The extent of the Samaritan Diaspora has been examined on a number of occasions over the course of the past seventy years. The most recent examination was that by I. Ben-Zvi in his Sepher Hashomronim, a study which was the most thorough hitherto undertaken and which demonstrated Ben-Zvi's masterly knowledge of Samaritan literature. Yet, for all the excellence of his discussion of Samaritan settlement in Palestine, Ben-Zvi's description of the wider Mediterranean Diaspora was inadequate, since he claimed, wrongly, that there were not sufficient authentic references to broaden his survey. We may, thus, reopen this discussion, but its scope has been limited to a consideration of the Diaspora outside Palestine as there would seem to be no need to duplicate Ben-Zvi's work. This limitation also applies to the Transjordanian Diaspora which was adequately described by Ben-Zvi.

There may be some profit in attempting a brief description of the problems which must be considered, for whilst an onomasticon of Samaritan settlement is in itself useful, it is at least as important to understand the factors which controlled the growth or contraction of the Diaspora, especially since such an understanding would allow us to extend the hard core of firm data with a soft pulp of hypothesis. The first problem is one of chronology. There are several indications as to the date of the final contraction of Samaritan settlement in Palestine, but we are on much shakier ground when we try to determine when the Samaritan Diaspora began. In effect, this question begs an evaluation of the date of origin of the Samaritan sect. The second problem is to understand how and why the different stages of the Diaspora developed. Did the Samaritans leave their homeland willingly at different eras or were they exiled by main force or driven by economic circumstance. The question can be of importance in attempting to estimate the size of the Samaritan Diaspora. The final question is the one on which we have the least information and that is how the Samaritans sustained themselves in their scattered territories. This question is important if we are to understand the problems which faced the Samaritans in their Diaspora.
The Samaritans call themselves *shamerim* = *shomerim*, the guardians or keepers of the law, rather than *shomronim*, Samarians, as the Jews know them. This claim is of considerable antiquity with oblique references to it in patristic literature from Jerome onwards. The claim to be *shamerim* stems from the Samaritan belief that they are of Israelite tribes. This claim must affect our understanding of the age and extent of the Samaritan Diaspora. If we accept the Samaritan account at face value, then the beginnings of the Samaritan Diaspora must lie in the Israelite exile from Samaria in 721 B.C. at the hands of the Assyrians. We must regard the settlements in Media and Assyria as being Samaritan as well as Israelite. We must also, in this circumstance give serious consideration to discussions such as that of Nau about a possible Samaritan presence at Elephantine. However, there is little evidence to support the Samaritan position on their religious origins. Though there are scholars who accept the Israelite element as basic to Samaritanism, they see this element arising through the progression from Israelite to Samaritan, Samaritan to Samaritan, and again, we must look for the development of the Samaritan Diaspora in post-exilic events.

If we accept the Rabbinic interpretation of the account in 2 Kings 17:1f., that the Samaritans are the “Cutheans” of Samaria, then any dispersion from Samaria from the end of the eighth century onwards, is to be regarded as developing a Samaritan Diaspora. Again, there is no evidence of any settlement, inside or outside the Holy Land which can be identified as Samaritan, unequivocally, at such an early date. The earliest evidence we have of the Samaritans as an identifiable religious body, points towards the view which sees them as a post-exilic sect, either of Jewish origin, or of Israelite-Samarian origin.

Most recent discussions incline to the view that the Samaritan schism began in the fourth century B.C. when the governorship of Samaria was exercised by one of a series of men named Sanballat, though whether one should seek this Sanballat early or late in the fourth century is a matter of opinion. It is frequently maintained that it was not until the second century B.C. that the schism between Samaritans and Jews led to active hostility between them. But, there is evidence of a Samaritan Diaspora before this time, and we should search for its origins from the time of Sanballat I (?) the contemporary of Nehemiah. For the reasons adduced, Samaritan indications of a Diaspora, before the time of Sanballat I, predating as they do an Israelite-Samarian origin, are ignored in this discussion.
Both Jewish and Samaritan sources speak of Samaritan contact with Alexander the Great. It is in this contact as reported by Josephus, that we have our first evidence of the settlement of Samaritans outside the province of Samaria. Josephus reports that Sanballat, seeking permission from Alexander to build a temple establishment in rivalry to Jerusalem, took eight thousand (or sixteen thousand) of his countrymen to help Alexander in the siege of Tyre and Gaza,\textsuperscript{14} Sanballat apparently dying before or during the siege of Gaza.\textsuperscript{15} The Samaritan Arabic Book of Joshua\textsuperscript{16} relates that there were Samaritans already living on the Tyrian littoral at the time of Alexander's invasion, but states that they remained faithful to Darius and had to be pressed into service when Alexander marched from Tyre to Shechem.\textsuperscript{17} Subsequently, according to Josephus, Alexander conscripted a party of Samaritan troops, during a visit to Jerusalem, and took these troops with him to Egypt where he gave them some land in Thebes and ordered them to guard the district,\textsuperscript{18} this, apparently, being the first mention of a Samaritan Diaspora in a non-Samaritan source.

