

INTRODUCTION

PARTS of the Samaritan Liturgy have already been published by Gesenius (*Carmina Samaritana*, Lipsiae, 1824, reprinted in square character by Kirchheim in *Karme Shomron*, Frankfurt a. M., 1851), by Heidenheim (in his *Vierteljahrsschrift*, Gotha, 1860+, and *Die samaritanische Liturgie*, Leipzig, 1885+), by Geiger (in *ZDMG.*, xviii, pp. 813+, xxi, pp. 169+), by Petermann (*Brevis ling. Sam. Grammatica*, Carolsruhae et Lipsiae, 1873, *Chrestomathia*, pp. 12+), by Merx (*Atti dei Lincei*, ser. 4^a Rendiconti, iii, 1, pp. 550+, 2, pp. 160+, *Actes du 8^{me} Congrès Internat. des Orientalistes*, ii, 1, 119+, in Pertsch's *Catal. Die orientalischen Handschriften... zu Gotha*, 1893, pp. 29+, and in Bäsch-Drugulin's *Marksteine aus der Weltliteratur*, Leipzig, 1902), by Hilgenfeld (in *Ztschr. für wiss. Theol.*, xxxvii, pp. 233+), and by S. Rappoport (*Journal Asiatique*, 1900, pp. 207+, and *La Liturgie samaritaine*, Paris, 1900).

These are mostly isolated hymns. Heidenheim's collection, which is the most extensive, is very inaccurate both in text and translations.¹ Many of the pieces are extremely difficult in any case, and only become intelligible when compared with others, and when the peculiarities of Samaritan style are studied. In the present edition it has been thought best to follow the MSS. closely, reproducing the traditional, or at least customary, spelling of the scribes, and correcting tacitly only what, as being departures from established custom, are clearly mistakes. Many difficulties, however, still remain on which the MSS. throw no light. It is not possible to deal with the texts by the ordinary rules of Hebrew and Aramaic (see below, p. xxxv), and to attempt to do so would be to destroy the character of the compositions. The later Samaritans, living in almost complete isolation, and from about the eleventh century A. D. speaking only Arabic, developed the use of Hebrew for religious purposes entirely on their own lines. Whether it was worth while to try to reproduce

¹ The same is true of Gesenius's work, but it must be remembered that his translation represents a first attempt, and that he had to rely on a single incorrect MS. in each case.

their form of the language, as has been done, is a question which need not be discussed here. The quality of the various compositions varies of course with the degree of the author's learning: the trustworthiness of particular MSS. depends on the intelligence of the particular scribe. The method adopted has been to select the MS. which seemed on the whole most correct, and to make it the basis of the text. The more important variants of other MSS., if any were accessible, have then been given in the foot-notes, which therefore sometimes contain the better reading. Where no complete MS. existed (e.g. for circumcision, pp. 818+) the text has been pieced together from the fragmentary copies. As a rule the variants, though numerous, are trivial, consisting of differences of spelling or mere scribal errors. In the case of inferior duplicate copies it was thought unnecessary to note such variants except for special reasons, but it is believed that none have been omitted which could in any way throw light on the meaning of the text or the usage of the scribe. The first part (pp. 3-81, containing the Defter) is based on P. Bollig's very careful transcript of the Vatican MS. (V 3), but since the Aramaic in which it is mostly written, is of the fourth century, and important in connexion with the language of the Targum, *all* variants (except those which are classified below, p. xxvi) are intended to be given in this part. The other texts are based chiefly on the MSS. in the British Museum¹ (L 1 &c.) and on the Crawford collection² (Cr 11 &c.) now in the John Rylands Library at Manchester. The *rubrics*, or headings, are mostly in very corrupt Arabic, which, after much hesitation, has been reproduced with all its errors. As their form seems to depend on the taste of the scribe, variants in them are given only when the sense is concerned, but they are printed in the most explicit form in which they appear in any of the MSS. used, and sometimes compiled from two MSS.

Liturgical MSS. are so numerous that it would have been impossible to collate them all. Moreover, little would have been gained by attempting to do so, since they all³ represent

¹ These will be described by the Rev. G. Margoliouth in his catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS.

² A catalogue of this is in preparation.

³ Except the fragments of the Damascus 'use' (p. xii) and MSS. of the Defter.

the same tradition. They are, with few exceptions, modern, and as they are uniform in character a detailed description of them is unnecessary here. They are usually of stout oriental paper, about $8 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ inches, written as a rule in a cursive hand, not in the formal character used in copies of the Pentateuch; and bound in native leather. The biblical passages, which form a large part of the liturgy, are written continuously, the hymns generally in double lines, forming two columns. To save space the biblical passages are here omitted and the hymns are printed continuously, but a single point is placed at the end of the first half-line and a double point at the end of the second half. These points are not to be regarded in any sense as stops, especially in the earlier parts (from V 3). They simply indicate the arrangement of the text in the MS., or, in prose passages, perhaps pauses in chanting. The MSS. used for the various parts of the liturgy are noted at the beginning of each division, and the folios of the copy on which the text is mainly based are indicated in the margin.

The following is a list of the MSS. used:—

At Berlin (Royal Library):

Most of these were not collated throughout:—

- B 1 = MS. or. 4to 531. Ff. 69. The acrostic (usually found only in Pentateuch MSS.) gives the scribe's name as Shelah b. Isaac Danfi. Date 1163 H. (= 1750 A.D.). For Harvest.
- B 2 = MS. or. 4to 532. Pp. 301. Written by Isaac b. Abraham Danfi in 1213 H. (= 1798-9 A.D.). The Defter, agreeing, even in the Arabic version, with Cr 11, but incorrect. The writing also is like that of Cr 11. Perhaps both are copies from the same original. It was collated to p. 108, thence only in the rubrics. Page 286 dated 1217 H.
- B 3 = MS. or. 4to 533. Ff. 58. Written by Shelah, as in B 1, in 1167 H. (1753-4 A.D.). For Mo'ed ha-Succoth.
- B 4 = MS. or. 4to 534. Written by Mufarrij (= Marhib) b. Joshua in 1201 H. (= 1786-7 A.D.). For Passover and the 1st of Nisan.
- B 5 = MS. or. 4to 535. Ff. 115. Written by Tabiah b. Isaac, the Priest (an intelligent and careful scribe), in 1200 H. (= 1785-6 A.D.). For Succoth. A good copy.

