

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Chitral would have to be rebuilt on better principles, and in a position where it would not be commanded from the neighbouring heights; and an overpowering force would be required to keep in check the hill-tribes, who are noted for their passionate love of freedom and for their dread of annexation. Even if annexation is not enforced, it would be most difficult to keep our hold on a country so far from our Indian border and so liable to local disturbances. The evidence seems to us in favour of retiring from the neighbourhood of Chitral, while a vigilant watch is kept on all that may be going on there; but we sympathize heartily with the Government of India in the very difficult problem which is now before it, and feel sure that it will be guided to do what is just and right.

HENRY MORRIS.

ART. III.—THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.¹

IV.

THE eighth and last class of variants in Gesenius' classification contains alterations made, as he considers, in favour of Samaritan theology. This, which is really a very small class of various readings, appears to be popularly looked on as if it were almost the whole.

The probability that manuscripts in the possession of the Samaritans, and still more copies of such manuscripts, might be so altered has been pointed out already, and has evidently nothing to do with the origin and age of the Codex itself, and not much to do with the value of the multitudinous variants which have no possible bearing on the differences between the Samaritans and the Jews. And, on the other hand, it must not be forgotten that, if the Samaritans during the period in which the Codex was in their hands may have made, which is certainly possible, a few alterations favourable to their own opinions or practices, we have not only reason to suspect, but ground for believing, that the Masorites during the hundreds of years, from about the sixth century of our era to the tenth, in which they were completing their very minute revision, made very considerable alterations in the Jewish Codex in opposition to Christianity.

This opinion has very sufficient grounds. The fact has already been referred to, as borne witness to by Abul-Pharagi, with reference to the chronology; implied by Jerome's asser-

¹ I., II., III. : April, 1894; July, 1894; March, 1895.
VOL. IX.—NEW SERIES, NO. LXXXI.

tion that our Lord always quoted the Hebrew text as existing in His day, and never the Greek when it differed from the Hebrew; and is rendered certain by a statement of Aben Ezra, respecting the work of the Masorites: "The Masorites," he says, "separated that which was sacred from that which had been mixed with it." And he further states: "Fifteen of their elders took an oath to examine three times with the utmost diligence every word and every full and defective phrase." It is not in human nature that such a revision would have no effect on some words and phrases favourable to Christianity or favourable to the Samaritans. The fact so stated, not in blame but in praise, by so unexceptionable an authority, explains at once the differences between the Jewish manuscripts of to-day and those which existed in the time of Jerome and in the time of Origen. There were five Masoretic recensions, or rather six, and the authority of these was maintained by the possession of power over the whole scattered nation concentrated in a few hands. "We know for certain," says Kennicott, "that the Jews had some kind of senate for six hundred years after Augustine, to whose decrees the whole nation, bound to it as by a religious vow, gave willing obedience; that if anyone ever so little resisted, he was immediately, with the consent of the rest, put out of the synagogue—interdicted from water and from fire. You may judge how easily, up to the year 1000, the Jewish books throughout the whole world could be corrupted."¹

Bearing these things in mind, let us consider the alleged alterations in favour of Samaritan theology in the Pentateuch which they received, as already proved, from the Ten Tribes. They had it in their own hands, and we know that the copies we possess now are not identical in all points (the chronology of the patriarchs, for instance) with the manuscripts which Origen and Jerome saw. They may have altered other passages previously, and we can only conjecture in each case whether they are most probably altered by Jews or Samaritans.

Two passages which appear separated in our ordinary Hebrew Bibles—as Deut. xxvii. 2-8, and xi. 30—are found in the Samaritan manuscripts united, and immediately following the Ten Commandments, both in Exodus and Deuteronomy. That they naturally fit together, and that their proper place is after the Commandments, few, I think, would doubt. And it

¹ Kennicott, "Dissertatio Generalis," p. 19. Buxtorf, though the great defender of the "Hebrew verity," yet says "that infinite errors were introduced into the Masora, tearing asunder contexts, uniting separated parts, transplanting what belongs to one passage to another" (*ibid.*, p. 50).

is impossible not to see how very obnoxious any prominence given to them would be to the Jews in their controversies with the Samaritans. The words run thus in the Samaritan text, directly following the Ten Commandments: "And it shall be when the Lord thy God hath brought thee to the land of the Canaanites, which thou art going to possess, thou shalt set up for thyself great stones, and cement them with cement. And thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law. And it shall be when ye have passed over Jordan, ye shall set up these stones which I command you this day in Mount Gerizim. And thou shalt build there an altar unto the Lord thy God, and thou shalt offer up on it whole burnt-offerings unto the Lord thy God; and thou shalt sacrifice peace-offerings, and thou shalt eat there, and rejoice before the Lord thy God. The mountain is on the other side of Jordan, after the way of the going down of the sun, in the land of the Canaanites, that dwell in the plain over against Gilgal, that is near the plain of Moreh, over against Shechem."

