Aramaic equivalents,<sup>207</sup> which suggests its later redaction. In general, all sorts of the Samaritan literature were mostly developed between 4<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> to some extent 18<sup>th</sup> centuries with continuous copying accompanied by new redactions. Ultimately, since almost all the existing literature originated in the Islamic era, it is easier to assess Islamic influence,<sup>208</sup> because the 14<sup>th</sup> century literature shows extensive external influences, Islamic and Christian theological concepts.<sup>209</sup> Particularly Islamic ideas are extensively adopted in the 14<sup>th</sup> century onward, ideas that were alien to Judaism and Christianity and distinctive of Islam.<sup>210</sup> Probably these points caused Macdonald to define Samaritanism as a religion that 'developed its original beliefs with the aid of assimilated ideas from Christianity and Islam.' In the final analysis, Samaritanism hardly appears to have doctrinal influences on Islam. During their interactions, perhaps the systematic structure of Islam places it in the 'giver' position. No matter who was the giver, the bottom line would be that, from the Qur'ānic point of view, it is not surprising to encounter some similar practices and beliefs in the religions that share ultimately the same source. There have been only culturally various interpretations of the fundamentally same thought, the idea that can be seen in the Qur'ānic philosophy of *nubuwwah*. But its view of Jewish and Christian distortion of their Books still stands; because according to the Qur'ān, it is the crux of the idea of sending new prophets.

---

<sup>204</sup> T.H. Gaster, "Samaritans," p. 195.

<sup>205</sup> Macdonald, "Introduction," *Memar-I*, p. xvii.

<sup>206</sup> Pummer, pp. 15-16.

<sup>207</sup> Macdonald, "Islamic Doctrines," p. 280; cf. "Arabic Musical," p. 48.

<sup>208</sup> Pummer, "Present State-II," p. 45.

<sup>209</sup> Macdonald, "Islamic Doctrines," pp. 281-282.

<sup>210</sup> Macdonald, "Patronage," p. 94; cf. "Islamic Doctrines," p. 282. Boid claims that Christians and Muslim have taken over a lot of Samaritan *halachah*, especially law of uncleanness. Boid, p. 274.

Table I. The Samaritan Works

	Works	Author	Year of Composition	Content	Language
Major Books	The Samaritan Pentateuch (SP)	Copied from the original by Abisha	In the 13 <sup>th</sup> year of Canan settlement		Samaritan -Hebrew
	Samaritan Targum		Probably between 1 <sup>st</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> century AD.		Greek & Aramaic
	Deftler		Probably 4 <sup>th</sup> century A.D.	Samaritan Prayer Book	
	Memar Marqah	Marqah (i.e. Mark)	Circa 4 <sup>th</sup> century AD	Theology and Exegesis	Samaritan-Aramaic
Samaritan Chronicles	The <i>Asätir</i>		10 <sup>th</sup> or 11 <sup>th</sup> century	Earliest chronicle From Adam to Moses	Aramaic
	The Tolidah (Genealogy)	Jacob b. Ishmael	1346 AD copy of a 1149 AD work	Genealogy: from Adam to entrance into Canan	Hebrew
	The Samaritan Book of Joshua		1 <sup>st</sup> part-- 1362 2 <sup>nd</sup> part-- 1513	History from Joshua to Baba Rabba --- 4 <sup>th</sup> cent. AD.	Arabic
	Annals of Abu'l-Fath <i>K. al-Tārīkh</i>	Abu'l -Fath	1355 AD	History from Adam to Abbasid times	Arabic
	<i>Shalshalah</i> ("chain")	Ascribed to Elcazar b. Phinchas	14 <sup>th</sup> cent. AD & added to in 19 <sup>th</sup> -20 <sup>th</sup> cent.	Genealogy of High Priests	Hebrew
	Chronicle Adler	Av-Sakhva b. Asad Ha-Danafi	1900 AD	From Adam to 1900	Samaritan-Hebrew
Halakic Works	<i>Al-Kāfi</i>	Yūsuf b. Salamah	1402 AD		Arabic
	<i>Kitāb al-Ṭabbākh</i> (Or <i>Tubākh</i> )	Abu al-Ḥasan al-Šūfi	circa 1400 AD (or 1030-1040)		Arabic
	<i>Maad'il al-Khilāf</i>	Munajjā b. Sadaqa	12 <sup>th</sup> cent. AD	Differences between Samaritans, Jews and Karaites	Arabic
	<i>K. al-Mirāth</i>	Ibrāhīm b. Ishāq As-Sāmīri	12 <sup>th</sup> cent. AD	Law of Inheritance	Arabic
	<i>K. al-Farā'id</i>	Abu'l-Faraj ibn al-Kattār		13 <sup>th</sup> or 14 <sup>th</sup> cent. AD	Book of Laws
	Hilluk or <i>K. al-Irshād</i>	Phinchas b. Isaac or Ya'qūb b. Hārūn		Differences between Jews and Samaritans	Arabic
	<i>Kitāb al-Tawhīd</i>	Sadaqa b. Munajjā Al-Ḥakīm	circa 1200 AD	Absolute oneness of God, Commentary of SP	Arabic
	<i>Sharḥ</i>	Abu'l-Faraj Nāfis ad-Dīn		Commentary on Leviticus 26	Arabic
	<i>Al-Fāriha</i> ( <i>Sharḥ ElSheḥem</i> )	Ibrāhīm al-Kabashī	16 <sup>th</sup> cent. AD	Commentary on Deut. 32: 3, 4.	Arabic
<i>Kāshif al-Ghayā'ib</i> (Megalleh Temirin)	Ghazzāl ibn Abū al-Sarūr al-Ghāzi	1753/54 AD	Aggadic commentary	Arabic	