At Rome (Vatican Library):

V 3. Ff. 193, vellum, sm. 4to. No scribe or date mentioned; ascribed to the thirteenth century by Bollig and Neubauer, but most probably of the fourteenth. The Defter in the early recension. The present text (pp. 3-81) is based on Bollig's transcript. The most important of all the liturgical MSS.

W. Some fragments belonging to the editor, containing parts of the Defter, in an early hand, like that of K 4 but smaller, perhaps of the fourteenth century.

Other MSS., belonging to Mr. E. N. Adler, Mr. Marcus Adler, and Dr. Gaster, were most generously offered by the owners for the purposes of this edition, but as the texts were already printed, they could not be used. The liturgical collection (modern copies) said to be complete, at Heidelberg, was not available for the present work. Besides collating the various copies where they coincide, it was necessary for the sake of completeness to incorporate the parts peculiar to each. All MSS. of a service do not contain the same amount of text. The hymns are regarded as an expansion of the service, or as fitting into the original framework, and appear to be not all necessarily used on every occasion to which they apply. Hence individual scribes include more or less of them according to taste, date, or other circumstances.¹ Some copies seem to be meant as outlines, and again additions are often made at the beginning or end of a volume, which do not properly belong to it. In spite of every effort to collect these scattered texts and fit them into the appropriate places, some must have been overlooked, especially in the less accessible copies, which were not fully collated, for the difficulty of dealing with so much material in manuscript is great.

With regard to the *dates* of various parts of the liturgy, obviously the only sound basis for investigation is the evidence of the chronicles, checked by one another, by genealogies, and by quotations or notices in other authors. It is true that the chronicles are most bewildering in their inconsistencies, their

¹ In a MS. belonging to Mr. M. Adler there is a note of a decision to insert a hymn in the service for the 1st and 2nd Sabbaths of Nisan. This is the only note of the kind I remember.

vagueness and their disregard of dates, but some definite results can be obtained from them. There are four extant: (1) the book of Joshua,¹ in Arabic, not used for the present purpose; (2) that called El-tholideh² (Et-taulideh), here quoted as *Elt*; (3) that of Abu'l-fath³ (*Abf*); (4) that belonging to Mr. E. N. Adler⁴ (*Ad*). Of these, *Elt*, in Hebrew with an Arabic version, is largely the basis of *Abf* and *Ad*. The earlier part of it was compiled by Eleazar b. Amram in 544 H. (= 1149-50 A. D.), it was continued by Jacob b. Ishmael, priest at Damascus, in 747 H. (= 1346-7 A. D.), and brought down to modern times probably by Jacob b. Aaron the Priest, who copied it in 1276 H. = 1859-60 A. D. For the periods immediately preceding these two dates (544 and 747 H.) it may therefore be regarded as fairly trustworthy. *Abf*, in Arabic, mentions (p. 5) the chronicles he used (now lost, except *Elt* and the book of Joshua) and seems to have made some effort to distinguish fact from fiction. He wrote in 746 H. (= 1355 A. D.) bringing his record down to the time of Muhammad. The various copies have additions by the scribes. *Ad*, in Hebrew, follows *Elt*, but is fuller and better arranged. Though not an independent authority, it is useful, since the compiler is intelligent and seems to have had other sources of information. It is brought down to the year 1900. The copyist, who is no doubt also the compiler, is called Ab-Sakhwah b. As'ad b. Ishmael b. Abraham ha-danfi, and is the same as the Murjān who wrote the Hebrew 'Book of Joshua' published by Gaster.⁵

From these three authorities it has been possible, with much wearisome calculation,⁶ to draw up a tolerably certain

¹ Ed. by Juynboll, Lugd. Bat., 1848.

² Ed. by Neubauer in the *Journ. Asiat.*, 1869, p. 385. The references here are to the extract.

³ Ed. by Vilmar, Gotha, 1865. The translation never appeared. A small part (to p. 33) was translated by Payne Smith in Heidenheim's *Vierteljahrschrift*, vol. ii, pp. 303, 431.

⁴ Ed. by E. N. Adler and M. Seligsohn in the *Revue des Études Juives*, vols. 44-46. The references are to the extract (Paris, 1903).

⁵ *ZDMG.*, lxii, p. 237.

⁶ It is unnecessary to give this here. For the later priests, with whom alone the liturgical dates are concerned, see the tables below (pp. xliii-xlvi). Where dates are given here it is to be understood that they are based on calculation from the chronicles.

list of High Priests¹ with approximate dates, as a foundation for the chronology, and ultimately to arrive at the dates of most of the liturgical compositions, where their authors are named.

A large number of pieces are indeed anonymous, giving no clue to their date, but these are mostly short *ישתבחות* (ascriptions of praise). The longer compositions are generally attributed in the headings to their authors, and as the MSS. are careful in this respect and nearly always corroborate one another, and are again often supported by external evidence, there is no reason to doubt the attributions.

The earliest collection is that called the Defter (*διδάχτρα*, the 'Book') contained in pp. 1-92 of the present edition. It is, however, by no means all of the same date. A considerable part is by Marqah, another part, the Durrân² ('string of pearls') is mostly by Amram Darah² (*דרה*, also *דון* and *מן*, 'the ancient'), and one piece is by Nanah b. Marqah.

The chronicles (Elt, p. 19; Ad, p. 55; Abf, p. 125) relate that Baba the great, contemporary (*son*, Ad, Abf) of the High Priest Nethanel (who died in 332 A.D.), built or opened the synagogues, *גולה אימנות קשטה*, and enjoined the reading of the Law (*ואלף מקרת אהוותה*). Ad, p. 55, looks like an account of the earliest form of synagogue worship. We need not here inquire how much historical fact underlies the exaggerated story of Baba. It seems clear at least that some important movement did take place in the fourth century, and since Marqah is mentioned by all three chronicles as living at the time, his work no doubt was written for the liturgy drawn up then.³ The date of Baba's 'appearance' (*נולא* = *was born*?)