The position of the passage in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the union of the two parts of the evidently-connected subject, is not, I think, made a ground of objection by Gesenius. It hardly could be. As the words stand in Deut. xxvii. in the Jewish manuscripts, they would seem to mean that the whole Pentateuch was to be written on the stones. Placed where they are in the Samaritan manuscripts, they mean—the only meaning which can easily be imagined correct—that the Ten Commandments were to be written on them.

But besides the difference of position, there are certain other differences. In the first place, the Talmud ridicules as totally unnecessary the last words, "over against Shechem." The whole passage must have been a great difficulty for Jews in controversy with the Samaritans, whose Bible consisted of the Pentateuch; and it is quite possible that "over against Shechem" may have been introduced by the Samaritans as a kind of red flag to irritate their opponents, or omitted by the Jews from dislike to the name. But in this case the alteration must have been made earlier than in the other, as the Septuagint here agrees with the Jewish text, and it is probably a Samaritan addition to the Israelitish reading. But the most important difference is in the name of the mountain on which the altar was to be built. According to the Jewish reading, the altar was to be built on Mount Ebal; according to the Samaritan, on Mount Gerizim. There is plainly intentional falsification on one side or the other. Whiston and Kennicott charged the Jews with corrupting the text by changing Gerizim into Ebal. "It is completely given up"—this

accusation against the Jews—"by modern Biblical scholars, although it cannot be denied that there is some *primâ-facie* ground for a doubt upon the subject."¹

The ground is a very strong one for believing the change to have been made by the Jews. The Levites who blessed the people were to stand upon Gerizim, and those who cursed on Mount Ebal. It is difficult to think that the stones were to be set up and the altar built on Ebal, the place of cursing.

But it is quite clear that both Jews and Samaritans were capable of such an alteration, and we have no sufficient warrant for any decisive judgment. It is in itself of very little importance whom we charge with the fault.

Gesenius refers, as an alteration in behalf of Samaritan theology, to Elohim being in four places joined to the singular verb, where in the ordinary Hebrew it is joined to a plural verb. Unless Gesenius, before he became a lexicographer, admitted that Elohim as a name of God is not merely a *pluralis excellentiæ*, the objection comes from him with an ill grace. What ground have we for thinking that the Jews were less jealous than the Samaritans for the unity of God? But it is just one of those changes which in a literary age like that of Jeroboam, when grammarians were in the ascendant, might very likely be made in the interests of grammar not of theology, by men ignorant of the mysteries, which in a later age, at all events, learned Jews rightly felt to lie hidden under the form of the name of God.

Kennicott, however, gives reasons for thinking that the Israelites were right. "There are three places in which the verb is now plural, although the nominative Elohim is certainly to be understood of the one true God. The three places are Gen. xx. 13, xxxv. 7, and 2 Sam. vii. 23. It is worthy of note that this distinction is almost always observable; namely, that when this plural name is used of false gods the verb annexed is plural, but when used of God the verb is singular. . . . In the first two of these three texts the correction is made in all the copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch which could be found; the third is corrected in the parallel passage in the Hebrew text itself—1 Chron. xvii. 21."

In his "Lexicon Manuale" Gesenius himself says that the plural form Elohim is joined to a singular verb and adjective except in certain formulas, perhaps remnants of polytheism, in which it is possible to translate Elohim also in the plural, and to understand by it "gods." Besides the three already quoted by Kennicott, he refers to Exod. xxxii. 4 and 8, where

¹ Smith, "Dictionary of the Bible, Samaritan Pentateuch" (all the quotations are from the edition 1861-63).

it is translated "gods" in the English Bible, and Exod. xxii. 8, where it is translated "judges" in the A.V. and "God" in the R.V.; 1 Kings xix. 2, where it can only be translated "gods." Psa. lviii. 12 (11), which he also quotes, seems to be an instance in point. Elohim in the sense of "God" is joined with a plural participle. He refers to his book on the Samaritan Pentateuch. In the Jewish Pentateuch, as has been shown, this only occurs in Gen. xx. 13, xxxiv. 7, and if the Samaritan reading is not really the original one—the most probable supposition—it is much more intelligible, that the alteration should be made in the time of the Israelitish kingdom than in that of the Samaritans, when the danger of polytheism had passed away.