Josephus' comments may well have been polemical and we must consider the situation in the light of all the evidence. Though Josephus is the only non-Samaritan to speak of Samaritan participation in Alexander's army, all the accounts of the conduct and course of Alexander's campaigns in Syro-Palestine differ and there is no reason to believe that any one of them is complete. Though Marcus\textsuperscript{19} dismisses Josephus' account as fiction, there is good reason to suggest that he is mistaken. Whilst waiting for the preparation of the equipment necessary for the conduct of the siege of Tyre, Alexander undertook a brief excursion south-east with his cavalry towards "Arabia, the mountain called Anti-Libanus. Part of this country he captured, part he received in surrender and in ten days returned to Sidon . . ."\textsuperscript{20} Whether this expedition included a trip to Judea is a matter of conjecture, but, in rejecting the possibility Marcus\textsuperscript{21} ignored another note of Arrian that after the siege of Tyre, "Alexander . . . determined to make his expedition to Egypt. The rest of Syro-Palestine as it is called had already come over to him."\textsuperscript{22} This would presuppose that Alexander had some contact with the Jews and the Samaritans, either in his ten-day expedition, or by delegations coming to him. Josephus' account then of the beginnings of an Egyptian Diaspora in Egypt would seem to be vindicated.

Only Josephus relates that Samaritans took part in the siege of Gaza. If his report is correct, then there may be here, also, an indication of the beginning of the Samaritan settlement in Gaza. According to Arrian, Alexander sold the Gazans as slaves.
after the fall of the city which was repopulated with “neighbouring tribesmen” who served to garrison the city. Perhaps these neighbouring tribesmen included some of the Samaritans who had served at Tyre and whom he had recruited for garrison service in Egypt.

It is not unlikely that there was a further development of the Samaritan Diaspora in the events of 331 B.C., events of which, unfortunately, we are not adequately informed. According to Quintus Curtius Rufus the Samaritans burned alive Andromachus who had been appointed by Alexander as ‘prefect’ of Syria. Rufus reported that Alexander journeyed to Samaria where the guilty were delivered to him and punished. None of the other sources hint at these events, yet the papyri from Daliyeh, as yet inadequately published, incline some scholars to the belief that Samaria was destroyed by Alexander and the Samaritans forced to rebuild Shechem. Some Samaritans fled Samaria. There is no evidence of their fate other than those who died in the cave at Daliyeh.

It is clear from the foregoing that one of the principal factors in developing the Samaritan Diaspora was the military situation in Palestine. The need to take refuge in face of impending danger or in face of a difficult economic situation, was one clear cause of the migration of the community. Recruitment of soldiers whether by force or whether as volunteer mercenaries was the second way in which the Diaspora spread, and it is probably this factor which accounts for the appearance of places whose names would identify them as inhabited by, and, perhaps, established by, persons of Samaritan origin in outlying zones of the empire. The process is, perhaps, best exemplified by Josephus’ report of Alexander . . . “There, he said, he would give them (the Samaritans) allotments of land, as in fact he did, shortly afterwards, in the Thebaid . . .” Josephus notes also that on the death of Alexander, Ptolemy Lagus carried numerous Samaritans captive to Egypt where they were settled, and many others followed of their own accord as the conditions in Egypt were favourable. Among frontier or military settlements we must note a village in the Fayyum about sixty-five miles south of the apex of the delta, called, in Ptolemaic times, Samaræia. There was also a town on the Caspian Sea which may have dated from Persian times.