¹ It may be thought that at any rate the earlier names in this list are purely fictitious. It is possible, however, that they rest on a genuine, though distorted, tradition. In a papyrus, dated 408-7 B.C., edited by Sachau (*Abh. d. Preuss. Akad.*, 1907), one of the authorities of Samaria is named Daliah. He was not governor, since his father Sanballat held that office. The name is uncommon, occurring only once in the list of Priests, and then at a date which seems to be about eighty years later than the papyrus. If he was a High Priest it would appear that the names in the list are right, though the years of office are not always correct.

²⁻² There is no doubt some connexion between these two names, though it may be only due to paronomasia.

³ Geiger, *ZDMG.*, xxii, p. 534, contends that Marqah cannot be put so early because he uses the 'Gürtelreim', which does not appear in Arabic poetry before the ninth century. He is referring to the hymn on p. 193. But this, the only instance, is probably not by Marqah. The style is not his,

is given with great exactness by Ad, p. 56, as = 308 A.D. He 'reigned' forty years and died about 362 A.D.

Marqah's father was Amram b. Sered (Abf, p. 133 *בן סרד*; *עמרם סריר* p. 130), also called *מוטה*,¹ a priest. It is not definitely stated that he is the same as Amram Darah the author of the Durrân, but it is probable that the two are identical. At any rate Amram Darah's language is the same as that of Marqah, namely the Aramaic of the Samaritan Targum. All the Durrân is, however, not of the fourth century. Some pieces contain Hebraisms and even Arabisms, indicating a much later period. These are in some cases no doubt merely due to the scribe, but there remain pieces (e.g. nos. 21, 22, pp. 46, 47) which must be really later. In the heading on p. 31 Amram Darah is called (by V 3) *כהנה רבה*, though according to the lists there was no High Priest named Amram in the fourth century, nor at any date at which the Aramaic of the Durrân could have been written. The heading evidently confuses two persons, and the hymn on p. 31 (which is not in the style of the Durrân) is not by Amram Darah, but by the author of the hymn on p. 30, a later Amram who was High Priest (see below, p. xxv). In later times Marqah and Durrân were used as general terms, so that e.g. the heading *בית דראן ובית מרקה מן מימר פינחס* (p. 81) only means that the two pieces are composed on the model of the Durrân and Marqah, being really by Pinhas, and in Hebrew. Similarly two *בית מרקה* on p. 37 are in Hebrew by Eleazar.

Marqah's son Nanah is the author of the hymn on p. 15 and of the short piece on p. 410 (cf. p. 442) but hardly of the hymn ascribed to him on p. 689, which in language and in its use of rhyme belongs to a much later period.

The reading of the Law, which Baba enjoined (or taught or instituted), was no doubt the original, as it always remained the essential, part of the liturgy. The work of Amram, Marqah, and Nanah was the earliest addition to it which can be dated. For liturgical purposes the Law was divided into

he does not use rhymes in the pieces which are certainly by him, and the acrostic may be accidental. [The only other acrostic is in the hymn on p. 846, Ad, p. 63.] On his date see Baneth *Des Sam. Marqah's ... Abhdg.*, p. 12. Baneth's identification of the author of the prayer of Joshua and of the book of Joshua with Joshua b. Baraq (Elt, p. 20, Ad, p. 56) is very unconvincing.

¹ If *מוטה* = Titus = מרקה = Marcus, and *ננה* (his son) = Nonus, the family must have lived in the time of the Roman government of Syria.

קצין,¹ an arrangement which perhaps originated at this time. The קטף is a string of phrases from the Law, connected by a common idea.

With regard to the anonymous compositions in the Defter, the prayers of Moses, of Joshua, and of the Angels, there is no evidence for determining their date. From the position of most of them at the beginning of the collection, from the high esteem in which they were held, and from their invariable use in all the services, it is probable that they were composed some time before the date of N and V 3 in which they mostly occur. They give the impression of being much earlier, but there are no means of dating them precisely. Moreover, it was natural that prayers should be attributed to Moses and Joshua in early times. In the eleventh century and afterwards they would bear the author's name. The קרישה (p. 11) as found in the later MSS. is an amplification of the earlier form, and perhaps something of the kind has happened to the prayer of Joshua.

To this nucleus further additions were gradually made: the compositions of ed-Dustân, Ṭabiah b. דררה, Ab-gelugah, Abu'l-ḥasan of Tyre, Joseph ha-rabban, Pinḥas b. Joseph, and perhaps Eleazar b. Pinḥas.

The meaning of the name ed-Dustân is quite uncertain. It occurs in Abf, where Vilmar (p. lxxiii) takes it to mean the followers of Dûsis. If Dûsis is the Dositheus mentioned by Epiphanius and others, as Vilmar considers, he was a contemporary of Philo, but Abf (pp. 151+) followed by Ad, puts him after the time of Baba, and so Elt, p. 21 (דוסתים). On the other hand ed-Dustân are mentioned by Abf as an heretical sect just before he speaks of Alexander the Great (p. 82) and again several centuries later (p. 162). It is, however, unlikely that compositions by heretics would be included in the liturgy or that they are of any great antiquity. All that can safely be said as to the date of these pieces is that they occur in V 3, so that they are earlier than the fourteenth century, and that they borrow from the Durrân (fourth century). The style suggests a date in the eleventh century.

Ṭabiah b. דררה seems from his style to belong to about the same period as Ab-gelugah (see below). The father's name is

¹ See *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vii, p. 134.

unusual. Vilmar (p. lxxxii), in his analysis of the additions to the Paris MS. of Abf, mentions a Duratha who helped to restore the synagogue shortly after the death of the High Priest Nethanel (died c. 274 H.). If this Ṭabiah is his son, he would belong to the tenth century A. D. He is quoted in a treatise¹ on repentance in the Leiden MS. (no. xxvii in de Jong's catalogue), p. 318, but the passage does not occur in the only prayer by him in the Defter.² Nor does this mention of him fix his date, since the date of Abu'l-ḥasan b. Ghanâim (not the same as Abu'l-ḥasan of Tyre, see below), the author of the treatise, is also uncertain. On various grounds it is probable that this Abu'l-ḥasan lived some time early in the twelfth century, which would be consistent with a tenth-century date for Ṭabiah.

