

# 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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jtvi-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

JOURNAL OF  
THE TRANSACTIONS  
OF  
The Victoria Institute,  
OR,  
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

---

SECRETARY: E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.

---

VOL. XLV.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Adelphi Terrace House, Charing Cross, W.C.)

---

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1913.

544TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,  
HELD IN THE ROOMS OF THE INSTITUTE, ON MONDAY,  
APRIL 21st, 1913, AT 4.30 P.M.

E. J. SEWELL, ESQ. (MEMBER OF COUNCIL), PRESIDED.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read and signed, and the SECRETARY announced the election of Mr. Williamson Lamplough as a Member.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon the Rev. J. Iverach Munro, M.A., to read his paper.

---

*THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH AND PHILOLOGICAL QUESTIONS CONNECTED THEREWITH.*  
By the Rev. J. IVERACH MUNRO, M.A.

A VERY valuable paper on "The Samaritan Pentateuch" was read before the members of the Victoria Institute by the Rev. Canon Garratt, M.A., on Monday, March 21st, 1904, which I shall presume to be known to the members here present.

My task is thus much simplified, as I am set at liberty to use the time at my disposal in showing from facts embedded in the Samaritan Pentateuch itself and in its Samaritan translation, which are not denied by scholars, that the Samaritan Pentateuch was received by the Samaritan Colonists in or about the time of Hezekiah. In short, the historical situation depicted in II Kings xvii, 24-41, gives the key to almost all the peculiarities of the Samaritan Pentateuch and its Samaritan translation, fitting into these peculiarities so minutely as to leave no shadow of a doubt in my mind that it was then received; and by a process of inductive and deductive reasoning from facts in it and in the Hebrew Pentateuch in the Massoretic text, along with those in the Septuagint translation, that they lead us right back to the time of Moses for the first reception of the Pentateuch, practically, making due allowance for marginal glosses, etc., as we now have it.

The evidence is cumulative. First comes the character in

which the Samaritan Pentateuch was written, which is the ancient Hebrew. There is no doubt of that whatever. Nor is it exactly like that of the Moabite stone and the Siloam inscription; but what is far better from an evidential point of view, the variations are just those that arise through the copying of many years. Then the insertion of a point between each word, just as is done on the Moabite stone and the Siloam inscription, quite coincides with Hezekiah's time.

Another striking coincidence between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Hebrew of Hezekiah's time is that the suffix *ô* of the third singular masculine, which is often in the Pentateuch represented by ם, as it is still on the Moabite stone, is throughout the Samaritan Pentateuch changed to ן, as it is written on the Siloam inscription.

This latter point in the evidence, however, brings us to a much larger and most important part of our subject, viz., the fact that the Samaritan Pentateuch as compared with the Masoretic Pentateuch has undergone a most drastic revision.

We are greatly indebted to Gesenius for the enormous labour by which he proved this. He gathered out and sorted under various headings the changes that appeared to be intentional in the Samaritan Pentateuch. These he grouped under eight heads. His classification may not be quite logical, and he may include doubtful examples, but his first seven classes of variation are, in the main, clearly established.

His eighth and last class, however, as I have endeavoured to show in my little book on the *Samaritan Pentateuch and Modern Criticism*, has almost no foundation in fact; but is presented in such a peculiar way that every scholar who has read the essay has been misled by it into thinking that the Samaritans made wholesale changes in their Pentateuch in the interests of their peculiar theology, hermeneutics and worship.

This is entirely erroneous, as no such change has been made either in their Pentateuch or in their translation of it into the Samaritan dialect.

Yet this error, baseless as it is, has had the result of discrediting for nearly a hundred years the authority of the Samaritan Pentateuch as a witness for the truth of the Bible record, and as a reliable means of reaching the original text.

If one may be permitted a reference to one's self: had it not been for the training and encouragement of the late Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., etc., Professor of Hebrew in the New College, Edinburgh, in thoroughness in investigation and especially in the verification of sources in critical work, I

should never have dreamed of testing Gesenius's eighth class : so that my presence in this honoured company is entirely owing to the influence of that great and good man, the most accurate scholar, the most absolutely truthful man I have ever known. You will, I am sure, allow me here to make this acknowledgment of my debt to him.