The military and social situation in the Samaritan homeland, in the period between Alexander and the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., is probably to be directly correlated with the extent and nature of the Samaritan Diaspora. In the period before the fall of the Jerusalem Temple, some of the factors which worked to
create a Jewish Diaspora would also have worked on the Samaritan Diaspora, though the circumstances were not exact because of the different experiences of the communities. In the period after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple the experiences of the communities began to diverge with a natural result on the different Diasporas. Avi Yonah has suggested a number of factors which would have inhibited true parallelism between the Diasporas in the Byzantine eras. These will be considered in detail later. In the Helleno-Roman periods, when the Jewish Diaspora began its expansion, the Samaritan Diaspora followed suit, except that Babylonia did not have the same attraction for the Samaritans as for the Jews. The Babylonian Diaspora developed as a result of the Babylonian captivity when Judah was not able to offer spiritual leadership, and, as the work of Ezra showed, it must have immediately begun to develop a cultural integrity of its own. Later, Babylon was to rival the restored Palestinian settlement and eventually to assume hegemony.

Egypt and Damascus, and the ports of the Phoenician coast which all offered refuge or homes to Jews and Samaritans, never developed the same cultural force as the Babylonian Diaspora. The reason is probably that the Egyptian Diaspora developed during the period when Jerusalem was the spiritual centre for Jewry and when Gerizim had a Temple to attract the Samaritans. In any event, in the early Christian world, Egypt was not so stable a homeland for emigrés as Babylon. Contrary to the widely held myth, Jewish intellectualism has never flowered significantly under direct persecution, outside its native land, and it may also have been because of incipient hostility to Jews and Samaritans in Egypt that no great cultural life developed to the extent that it developed in Babylonia.

The first large-scale movement of Samaritans that can be detected is in fact in Palestine. It is customary to regard any movement of Samaritans outside Samaria proper, but inside Palestine, as a Diaspora, apparently on the assumption that Samaritanism had a localized origin. The Samaritans began to move into the coastal cities fairly soon after the time of Alexander. Though we have no further direct reports of them on the coast until after 70 A.D., they may well have been involved in the oil trade which was conducted through the coastal ports. Samaria had been renowned for its oil since Biblical days (Ezek. 27:17), and this important commercial commodity which was supplied to Egypt and Phoenicia most probably was handled by Samaritan entrepreneurs. Although at the time it may have saved the Samaritans from warfare, their claim to Antiochus Epiphanes that they were Sidonians seeking Hellenisation ultimately carried
bitter fruit. In the short term, however, their freedom must have allowed them to develop their trade, especially since the toparchy of Samaria had access to the coast until the time of Jonathan,34 and some Samaritans may have travelled overseas in pursuit of trade. The comparative security of conditions in the north of Palestine may well have stimulated internal movements of Samaritans from place to place inside the country, but this security was short-lived. The Hasmonean victory meant that part of the Samaritan territory was ceded to Judea and that the Jews became the dominant party in the country. There is some suggestion that the Hasmoneans may have treated the Samaritans lightly as a counterbalance to the activities of the Pharisaic party in Jerusalem,35 but the reported conquest of Samaria by Hyrcanus's sons and the destruction by John Hyrcanus of the Gerizim temple does not seem to support this suggestion.36 We have no information about the state of the Samaritan Diaspora during the Hasmonean era and can only conjecture that if the Samaritans did migrate in response to the Hasmonean persecutions, that they joined their kinsmen in Egypt and, perhaps, Damascus.

The beginning of Roman intervention in Palestinian affairs marked the beginning of the period of greatest activity in developing a Samaritan Diaspora. The Samaritans almost certainly reached their numerical peak in Romano-Byzantine days, and their Diaspora was at its widest extent.

When Pompey subjugated Judea in 63 B.C. he again reduced the Judean territory to the size it had been before the annexation of Samaritan territory. The coastal ports, from Gaza northwards and Samaria were subsumed into the province of Syria. Galilee seems to have been linked into this new province, and it was a mainstay of the oil trade.37 The Samaritans had an ambiguous attitude to the Romans and the Herodian state until the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.,38 but the era seems to have been one of Samaritan expansion, from Galilee to the coast. There seems to have been marked stability in contrast with Judea and the Samaritans prospered. Their Diaspora may not have been extended at this time through warfare and the pressures of war on their homeland, but, so far as we can judge, the Samaritans were involved in trading activities which took them overseas and probably left handfuls settled there.