With regard to Ab-gelugah and Abu'l-ḥasan of Tyre the chronicles are very much confused. Both Elt (p. 25) and Ad (p. 95) mention an Ab-gelugah as famous for his good works, which included the building of a synagogue and an interest in its services, apparently soon after the time of Al-ḥakim ibn al-Mu'izz, about 1080 or 1100 A. D. We should naturally identify him with the liturgical writer, who lived at any rate before the fourteenth century, since his work is included in V 3. But he is said by the chronicles to have been the son of Ab-ḥisdah (= Abu'l-ḥasan) and his genealogy is given (by Elt) for 200 years, whereas in the heading in V 3 he is called son of קלה and in H 1 son of Ṭabiah³ son of קלה. The account in Elt, p. 66, however, does seem to refer to the liturgical writer, and if so, he lived in the time of Aaron b. Amram, who was High Priest from 509 to 531 H. (= 1115-37 A. D.). Both Ab-gelugah and his father lived at Acco.

Abu'l-ḥasan (or Ab-ḥisdah) of Tyre is not mentioned as a liturgist in the chronicles. He may be one of the men of that name in the genealogy of Ab-gelugah, though it is not mentioned that any of the family were connected with Tyre. His father's name is not given in the headings in any MS.,

¹ In Arabic. He is consequently called Ghazâl, the regular doublet of Ṭabiah (غزال = ظبي). The name is never written טביה.

² In V 3, not in any other MS. known at present. There are fragments of a (different?) prayer by him in H 3, f. 48; see Appendix.

³ In Elt, p. 66, the translation is wrong. The MS. has מן הוצי איין טוביה = of the family of these good men.

but in H 3, f. 83 he is called الامام, i. e. of priestly family. He is not later than the thirteenth century, since a hymn by him is found in N. He is generally said by recent writers¹ to have lived in the eleventh century, but without any reasons being stated. This is probably about his date, although it is founded on a wrong assumption. In the preface to an anonymous commentary edited by Neubauer (*Journal Asiatique*, 1873, p. 343) an Abu'l-hasan Daud b. Amram b. Levi is mentioned who had a son Abu Said, in 1033 A. D. It seems to have been assumed that this Abu Said is the same as the author of the Arabic version² of the Pentateuch and that this Abu'l-hasan is identical with Abu'l-hasan of Tyre. The only ground for the former assumption is that Abu Said's translation is not used in the commentary, which is surely an insufficient argument. Moreover, Kahle³ has recently shewn reasons for dating Abu Said in the thirteenth century, and in any case he cannot have been the son of Abu'l-hasan of Tyre, since in the preface⁴ to his version he speaks of Abu'l-hasan, not as his father, but as a person who lived considerably earlier. There is a quotation from Abu'l-hasan of Tyre in the Leiden MS. (Catal. de Jong, no. xxvii), pp. 317, 318, which is not found in V 3 (the hymn on p. 79 of this edition being incomplete in V 3) but occurs in N. The quotation, however, does not help to fix his date owing to the uncertainty as to the author of the treatise (see above). On the whole, the commonly accepted date, the eleventh century,⁵ best suits the facts and the character of his work.

A little later, in the time of the High Priest Aaron b. Amram (509-531 H.), the chronicles⁶ mention a certain Mattanah = Isaac b. Abraham as having established the ritual of the synagogues, and the order of the hymns (תב כל תלמודי).

¹ e. g. Nutt, *Sketch of Sam. History*, p. 139, n. 2. Montgomery, *Samaritans*, p. 293. Juynboll, *Lib. Jos.*, p. 115, says tenth century.

² Hence dated about 1070 by Nutt and others.

³ *Die arabischen Bibelübersetzungen*, p. xi and note.

⁴ In the Paris MS. C in Kuenen's ed., p. r. The preface in the other Paris MS. (B) has been falsified by Abu'l-barakât. See also De Sacy in the *Mémoires de l'Académie*, vol. 49, for a collection of material on the Arabic version.

⁵ When, according to Kahle, the version was composed. He seems inclined to think that Abu'l-hasan was its author, Abu Said being only a reviser. See also de Sacy, op. cit.

⁶ Ad, p. 95. Elt, p. 31 and p. 25, where the translation is faulty.

הכנישות ויתוב השירים וכו' [אלפנה Elt]). The hymn quoted with his acrostic is not found in the liturgy, and no composition of his occurs in the Defter. Probably therefore the Mattanah (ha-mizri) of the later liturgy is a different person, see below, p. xxix.

It was pointed out above that the High Priest Amram, to whom are ascribed the hymns beginning on pp. 30 and 31, is to be distinguished from Amram Darah. As to his date we have only the negative evidence of N, which omits these two hymns with others by later authors, i. e. all from the heading on p. 30 to the heading on p. 38, and continues with the Durrân immediately after the hymn of Amram Darah ending on p. 30. As the other authors on these pages are all later than N it is probable that there is the same reason for the omission of Amram High Priest. He is, however, included in V 3. The only high priest of the name who satisfies both these conditions held office from 653 to 668 H. (= 1255-69 A. D.).

The remaining writers who appear in the Defter, Joseph the High Priest or ha-rabban, Pinhas, and Eleazar, will be discussed below, as belonging properly to the next period.

Till the fourteenth century then, the Defter was the *Corpus Liturgicum* from which prayers and hymns for the various festivals were selected. This view is corroborated by the fact that V 3, which was written not later than the fourteenth century, prescribes the portions to be used for the particular occasions.¹ In the later MSS. (as Cr 11) these directions are not given, because they are not required, the special services being by that time instituted. At some time after the fourteenth century the Defter thus completed must have been revised. At any rate there is a clearly marked distinction between the recension found in the early copies (as V 3) and the later (as Cr 11). Nor is the distinction merely accidental. It is so consistent that it has been found possible to mark the additions, alterations, and omissions thus:—(not in V 3 and the earlier MSS.); [not in Cr 11 and the later MSS.]. Peculiarly interesting in this respect is the fragment K 4, on which see above, p. xiii. The differences are not due to gradual corruption of the text, but are evidently intentional, and extend to details of spelling and grammar.