Gesenius refers to a very curious variant in Gen. xlix. 7, which in the Samaritan, instead of "Cursed be their anger," runs thus, "Glorious was their league." That it is an alteration from the original there can be no doubt. But it is much more likely that it was made by the Israelites than by the Samaritans, who were not a fierce and warlike people. It is quite conceivable that the crime of Simeon and Levi may have seemed to the Ten Tribes honourable vengeance, and the Samaritans had no special concern in the tribes of Simeon and Levi.

He refers to certain changes of words which bear an ill sound for others more suitable for public reading. These are few, and they correspond, at all events in intention, to the "Keri" readings, most of which Kennicott discovered in the text of some of the Hebrew manuscripts he collated. Just as in our own Revised Version "judgment" in the margin of our Authorized Version in place of "damnation" has found its way into the text. These altered words are as likely to owe their origin to the Israelitish transcribers in the golden age of Hebrew literature as to the Samaritans.

It is in this last class he places the following objection: In Deut. xxxiii. 12 the word for "beloved" (יְיָ) spoken of Benjamin is divided in the Samaritan manuscripts into two יָ יָ, which, instead of treating as an obvious accident, he translates "the hand, the hand," and ascribes to "the hatred of the Samaritans for a Benjamin, the founder of the Judæo-Davidian Empire."¹ Of course, if the minute criticism were of the slightest weight, it would be more rational to ascribe it to zeal for the new dynasty of Jeroboam. But it really is too absurd a criticism to be worth appropriating.

¹ "The beloved of God (Benjamin, the founder of the Judæo-Davidian Empire, hateful to the Samaritans) shall dwell securely," transformed by them into 'The hand, the hand of God will rest securely.'—Smith's "Dictionary," iii., p. 1110, note 6.

Kohn¹ gives another instance of Samaritan alteration on dogmatic grounds, which Gesenius does not consider to be so. It is for other reasons an interesting point. In Gen. xxii. 2, "Get thee into the land of Moriah," the Samaritan reads for Moriah "vision," the "land of vision," appearing in the Septuagint as the "high land"—a high land visible afar off. It seems that the Samaritans made use of this text so worded as an argument in favour of Mount Gerizim, as being higher than Mount Moriah, where the temple was built, and that the Jews accused them of having altered it. If there were anything in this, "Moriah" would have been found in the Septuagint, the translators of which evidently knew nothing of this argument against Abraham's offering being on the site of the future temple. If altered by anyone for the purpose of hiding this prophetic intimation, it is at least as likely to have been altered in Jeroboam's day. But the real reason of the alteration, if alteration it be, is a kind of play on words, or alliteration, in the name "Moriah" and the word "Jireh," and whoever wrote "vision" in the place of "Moriah," from which it differs only by the dropping the letter yod, was trying to connect verse 2 with verse 15.

Wellhausen is perplexed with the passage, which is one of those he calls Elohistic. He is quite sure the Elohists did not write Moriah, and agrees with the Samaritans in thinking the mountain to be Gerizim.²

The truth is, Kennicott settled all these questions long ago. But since his time there has sprung up a criticism of wild conjecture, based on no facts, opposed to the monumental evidence now providentially bearing witness to the truth of the Old Testament—a criticism to the very existence of which it was absolutely necessary to get rid of the Israelitish form of the Pentateuch. And it was an appropriate work for Gesenius' first literary effort to discredit it, and very consistent with the course adopted by modern criticism to allow his supposed proof of its inferiority, philologically and æsthetically, to hide the important historical question as to its age and origin which was in his thesis, but which he is admitted not to have really touched.

To estimate aright the importance to be attached to the objections of Gesenius, we must see what he says himself about them. We have already seen that neither in Smith's "Dictionary" nor in Herzog's "Real-Encyclopädie" are they looked upon as in any way deciding the admittedly most important question—that of the origin and age of the Codex. The first

¹ Kohn, "De Pentateuch Samaritano," pp. 47-49.