In spite of the grave defect of this unfounded charge, the debt we owe to Gesenius for his proof of the fact of revision is a great one, for he has made it possible for us to question the revision itself, as to its nature and extent, as to why and when it was made. Not only so, but we have a translation which follows most faithfully the Samaritan Pentateuch as we have it, and further, we have an invaluable asset in the Samaritan dialect itself embodied in that translation, and the evidence derived from this, all which combine to form a threefold cord not easily broken.

We have the fact of a great revision. When, why, and by whom this revision was made form legitimate subjects of inquiry.

The Samaritan Pentateuch when duly examined should answer these questions. For example, our Revised Version of the English Bible bears in itself indisputable marks of its date and origin. Stamped upon it is the fact that it is the product of an age of criticism. This has so affected the revision that it has not been popularly accepted even in the age of its production, if it can ever be so accepted. But whatever be the main motive for revising any religious work, that motive is bound to appear in the revision itself. Further, it is bound approximately to be in the language of its day, making due allowance for religious conservatism.

Now Gesenius has proved beyond dispute that the Samaritan Pentateuch was thoroughly revised grammatically. When we examine the data we find that the Hebrew to which it is brought is that of Hezekiah's time with the tincture of the Northern Kingdom, which we know from the Elijah and Elisha narratives existed in that kingdom.

These facts of revision agree with the reception by the Samaritan colonists of this copy of the Law when the priest was sent from the exiles to Samaria to teach them "the manner of the God of the land." They do not agree with any other period, as we see when we reflect on the possibility of this having been done at a later time. Not only would we have to account for its being done at all at a later period, the Hebrew of Hezekiah's time must also be explained.

Why would the Samaritans revise their Pentateuch at all if they received it after the return of the Jews from the exile? There is no assignable reason for such a course known to me. When we ask, further, why they would have revised it to the Hebrew of Hezekiah's time, and understand what such an undertaking involved, we see not only that there was no reason for their undertaking such a task, but we also see that they would have found it impossible. Consider that there would have been involved a most careful study of Hebrew literature, so that the deviation from the Hebrew of Hezekiah's time would be no more than was required by that variation in the Northern Kingdom which the reception of it in the circumstances recorded in II Kings xvii involved, and this by men who certainly received not one piece of writing of that time as sacred, and if not as sacred, then as certainly they would not receive it at all. The hypothesis then that they received the Pentateuch after the time of the exile is shattered on this rock that, the careful study of the Hebrew of Hezekiah and the nice adjustment to that, with the exception mentioned, and the avoidance of the snares and pitfalls of Ezra and Nehemiah and the writer of the Chronicles are all involved, a task the attempt at which would have involved herculean labour without one reason for it, in fact in the circumstances a pure impossibility utterly beyond the powers of those whom Gesenius styled "criticasteri."

The other features of the revision, in so far as they hold good, and prove to be intentional, all point to a very powerful influence at work, with the result that in certain directions it is so thorough that Gesenius himself bears witness to it. For example, commenting on the fourth class of changes—"Readings either supplemented or corrected from parallel places"—he says, "On this class, as will easily appear, the Samaritan critics bestowed remarkable labour, as the sacred text bears out from its every part; nothing that appears to be required for the full expression of the text is ever left out."

The rigorous and thorough aspect of the revision on these points again demands an explanation. What influence could have been strong enough to carry the revisers through so remarkable an achievement? What motive would the Samaritans have had to change a sacred text? Whence could they have got the necessary familiarity with that text to fit them for doing so thoroughly such a delicate task, especially when they had to keep in view what has already been shown—that these changes had to be expressed in the Hebrew of Hezekiah's time? We know of neither motive nor power adequate.