¹ See pp. 66, 67. It was thought unnecessary to print these.

The following is a list of those which are not mentioned in the notes:—

(a) confusion of gutturals, as

תהביה, סהר, נצועה, עורן Cr II תאביה, סער, נצחוח, חורן V 3

(b) transposition of gutturals, as

סלוחה, שמעיו, אהן, נביע Cr II סלוחה, שמעיו, האן, נבעי V 3

(c) return of quiescent letters, as

לאהן, דהי, דאת, אהלן Cr II דאן, לאן, די, דת, אלן V 3
דין and דיאן

(d) insertion of a vowel-letter, as

צריך, קדמך, חכום, דכרון Cr II צרך, קרמך, חכם, דכרן V 3
זעק, יהיב and יהוב, מעים ין, זעק, יהב, מעם
דהן, דאן, דין, זעיק and

(e) vowel-letter omitted, as

הך, אלית', יחדאי Cr II הך, אלית, יחיראי V 3
הך and היך

(f) omission of prothetic א, as

דרע, בנצירו, פרש Cr II אדרע, באנצירו, אפרש V 3

(g) return of original ו consonantal for ב (but not consistently), as

לגה, אר־ה Cr II לגה, ארבה V 3

(h) hebraizing forms, as

ל-, ירך, מזבה Cr II ל-, ארך, מרבה V 3 (genitive)

(i) miscellaneous, as

מן, קנומן, לן Cr II מ-, קלומן, לנן V 3

V 3 frequently omits ו connective where Cr II has it.

V 3 is uncertain as to יים or דין, הוא or דין. Cr II generally prefers יים.

Both are uncertain as to מן or כל before the relative ד-, owing to the similarity of the characters.

Some of the changes seem to be due to a desire to remove difficulties, anthropomorphisms or otherwise dogmatically incorrect expressions, e.g. on p. 57, ת-ה, p. 58, l. 23, Cr, &c., have ר' כתבה instead of רבות אמורה, and in the last line, even of Angels, אתעמו for מתעניאן. The Arabic version is equally scrupulous, e.g. in rendering יד (of God) by قد. Again, as

would be expected, the rubrics or headings in V 3, &c., are very short and in Samaritan (Hebrew or Aramaic), which still remained the traditional language for the purpose. In the later MSS. they are longer and in Arabic, which had become the only language really familiar to the writers.

The results obtained for this second period (about the eleventh century) are far from certain, but there are no data for arriving at any more definite conclusions. With the third period we are on firmer ground. The contents of the special services, so far as they can be dated, and so far as they are not merely taken over from the Deftar, are all of the fourteenth century or later, and are written in Hebrew. In fact it seems that a definite beginning was made at that time to fill out in a more dignified manner the framework already existing. A reason readily suggests itself. From 708 to 764 H. (= 1308-1363 A.D.) the office of High Priest was held by Pinhas b. Joseph, evidently a man of character, and earnest in promoting the interests of religion among his people. It was at his instigation that Abu'l-fath compiled his chronicle in 756 H. (= 1355 A.D.), by him (as stated by Abf, p. 35) the famous roll of Abisha was 'discovered' in the same year, and it is probable that to him is also due the new development of the liturgy. His aim evidently was to bring about a religious revival. He is the author of the hymn on p. 34 which is found in V 3 (but not in N), and of the earliest work in the other services, thus forming the connecting link between the two periods.

His father Joseph is probably the author of the two hymns on pp. 63, 64 who is described in some MSS. (cf. p. 714) as High Priest. There was only one High Priest of the name, who held office from 690 to 708 H. (= 1291-1308 A.D.). The two pieces are in the same style and both are in V 3. The second is also in N, in the part which is certainly later than the rest, but probably not much later than 1300. The Joseph ha-rabban, to whom some MSS. ascribe the hymn on p. 63, is no doubt a different person (see below, p. xxxii).

Pinhas had two sons, Eleazar and Abisha (Elt, p. 28; Ad, p. 101). The former who succeeded as High Priest (764-789 H. = 1363-87 A.D.) is the author of several liturgical pieces, in the headings of which he is called Eleazar b. Pinhas (sometimes + b. Joseph) or Eleazar the High Priest (sometimes + b. Pinhas) the brother of Abisha. From the similarity of style

there can be little doubt that the remaining (three or six) pieces (see Index), ascribed simply to Eleazar (once + priest), are also by him. He also wrote on Grammar: see Nöldeke, *Gött. Nachrichten*, no. 17, p. 337.

The other son, Abisha (المصنف *Elt* בעל המימר, cf. Ad), had a great reputation as a writer. About seventeen pieces are certainly by him. Probably also seven others, but some of these may be by his grandson the High Priest Abisha b. Pinḥas b. Abisha. The difficulty is that in the headings of these seven pieces he is called High Priest, in his acrostic on p. 511 he calls himself Abisha b. Pinḥas b. Pinḥas רבה רבה, and on p. 504 actually Abisha b. Pinḥas b. Joseph בנה רבה. If we had only the evidence of the headings we might suppose that this was a case of confusion, but the acrostic cannot be so explained. Abisha b. Pinḥas b. Joseph, though he was a בן, was certainly not High Priest. Petermann (*Grammar*, p. vi) says that he 'munus sacerdotale superstitionis causa respuisse dicitur', which must be a tradition he heard at Nāblus. Whatever the explanation¹ of the acrostic may be, as no compositions are definitely ascribed to the grandson (who was a quite undistinguished person) the presumption is that all these pieces are by Abisha b. Pinḥas b. Joseph. He died in 778 H. (= 1376 A. D.) leaving a son, Pinḥas, one year old, who was brought up by his uncle the High Priest Eleazar. When the latter died in 789 H. (= 1387 A. D.) he appointed the child Pinḥas (then aged 10 years 11 months) as his successor, and put him under the guardianship of Abdallah b. Solomon. See p. 490 heading, and p. 491 top, and *Elt*, p. 28. Pinḥas b. Abisha, who was also a liturgical author, died in 846 H. (= 1442 A. D.) after holding the office of High Priest for fifty-six years.