Between 6 A.D. and 66 A.D. Samaria was governed first by Herod Antipas and then was subject to the long and prosperous reign of Herod Philip. The Samaritans seem to have been particularly favoured at the expense of the Jews, for the immediate occasion for the removal of Pilate seems to have been
a Samaritan complaint to Vitellius who had charge of affairs in Syria. It is possible on the one hand that the Romans sought to encourage the Samaritans as a means of maintaining the balance of power against the Jews, though Pilate's massacre of Samaritans at Gerizim indicates that the Romans were not consistently friendly to the Samaritans. On the other hand it should be remembered that the mother of Antipas was a Samaritan.

During the revolt of 68-70 A.D., when Judea suffered a terrible fate for its anti-Roman rebellions, Samaria seems to have passed into the hands of Agrippa II and remained comparatively prosperous until his death in 93 A.D. However, the city of Samaria was destroyed during the war itself, and it is quite probable that some of the smaller towns in the Samaritan homeland fell, in the same series of events. Vespasian, apparently wishing to fill the void in the urban map or Judah after the fall of Jerusalem, established a new Samaritan capital, Neapolis, and the Samaritans accepted the standard municipal constitution. This period was crucial for the development of the Samaritan Diaspora and the enlargement of their settlement in Palestine. R. Abbahu in the Jerusalem Talmud is said to have remarked that "Thirteen cities reverted to the Samaritans in the days of persecution." From the fall of Judea in 70 A.D., to the period of the rebellion under Bar Kochba, there is a lacuna in Samaritan history. Yet this was the period when their seafaring career seems to have begun and they began to move afield in pursuit of trade. Our information on the subject is scant, but recent studies enable us to piece together some of the relevant data. By the second century the Samaritans are located in the coastal cities in Palestine, in Caesarea and at Dora; by the third century at Joppa, Ashkelon and Akko, and in the fourth century at Yavneh Yam. This list should, in all probability include Tyre and Gaza from the evidence relating to Alexander's conquest. They were also in Antioch and Rome. This concentration in the coastal cities would seem to indicate a pre-eminence in trading and banking, an assumption that is supported by what we learn of Samaritan involvement in the slave trade (infra) and the fact that at Constantinople, the name Samaritan was regarded as synonymous with accountant.

The occasion for this excursion into commerce and their expansion into the Mediterranean basin was a change in the seafaring situation, best described by Karmon, in these words, "Rome . . . struck a mortal blow at the last remnants of Phoenician as well as of the Greek maritime empires. For a short while a vacuum was created which could not immediately be filled by
Rome and under Roman sufferance . . . the Hasmoneans were able to enter the circle of the seafaring nations. Pompey . . . decided to confine Judea again within the mountain coreland. There was one last attempt on the part of the Judean state to be admitted to the Mediterranean trade: the foundation of Caesarea by Herod. The harbour . . . never became a Judean port. It became the focus of all the anti-Judean forces and the many opponents of Jerusalem and in the end triumphed over the latter." Amongst those anti-Judean forces we must count the Samaritans who are said by the Talmud Jerushalmi to have been one of the larger groups in the Caesaria community.

Avi Yonah has described the most important factors which guided the relationships between the Samaritans and the Romano-Byzantine world. These same factors explain why the Samaritan Diaspora was never able to develop in the same way as the Jewish Diaspora. One fundamental factor was that the Samaritan religious centre, the temple at Gerizim, was in existence until at least 484 A.D., and served as a spiritual and cultural centre which could not be rivalled anywhere in the Diaspora. The Samaritans seem to have been more ready than the Jews to convert to Christianity, and it may have been this factor which kept reducing their number in the Diaspora. There are numerous indications that the Samaritans were spread wide across the Mediterranean basin and beyond, into Asia Minor and Mesopotamia. These indications are often associated with particular individuals or with special circumstances, but careful examination of the secondary detail often enables us to see behind the single instance to the larger picture.