² "Die Composition," ss. 20, 21.

part of the work, as of the thesis, is on this subject, but the two are separated in a very marked manner, which clearly shows that the second part, the classification of the Variants, was not supposed by Gesenius himself to have any bearing on the first. So far as he closes it at all, he closes the first discussion before commencing the second. He begins by saying, "At what time and from whence the Samaritans received their Pentateuch is a most weighty question (*quæstio gravissima*), in solving which the critics of our age have diverged into very various opinions."¹ He then mentions the opinion of Morinus, Kennicott, J. D. Michaelis and others, that it was to be traced back to the time of the division of the kingdom, in opposition to which he quotes with approval a sentence from De Wette, that, had the Israelites possessed the law, they could not have fluctuated between Jewish and pagan rites as they are said to have done in 2 Kings xvii.—a very common mode of reasoning among modern critics, which would prove that the law did not exist in our Lord's time: "Did not Moses give you the law? and yet none of you keepeth the law." Such an argument needs no answer except a reference to the chapter in question. But he goes on in words which show distinctly what was, and is, the real ground of objection, which led Gesenius to write against it, and the critics of his school in the present day to be for the most part silent about it. "We think it must be taken for granted that the Pentateuch could certainly have passed from the Jews to the Samaritans, on the supposition that the Jews themselves had it in the form in which we now use it. But so far are we from thinking that this was the case, that arguments are forthcoming which satisfy us that the Pentateuch in its present form existed neither among the Samaritans"—by whom of course he means the Ten Tribes—"nor among the Jews, in the time of Jeroboam and the division of the kingdom."²

Here the real ground of objection is plainly shown. It is inconsistent with the view that the Pentateuch, instead of being written by Moses, was a succession of works, the earliest of which was much later than Moses, and the last composer a hundred years after the Babylonish captivity. That it is a "*quæstio gravissima*" for Gesenius and his followers is indeed most true, since, as he in these words recognises, the admission that the Samaritan Codex reaches back to the division of the kingdom is fatal to the whole fabric of the so-called higher criticism, of which he was then laying the foundations.

The words in which Gesenius concludes this first part of his work are not exactly those of a man who thinks himself to

¹ Gesenius, "De Sam. Pent. Origine, indole et auctoritate," p. 3.

² "De Sam. Pent. Origine," etc., pp. 5, 6.

have proved his point: "All that we claim is that there is scarcely any other moment of time suggested suitable for the origin of the Samaritan Codex, than that which we have said, and since, in a matter destitute of historical testimony, we must take refuge in a probable conjecture, this is the one which is certainly to be preferred to all the rest."¹

If 2 Kings xvii. is believed, there is historical testimony enough. Gesenius' own "probable conjecture" has gained no favour and no following, but his criticism of the relative priority and authority of the various readings has been allowed to put out of sight the "gravissima quæstio"—the difficult question of the origin.

What has been shown is this: that the Law was brought to the Samaritans immediately after the captivity of the Ten Tribes; that it was brought by an Israelitish priest sent back from captivity to teach them; that the Law he possessed must have been that which the prophets of Israel had constantly accused them of having broken; that therefore the Samaritan Pentateuch is the Israelitish Codex; that as the Masorites altered the Jewish Codex, the Samaritans may have altered the Israelitish Codex; that though this Codex is as old as the division of the kingdom, it is more recent than the other, which has an antiquity reaching back to Moses; and that, through the providence of God, His Law has been guarded all along since Israel separated from Judah, by hostile nations first, and hostile religious bodies subsequently, each eager to find the other out, in any change even of a word.

The result we have arrived at is altogether independent of the investigations of Gesenius and Kohn as to the priority or superiority of the two recensions. Gesenius and Kohn may be right in their critical conclusions, and yet the Samaritan Pentateuch date back to the time of the separation of the kingdom of Israel from that of Judah. Gesenius treated the two questions as in entire independence of each other. He first very briefly examines the question of the origin and age of the Samaritan, and does not profess any certainty about it, only, as he did not believe that any Pentateuch at all was in existence at the division of the kingdom, he could not believe that the Samaritan text of it existed then. The fundamental objection to so believing was its inconsistency with the new views as to the Five Books themselves. It is confessed by modern critics that this question of the age and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch he did not solve, and they consider it still unsolved. On "the recognition of the Pentateuch and the building of the temple on Mount Gerizim we are im-