His guardian, Abdallah b. Solomon, of priestly family,² was a prolific writer. As he must have been a man of mature years in 789 H., his work may be dated (about or) before 800 H. (= fourteenth century A. D.).

About a century earlier Ad (p. 100) mentions Sa'dallah (or

¹ e.g. he may have been the elder son and resigned in favour of Eleazar, but kept the title. Or the acrostic may mean Abisha son of the High Priest Pinḥas, and have been misunderstood by copyists. Or there may be a distinction between בן and בר, the usual adjective.

² See his genealogy (acrostic) on p. 819. He is called בן on p. 178, &c., and ancestor of Solomon b. Ṭabiah on p. 295, cf. Ad, p. 101.

Sa'd-ed-din) el-Kethari (on p. 533 b. Zedaqah) and Ibn Manir. The former is chiefly the author of the marriage service.

A ben Manir is mentioned much earlier by *Elt*, but his name was Zariz, whereas the ben Manir of the liturgies gives his name (in an acrostic, once, p. 644) as Aaron. The passage in Ad, p. 100, seems to indicate the liturgist, the words ויהם ויהם עליה בכות גדולות meaning that Sa'dallah and Ibn Manir composed lamentations, and not as the editors translate. They would then, according to Ad, both belong to the early fourteenth century.

The compositions ascribed to ha-Mizri are difficult to date. In the headings of certainly four pieces his name is given as Mattanah: in six others as Hibat-allah. In one of the latter (on p. 632) the acrostic is Nethanel b. Obadiah b. Ab-Zehutha. Hence it appears that Hibat-allah is merely the Arabic of Nethanel. If Mattanah is also a form of the same name (as in Harkavy's catalogue,¹ p. 68), all the pieces are by one writer. He cannot be identical with the person mentioned in Ad, p. 95, *Elt*, pp. 25, 31 (see above), whose other name was Isaac b. Abraham. Nor is he the scribe in Harkavy, p. 68 (840 H.), whose other name was Nethanel b. Ishmael. In the absence of any evidence we can only say that in style he seems to belong to the period about 800 H.

About this time *Elt* (p. 29) appears to place Pinḥas b. Ithamar who was High Priest at Damascus. The statements, however, are confused. Probably the date 793 H. is right for the beginning of his term of office, and is not to be altered to 993 as Neubauer has in his translation, for we find Pinḥas b. Ithamar High Priest at Damascus witnessing a sale in 807 H. (*J. Q. R.*, xv, 636). Then the writer of *Elt* must be referring back to a previous date, and earlier in the paragraph we should read שבע וארבעים ושבע מאות (749) instead of "שבע וארבעים וחמש כ" (947). The phrase והיו ימי כהנת אדון הכהן הגדול פינחס בן אלעזר ought to mean 'those were the days of Pinḥas b. Eleazar',² who was High Priest at Shechem and died about 955 H. (= 1548 A. D.). This is clearly impossible. According to the genealogy given by *Elt*, Pinḥas b. Ithamar must belong to the earlier period (793-834 H.). Jacob b. Ishmael, who wrote part of *Elt*

¹ *Opisane Samaritjanskikh rukopisei* . . . , St. Petersburg, 1875.

² So the Arabic version; not as Neubauer translates.

(see pp. 10, 11) in 747 H., is the same as Jacob the High Priest at Damascus on p. 29 (where Pinhas is to be read for Joseph in the genealogy), so that the date 749 H. for his death is quite possible. He was succeeded by his son Ishmael for one year, and in 750 H. Ithamar succeeded till 793 H., when he was followed by his son Pinhas, the liturgist. The chronicler would therefore have been right if he had said 'those were the days of Pinhas b. Abisha', who was High Priest at Shechem from 789 to 844 H. The mistake perhaps arose from the fact that Pinhas b. Abisha was preceded in the office at Shechem by Eleazar, who, however, was not his father but his uncle (see above). The statement of Elt (p. 35) that the chronicle up to that point is taken from Rabban Jacob, cannot be strictly accurate, since the death of Jacob and subsequent events are narrated. This part is really by the later continuator (his statement on p. 35 referring only to the preceding genealogical matter), who has made a mistake of 100 years in his chronology, and confused Pinhas, High Priest of Damascus, with Pinhas, High Priest of Shechem; for the Eleazar who, he says, succeeded, is undoubtedly the man who was High Priest at Shechem from about 955 to 1003 H. (1548-95 A.D.). The alternative is that the chronicler made a mistake as to the Ithamar who succeeded Ishmael b. Jacob, and passed over a period of 100 years. It may be noted that he implies (p. 36) that Ishmael had no son, so that the office passed to another branch, whereas on p. 11 Jacob, who must have known, speaks of the sons of Ishmael.¹ One of the sons may therefore have succeeded and with his descendants have occupied the missing 100 years. In that case Pinhas b. Ithamar, the liturgist, may have lived a century later and be rightly made contemporary with Pinhas b. Eleazar of Shechem (914 to 955 H. = 1508-48 A.D.). As far as Elt is concerned, this would be the simpler explanation, but as we know independently (*J. Q. R.*, xv, 636) of a Pinhas b. Ithamar, High Priest at Damascus in 807 H., and do not know of another person of that name as High Priest there a century later, the former explanation is the more probable.

Whether the two liturgists Jacob ha-rabban and Jacob the priest (or either of them) are to be identified with the author of Elt, there is nothing to shew.

¹ The translation is incorrect here. The text means not *בְּנֵי יִשְׁמָאֵל* but *בְּנֵי יִשְׁמָאֵל*. The phrase *שְׁמֵי דְרַחֲמָה* is descriptive of Ishmael, like *شمس الحكماء*.