Justin Martyr's First Apology allows us to see beyond the various legends and traditions associated with Simon Magus, to the fact that there was a large Samaritan community at Rome with connections with the rest of the Samaritan Diaspora. Like most of the Jewish communities in Rome they may have begun their lives in the Diaspora as slaves transported from Palestine. Some may have been attracted to Rome after joining a mission to the country on behalf of the Samaritans in Neopolis and may have remained behind to start a new life. If there is any truth at all in the tradition that a statue was erected to Simon Magus by his Samaritan countrymen, in Rome, then the Samaritans may have begun to number some wealthy individuals amongst their community and may have included some wealthy merchants. Later, when the Samaritans were in Imperial service in various roles they may have been able to migrate to Rome in comparative wealth, as citizens. Others may have been attracted through family relationships after intermarriage with Roman citizens.
In the fifth century A.D. the Samaritans were well scattered through Italy. They had a synagogue in Rome which is mentioned in a dispute when it was apparently illegally bought by Simplicus. It is evident that the Samaritans were well established in Sicily where there was a concentrated Jewish settlement across the countryside. It is evident from the recipients and the details of letters sent by Gregory the Great, relating to the Samaritans, that they were both merchants and farmers in Sicily. Gregory wrote to Syracuse and Catena, one a port and one a farming settlement, regarding the sale of Christian or pagan slaves. The Samaritans, like the Jews, may have been involved in the slave trade. In his letter to John of Syracuse (supra) he noted that one, Felix, had been in his master’s service for eighteen years, which would indicate a permanent establishment perhaps for agrarian purposes. The fact that some of the edicts relating to Samaritans were couched at Ravenna may indicate the extent of the Samaritan settlement in Italy.

We know much less of Samaritan settlement elsewhere in the Empire. There are a number of references to Samaritans at Constantinople which must lead us to the belief that there was a substantial Samaritan community there, possibly with a synagogue and certainly with considerable influence. The Samaritan Chronicles preserve a memory of the Constantinople community, in their account of Baba Rabbah. According to the Samaritan Chronicle of Juynboll Baba Rabbah sent his brother, Levi, on an espionage mission to Constantinople and there Levi stayed, eventually becoming an archbishop. In the more likely version in the Hebrew Chronicle, Baba Rabbah was incarcerated in Constantinople by an Emperor, probably Galerius. There, he was joined by his son, Levi, and there he died, his tomb eventually becoming a sacred site that was incorporated into a mosque. The account indicates that there was a sizeable Samaritan community that wielded influence and prestige. Several of the edicts of Justinian refer to Samaritans and one of 527 A.D., apparently issued in Constantinople, speaks of the Samaritans “in the glorious city”. Justinian repeated edicts which had appeared in the Theodotian code, and it is clear that the Constantinople community was of considerable antiquity. From Procopius, we learn that Faustinius, a Samaritan convert to Christianity, was living in Byzantium but observing the Samaritan rites, presumably amongst the Samaritan community there. John of Ephesus describing events in Constantinople in 579 A.D., gives the impression of a substantial and troublesome Samaritan community. Although the Samaritans were extremely militant and a threat to the Empire in the sixth century they had sufficient influence in Con-
stantinople and at the court to force Justinian to relieve the pressure put on them. In all probability there were many crypto-Samaritans in positions of influence in the Empire, especially at Constantinople, of whom we hear but little, but who were able to provide some protection for their countrymen when it became necessary.

There is sufficient evidence to indicate that there was also a Samaritan community in Piraeus, the port of Athens, and other Greek cities, but we have no information as to its size, relationship with the Jewish and non-Jewish communities and its vicissitudes. The information is scant and allows us to speculate but little. At Thasos, in the second century A.D., we hear of an epitaph to Podoxiles the Samaritan. In the third century A.D., there is an inscription from Piraeus. At Thessalonica there was a synagogue, one portion of which preserving the name the "Tower of the Samaritans", appears to be still in existence today. The synagogue is believed to have been founded in the fourth century by Siricus of Neapolis.