Will it be said that those from whom they obtained their copy of the Pentateuch made these changes on their own initiative? Again we ask for an adequate reason for them to have carried it through so successfully and with such unanimity that the translation into the Samaritan dialect follows it closely throughout. We are shut up to Hezekiah's time for the revision. We are no less shut up to the Northern Kingdom for the recension of the Pentateuch which was received. The Samaritan colonists required to know the manner of the God of Northern Israel, not of Judah. That being so, can we believe that those from whom they obtained their Pentateuch gratuitously made these changes? What could be their motive for such work? There could be none arising from their own initiative. Why then was it done? No one can dispute the fact: as men of science we ask the reason.

Every other reason failing, the real reason and an altogether adequate one was found by me to lie embedded in the appeal of the Samaritan colonists to the Assyrian monarch. They were not likely to have troubled him unnecessarily. Every effort to secure the appeasement of the God of the land, we may be quite sure, was made before the appeal to Cæsar.

From the evidence already mentioned of the revision we know that the Pentateuch existed in the Northern Kingdom. If so, the Samaritans must have been able to procure a copy of some kind. But evidently that copy had not served their purpose. To their mind something must have been omitted or not done rightly, hence the lions were as bad as ever.

In these circumstances it is certain that if they induced the Assyrian monarch to move at all in their behalf, he would take care that everything would be done to secure authentic teaching, while the after-disappearance of the lions, consequent on the re-occupation of the deserted parts of the devastated country, would set the revised recension of the Pentateuch far above the ancient and authentic one in the estimation of the Samaritans, according to the well-known fallacy of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. But had the Assyrian monarch power to effect these changes? He had Assyrian-Hebrew scholars like Rabshakeh. He could, as we know, get men flayed alive. A twentieth-century critic is quite safe in scoffing at such possibilities. The grim possibility stared the scribes of the Northern Kingdom in the face. We know the gratuitous cruelty of the Assyrian. We know their power to deal with texts. The appointment of Assyrian-Hebrew scholars, then, with full powers to make the unhappy exile scribes of the Northern Kingdom do their utmost in the

matter of producing an authentic and intelligible copy of the Law, cleared of every ambiguity and apparent contradiction, is in the circumstances a certainty: and so far from, as was said by one critic of my work, being "a theory only, unsupported as yet by solid facts," it is a conclusion to which I have been shut up by "the solid facts" of the Samaritan Pentateuch itself, the historical situation revealed in II Kings xvii, and the facts of the translation in the Samaritan dialect. My placing of it in the forefront in my work on the Samaritan Pentateuch was intended to save the reader the drudgery of following the investigation while it afforded the light upon the subject, which was needful.

We now come to the evidence of the translation. The first thing that strikes me about that translation is that it has the name Jehovah everywhere throughout when it is in the Hebrew-Samaritan. There has been no attempt whatever to make any change or substitution for it, from any reason whatever. This I especially emphasize because of the error of Gesenius on this important point. I may mention here, though not stopping now to give the grounds of my conviction, that I am convinced that Jehovah is the original pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton after all. We shall revert to the subject.

Here we note that the occurrence of this name throughout is a very strong proof, taken in conjunction with the rest, of the early date of the translation. Since it occurs throughout, in a translation which must have been made for popular use, then it must also have been read. Therefore it appears to me that the translation must have been not only earlier, but much earlier than the Targum of Onqelos or that of Jonathan Ben Uzziel or the Jerusalem Targum, and also much earlier than the Septuagint translation. The citation of any modern Hebrew work in proof of the contrary is beside the mark. The condition of mind which prevented the translators of these Targums and of the Septuagint from writing and reading the name is quite absent from that of modern Jew or Gentile. We can write and read anything so far as reverence is concerned.

The simple directness and force of the translation and the absence of any attempt at circumlocutions in connection with the names of God also bear out the evidence of the name Jehovah. They mutually support each other. But in turn they form part of a series of evidences which is overwhelmingly in favour of the early translation.

This brings us to examine the kind of dialect which is used by the Samaritans in the translation of their Pentateuch.

Let us here observe that the facts of philology are as real as those of any other science. They cannot be brushed aside. They stand in all the majesty of truth, and must be respected even as the facts of physical science are in their sphere.

When we analyze the language of the Samaritan translators of their Pentateuch into their own dialect, we find that there are three different Semitic elements present and these are very imperfectly fused. Sometimes one element is used, sometimes another.