Several authors were connected with Damascus about this time. Abraham (b. Abi-'uzzi) ha-yithrani and (his nephew?) Abraham b. Faddāl b. Abi'l-izz are each called *שׁוֹפֵט יִשְׂרָאֵל*. They are perhaps descended from the Yithranah¹ who is mentioned by Ad (p. 101) as *שׁוֹפֵט עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל*. In Harkavy, p. 95, a deed of sale is signed by Abraham b. A[bi-'uzzi] of the family of Yithranah, who is *בְּרִמְשֶׁק יִשְׂרָאֵל*. The date is lost, but as the transaction took place before the High Priest Abisha b. [Pinhas] it must have been between 844 and 878 H. (= 1440-74 A.D.). In Harkavy, p. 181, an Abu'l-fath b. Abraham (*מֶן שׁוֹפֵט יִשְׂרָאֵל*) of the family of יִתְרַן bought a Torah in 929 H., a date which is quite reasonable if he is the son of one of the authors under discussion. Perhaps the Abu'l-'izz, who is the author of one hymn, is of the Yithranah family and father of this Abraham.

Another inhabitant of Damascus is Seth Aaron b. Isaac, the author of two compositions. Unfortunately the genealogy is Seth (Aaron) b. Isaac b. Seth Aaron b. Isaac (b. Seth Aaron); see the colophon in *J. Q. R.*, xv, p. 637, written in 874 H. (= 1469-70 A.D.). Abraham b. Seth Aaron wrote the MS. described in *J. Q. R.*, xiv, p. 31, in 909 H., and witnessed the sale in Harkavy, p. 181, in 929 H. There is nothing to shew which Seth Aaron b. Isaac is the liturgist. If the earlier, his date will be about 830 H. (1427 A.D.); if the later, about 860 H. (1456 A.D.).

In 945 H. (= 1538 A.D.) the High Priest Pinhas and his son Eleazar were brought (back?) from Damascus under the protection of Zedaqah b. Jacob, of the family of Munes (Elt, p. 36; Ad, p. 103). The date is well established, for Zedaqah's father, Jacob b. Abraham Munes, is the person for whom the Bodleian MS. Marsh 15 was written in 911 H. and who sold it in 935 H. His brother, Japhet b. Jacob (b. Abraham) Munes, was witness of the sale of it in 935 H. and also of the sale of the Berlin MS. or. fol. 534 in 941 H. With them came, according to Ad, Abraham b. Joseph ha-qabazi, the liturgist, usually called Abraham Qabazi,² and associated with them, according to Elt, was Abdallah b. Abraham *חַבְתָּה* (Arab.

¹ Elt, p. 72, has *כְּתִיר* for this name in the Arabic version, so that they may be members of the family of Kethāri mentioned before (*כְּתִיר = יִתְרַן*).

² See his account of himself on pp. 466, 552, 812.

الخفّاي¹ not as printed in *Elt*, p. 81, note 1), also a liturgist,² who is a witness in 929 H. (*Harkavy*, p. 181). It seems that the office of Ḥaṭṭāwī was hereditary, and that the holders of it who were liturgists are probably to be connected as follows:—



With regard to Abdallah b. Berakhah, the end of the acrostic (bar Maṭar) on p. 432 is probably accidental and is not to be taken into account, as there is no evidence that the family of Matar was connected with the office of Ḥaṭṭāwī. In the other piece by him (on p. 345) a section is by Pinḥas who must be the High Priest who came from Damascus in 945 H. (1538–9 A.D.). All the family, except Berakhah, were liturgists and must have written between about 920 and 960 H., i.e. early in the sixteenth century. There is also a Joseph עבדה דמשק whose father is not named. He probably belonged to the same family and the same literary period at Damascus. Perhaps he is the same as Joseph ha-rabban, mentioned above, since the title of Rabban seems to be associated with Damascus. Pietro de la Valle found Samaritans there in 1616, but the congregation must have come to an end soon after, since it is not mentioned in later epigraphs or documents. It had a special מנהג (rite) of its own; see above, p. xii, on MSS. H 1 and 3.

Isma'il b. Badr er-Ramiḥi (Rumaiḥi) may reasonably be identified with the author (in 944 H. = 1537 A.D.) of a work in praise of Moses (*Nutt*, p. 132). He was a pupil of Abraham Qabāzi, and is quoted by the commentator Ibrahim (see below). Since ישר = ישר he is no doubt the same as the Ishmael b. Zaharah ha-ramiḥi who in 939 H. (= 1532–3 A.D.) witnessed the sale of MS. Bodl. or. 139, with his father Zaharah b. Abi-uzzi b. Remah.

As a summary of the preceding remarks and as the basis of

¹ The title of the assistant priest (at Damascus?). The origin of the word is unknown to me.

² See p. 449, where he is called עבדה דמשק (= עבדה).

what follows, reference should be made to the tables on pp. xliii–xlvi.

The later writers belong chiefly to three groups: the Levitical (or Priestly¹), the Danfi and the Marḥib (= Mufarrij) families. They are more easily identified than the earlier authors, because their names (and genealogies) frequently appear in the colophons of MSS. In the headings also where the author is the same as the copyist, the composition is ascribed لکاتبها.

Of the Levitical or Priestly family the liturgists are Abraham b. Isaac who died in 1145 H.² (= 1732 A.D.); Ṭabiah or Ghazāl b. Isaac (died in 1201 H. = 1787 A.D.), a prolific writer; his son Solomon b. Ṭabiah (died in 1273 H. = 1857 A.D.); his sons Amram b. Solomon (died in 1291 H. = 1874 A.D.) and Isaac b. Solomon (the hymn, on p. 257, of Isaac the Priest is probably also his, unless it be by Isaac b. Zedekiah, Priest, who died in 1105 H. = 1693–4 A.D.); Pinḥas b. Isaac (died in 1898) and his brother Khidr. Ṭabiah b. Abraham is probably the son of Abraham b. Isaac, but there is no proof of this.