We are permitted a number of insights into the spread of the Diaspora into Persia, and perhaps into Arabia, in the events which marked the clash between the Persian and Byzantine empires and the coming of the Arabs to Palestine. The confused situation of the early seventh century A.D., when Blues and Greens murdered each other and blamed the Jews for the consequences, saw a rumour spread through the empire that the Jews were planning a mass slaughter of Christians at Tyre and neighbouring cities. Heraclius attempted to forestall this rumoured plot, and many Jews and Samaritans were murdered instead.

These disorders gave an opportunity to the Persians who poured into Palestine. Though the Samaritan Chronicles speak of Heraclius, Chosroes and the Arabs alike as despoilers of Palestine Malalas records that the Samaritans offered Chosroes fifty thousand troops for his campaign and that there were already in Persia some fifty thousand Samaritan refugees from persecution. They may well have been settled near the older established Samaritan communities of Persia such as that at Samareia (supra). There is some evidence also of Samaritans in Babylon, but the reference seems to indicate that the Samaritans in Babylon were so few in number that they were forced into religious symbiosis with the Jews.

The Samaritan Chronicles record that the Arabs transported large numbers of Samaritans during their onslaught at the beginning of the seventh century, especially from Caesaria, and
add that the place to which they were transported is far away and is unknown "to the present day". It is quite likely that the Samaritans were sold as slaves. However, the twelfth century Arab geographer, Idrisi, notes that on an island called Samiri in the upper part of the Red Sea, lived a race of Samaritans. If Idrisi is to be believed then the origin of this strange Diaspora may be found in the events of the Arab conquest of Palestine.

The Egyptian Diaspora, begun by Alexander, continued beyond the period covered by this survey. It lasted well into the second millennium A.D., and medieval travellers record pilgrimages of Samaritans to Gerizim. However, the Samaritan Egyptian Diaspora was most active in the first millennium A.D., when it was able to dispute with the Jewish population, cause concern to the Christian ecclesiastical authorities, and threw up a number of sectarian groups. Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, in the early seventh century was troubled by a violent controversy between two Dosithean sects of the Samaritans, and they were sufficiently numerous and influential to indulge in 'pamphleteering'.

Most references to the Samaritans relate to Alexandria, but we know of Samaritan settlements in the Fayyum at the beginning of their Diaspora (supra) and in the second millennium A.D., there was a community at Cairo with a synagogue. There is also some possibility that at the very end of our period there were some Samaritans in Crete or Cyprus, though whether there was a permanent settlement there of long-standing or whether there were but a few visiting merchants from Cairo, cannot be stated with certainty.

There is no means of estimating with any degree of real accuracy the size of the Samaritan Diaspora. For the reasons stated above it is doubtful if we have more than a fractional reference to the true size of the Diaspora. We do not know whether the Samaritan Diaspora matches the Jewish Diaspora in its spread across Roman Europe. The best estimate of the Samaritan population in the fifth and sixth century A.D., is three-hundred-thousand souls in the homeland alone. This compares with an estimate for a total Jewish population of the Roman Empire before 70 A.D. of some six to seven million souls, of whom five million are estimated to have been in Palestine. If, in fact, fifty thousand Samaritans were in Persia at the time of Chosroes, and the Persian Diaspora was by no means as important as the Egyptian Diaspora, then we may reckon at least a similar number in Egypt. The Jewish population of Egypt in the first century is estimated at one eighth of the total population of Egypt, i.e., about one million. There is no means of evaluating the proportion of Samaritans to Jews, but knowing the emphasis
placed by the Egyptian Church fathers on the Samaritans in the middle of the first millennium A.D., we can estimate that they were quite numerous, and an equivalent number to the Persian Diaspora may at least be suggested. Thus, in two centres outside Palestine about one hundred thousand Samaritans can be reckoned.

Since, for the reasons considered, the Samaritan Diaspora was smaller than the Jewish Diaspora, and since its rate of conversion to Christianity was quite high, it is doubtful if at any stage the rest of the Diaspora can have had any great concentration of persons. We may estimate a thousand in each of those places where there was a synagogue—and never more than perhaps three-thousand in any centre. It is doubtful if the rest of the Diaspora outside Egypt and Persia could have been larger than fifty-thousand persons. In all we may say that perhaps one-hundred and fifty-thousand Samaritans all told lived outside Palestine in the middle of the first millennium A.D. Closer to this estimate we cannot go.
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