¹ "De Sam. Pent. Origine. pp. 9, 10.

perfectly informed, since with respect to the first point we know absolutely nothing."¹

"In 1815," says a writer in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible"—I have quoted it before, but it is so important to the present division of the subject that I must quote it over again—"Gesenius abolished the remnant of the Samaritan Pentateuch. So masterly, lucid, and clear are his arguments and his proofs, that there has been and will be no further question as to the absence of all value in this recension and its pretended emendations." What, then, can we do after such a statement as to the result of Gesenius' prelection but give up all thought of the Samaritan Pentateuch? But if we finish the article, we shall find that abolishing the remnant of the Samaritan Pentateuch means only proving its inferiority as a Codex to the Jewish Pentateuch, and that what "there has been and will be no question" about is not the age and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch, but simply the value of its various readings. The same writer who has used these strong expressions goes on to say: "It may perhaps not be quite superfluous to observe, before we proceed any further, that since up to this moment no critical edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch, or even an examination of the Codices since Kennicott—who can only be said to have begun the work—has been thought of, the treatment of the whole subject remains a most precarious task, and beset with unexampled difficulties at every step; and also that, under these circumstances, a more or less scientific arrangement of isolated or common Samaritan mistakes and falsifications appears to us to be a subject of very small consequence indeed." And yet this is all that Gesenius' "masterly, lucid, and clear" argument even claimed to have done.

"It is, however," the writer goes on to say, "this same rudimentary state of investigation—after two centuries and a half of fierce discussion—which has left the other, and much more important, question of the *Age and Origin* of the Samaritan Pentateuch as unsettled to-day as it was when it first came under the notice of European scholars."²

This passage, or most of it, I have already quoted, and I have shown that, if unsettled, it is not for want of historical evidence to settle it, but because the age and origin to which historical evidence points is inconsistent with the critical theories of Gesenius, Wellhausen, and their followers. I quote it again for the purpose of placing it side by side with the statement of Kennicott, admitted in this passage to be the last scholar who has made any attempt to collate the manuscripts.

¹ "Wissen wir gar nichts," Herzog, "Real Encyclopädie," B. XIII., s. 342.

² Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible": "Samaritan Pentateuch."

It has been, as we have seen, the subject of two academical prelections for their doctors' degrees of two men who subsequently became famous.¹ But neither of them continued Kennicott's researches. Since Kennicott's time nothing has been done except the classification of the variants which we have just been examining. No fresh information whatever has been gained. There has been nothing learned about it which was not known when Kennicott wrote his Dissertation. By the admission of Gesenius' followers, and really of Gesenius himself, his book leaves the question of the origin and age of the recension where he found it. And he found it where Kennicott left it. The last great scholar who has studied the subject, and who studied it more fundamentally than anyone before him, left it as a settled question that the Samaritans received the Pentateuch from the Ten Tribes. In his summing up of what he had proved, he concludes thus:

"In the history of the Hebrew text . . . it was shown that the Pentateuch was placed by Moses by the side of the ark, and copies afterwards taken for the use of the priests all over Canaan. Nevertheless, in the reign of Manasseh, when idolatry pervaded the country of Judæa for fifty-five years, while some copies perished the rest were carefully concealed. So that at Jerusalem the Law was almost unknown when Moses' own autograph² was found and publicly produced in the reign of Josiah. But copies of the Law were preserved among the Ten Tribes. These were carried into captivity, but a Samaritan priest returned to teach the inhabitants the manner of the God of the land, which could not be done without the written Law. From which time, about B.C. 719, the Pentateuch was preserved by these Samaritans for a thousand years, till the times of Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, etc., who often quoted it. After a lapse of one thousand two hundred years, manuscripts were found with a few poor Samaritan families surviving to-day in Palestine and Egypt. . . . Lastly, the character in which the Samaritan Codices transmitted to our times are written seems to be more the original character than that in which our Hebrew Codices are written. . . . There are not so many errors in the Samaritan as in the Hebrew, because they have not been so often copied. How adorable is the wisdom of God, that Christians should have received the Pentateuch from these two nations, so hostile to one another for two thousand years that their hostility should have passed into a proverb!"³

SAMUEL GARRATT.

¹ Gesenius dedicated his book to those who had conferred the degree. Kohn's title-page contains the names of his three opponents.

² Heb., "By the hand of Moses," 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14.

³ Kennicott, "Dissertatio Generalis," p. 60.