The genealogy of the Danfi family can be collected with certainty from their colophons, for they were assiduous copyists. The only difficulty is to distinguish the two Murjāns and the two Muslims. Murjān I (= Ab-Sakhwah) b. Ibrahim is the author of several pieces, and perhaps those ascribed simply to Murjān the Danfi are his also. If he were Murjān II, he would no doubt be distinguished in some way from his grandfather. Muslim I (= מישלמה) b. Ab-Sakhwah (= Murjān I) [cf. Ad 107] is the author of certainly two pieces, and probably of those ascribed to Muslim b. Murjān, or simply to Muslim. In one case (p. 311) Muslim b. Ibrahim b. Murjān is a mistake for Muslim b. Murjān b. Ibr. The Abū Murjān, author of two pieces, should be a member of this family, but the reading of the name is not certain. Abraham b. Jacob b. Murjān I (= Ab-Sakhwah) b. Abraham (see his acrostic on p. 796), the liturgist, also called Abraham العبد, or simply Abraham ha-danfi, wrote the Arabic commentary³ on the Pentateuch,

¹ In 1033 H. (= 1623–4 A.D.) the High-Priestly family (descended from Aaron) died out. From that date the priest is not called הכהן but הכהן הדני, being descended from Uzziel, a younger son of Kohath.

² The dates are calculated from the chronicles and from colophons of MSS.

³ Parts of it were published as doctor's dissertations by M. Klumel, Berlin,

existing in MS. at Berlin, to which attention was first drawn by Geiger in the *ZDMG.*, vol. xvii, p. 723.¹ He is mentioned by Ad (p. 108) as a benefactor (though nothing is said of his commentary) in the time of Ṭabiah b. Isaac the Priest, and he is also the copyist of several MSS. He belongs to about the middle of the eighteenth century; see the table, p. xlvii.

The family of Marḥib is important in liturgy and also in the copying of MSS., though not so distinguished as that of Danfi. Marḥib by interpretation is Mufarrij (فرج = رحب) as appears from several epigraphs and is definitely stated by Huntington in 1695 (*Epistulae*, London, 1704, p. 55): (litteras) scripsit Merchib Ibn Yacob, vulgo Mopherrege, vir inter illos primarius. This Marḥib b. Jacob, the earliest of the family who needs to be mentioned here, is also called simply Mufarrij al-mufarriji. He is the author of the two letters in 1086 and 1099 H. (= 1675 and 1688 A.D.). The rest of the family are chiefly important as copyists. The latest member of the family to write liturgical compositions is Abraham b. Ishmael (b. Joseph al-mufarriji), who was living in 1828 (see also *Notices et Extraits*, xii, p. 160). It is not certain where Abdallah b. Joseph b. Jacob b. Marḥib ha-marḥibi fits into the genealogy.

To sum up the results of this inquiry: it appears that the composition of the liturgy may be divided into three main periods,—(1) the fourth century A.D., when Aramaic was the language used; (2) the tenth and eleventh centuries, when Aramaic had ceased to be the vernacular, but was still used in liturgy, though it had become artificial and was mixed with Hebraisms; (3) the fourteenth century and after, when Hebrew, mixed with Aramaisms, had become the liturgical language.

On the basis of this division it is possible to class most of the compositions whose authors are either unknown or cannot be dated, under one of the three periods. But not without reserve, since e.g. Abu'l-ḥasan ha-Ṣūrī wrote his *אלה* (p. 70)

1902, and S. Hanover, *ibid.*, 1904. The former puts him in the fifteenth century, and identifies him with the liturgist, knowing only the hymns published by Heidenheim. Hanover notes that Abraham mentions coffee and tobacco, and consequently puts him two centuries later.

¹ He calls himself Abraham יצחק רמב"י, which does not mean 'of the tribe of Jacob', but simply 'one of the sons of Jacob'. He describes himself so because his father Jacob had other sons, among them being Solomon, a great copyist (see the list of MSS. above), and Zedaqah (چلی = شلبي), ancestor of the well-known Jacob Shelaby.

in Aramaic, and *ברוך אתה* (p. 79) in Hebrew. Moreover, some Hebrew pieces at the beginning of the Defer cannot be ascribed to the third period.

That Aramaic had ceased to be commonly understood by the eleventh century is probable on other grounds, and is made evident by the appearance, about that time, of the Arabic version of the Pentateuch in place of the Targum. No doubt Arabic became the only current language soon after the Moslem conquest of Syria in 638 A.D., while the knowledge of Aramaic, and even of Hebrew, gradually decreased with the lapse of time.¹ We consequently find in the later compositions an increasing number of Arabic idioms and words, Hebrew (or Aramaic) words used in the Arabic sense, and even phrases adapted from the Qur'an.²

The grammar of Samaritan Aramaic has been well treated by Petermann in his *Brevis Linguae Sam. Gram.* (Porta Lingg. Or., Lipsiae, &c., 1873). The following remarks, referring chiefly to the liturgical texts, are only intended to supplement his work. It must also be observed that the Aramaic forms here noted may equally well appear in Samaritan Hebrew.

Pronunciation: as the gutturals א, ה, ח, ע are not sounded and merely serve to support a vowel, they are often either omitted in writing, as מאלף for מאלף פס, or interchanged (א with ה, ח, ע; ע with א, rarely with ח, ע; ח with א), as אב for הב, חויר for חויר, אלה with v.l. אלה, or transposed, as אחי (often), אחרחך (commonly), רוחחה and רוחחה (p. 14), בלעיל for בלעיל (p. 45).

The hard (dageshed) sound of ב and פ, and the consonantal sound of ו, are usually marked by an overline, as ריח = ריח, but ריח = ריח, נפש = soul, but נפש (Pa. neppesh) = deliver. ב interchanges frequently with ו and sometimes with פ, as in מסבך (V 3)

¹ There is no evidence to shew the date of the Arabic versions of the earlier liturgy which are found in some MSS. That of Cr 11 and B 2 was not made by the scribe from the text before him, but was copied from an existing version, since it often translates a different reading. It sometimes gives a wrong rendering, or translates literally, using identical words, without understanding the sense.

² e.g. خير = משה דמע הנוראים, محمد خاتم الانبيا = משה החכם הנביא. No doubt too the frequent *אלה* אלה אחר is of Muhammadan origin, but earlier varieties of it (in Marqah, &c.) are derived from Deut. xxxii. 39, &c. Its addition at the end of each hymn of Marqah and Auram is of course not due to the author.