Now philological science shows us that such a state of language marks a recent formation: that is to say, unless something has happened to stereotype this state of things and make it permanent, the elements will get welded together and a certain uniformity will take the place of the heterogeneous.

Here, then, we have philological facts which prove the Samaritan dialect to be a recent formation, composed of elements which we can quite easily identify, viz., Aramaic, Assyrian Aramaic, and Hebrew. For the particulars I must refer you to any of the Samaritan grammars, and for a general outline and discussion of the elements I may refer you to what I have tried to show in Chapter V of *Samaritan Pentateuch and Modern Criticism*. Suffice it here to say that these philological facts shut us up to the conclusion that a population composed of elements speaking Aramaic or common Syriac, Assyrian Aramaic or Biblical Aramaic, and Hebrew, more or less in equal proportions, have in the use of these languages reached the stage of lingual development represented in the Samaritan translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch; that this union is quite recent, unless some important literary work read and studied by the whole population had previously stereotyped the language.

Now, there is no such work other than this translation itself which could have thus affected the language and arrested its further development. Therefore this translation stands at the source of the Samaritan dialect, and must have been made shortly after the Samaritan colonists and the remainder of the old Hebrew with the Syriac or Aramaic part of the population had come together.

The historical inquiry which this problem in philology raises is this: when did these three elements exist together in Samaria? If we can answer that question, we have solved the problem of the date of the translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch into the Samaritan dialect.

We are in the happy position of being able to answer that historical question. There was one period and one alone, when

these three elements met and mixed for the short time necessary to produce the exact precipitate of language which we find in the Samaritan dialect.

That period was the one which we can identify by the historic account preserved in II Kings xvii, where we have the introduction of the Samaritan colonists among the Hebrew remnant in Samaria. The inrush of the surrounding Aramaic inhabitants into the depopulated country is also certain. At no other time do we have these elements meeting in the living intercourse which could have produced this dialect.

Another most remarkable circumstance is that any book at all should have been written or translated into a language which was in such a crude state. So heterogeneous a population would naturally have other work than the production of literature.

Here again we have the reason given us in the recorded urgency of the fear excited by the lions making these Samaritans translate the newly-received revised Pentateuch into the common speech that everyone might know how to avoid the anger of the God of the land.

Now a critic may laugh at the fear of these Samaritans, as to that I say nothing; though I have my own thoughts as to what he would do in the presence of a few lions, perhaps even of one. But if he ignores that fear as a factor in explaining the phenomena of the Samaritan Pentateuch and its Samaritan translation, then I have this to say, that a man who can so regard the realities in life would be much better employed in a calling more suited to his capacities than in sitting in the chair of the critic, for he shows that he is simply blind to what moved men in that far-off time, and is therefore sure to err.

From the Samaritans themselves we have no evidence that is of any weight as to the date of the translation, therefore the philological and other evidence which we find embedded in their works is the more valuable.

The assertion that it was composed in the century before Christ by a priest named Nathanael is simply absurd in face of the testimony of the language itself.

Here a reference may be made to the general value of this translation to Biblical science.

An example of the light which this translation throws on the use and non-use of one word in Ezekiel will better indicate its great general value to Biblical science than any mere expression of opinion.

Take the word פָּקַד to "visit," often used in the sense of to visit with punishment.

In Jeremiah this word frequently occurs in the latter sense. In the whole of Ezekiel it is only twice used, and even then not in the sense of punishing, although the prophet has often to express that idea.

Here, then, are two contemporary Hebrew prophets, one of whom never uses the usual word for "punishing," the other constantly. When we ask the reason, the Samaritan translation of the Pentateuch comes to our help. For פָּקַד is the word always used in it to translate the Hebrew word צִוָּה, to "command." When we see this the problem is solved. For Ezekiel is writing to those exiles who are using the same language as the Samaritan colonists had before they entered Palestine. Therefore פָּקַד would be liable to be misunderstood and taken in the sense of "command" or some kindred meaning. If with this in mind we examine the late Professor A. B. Davidson's *Commentary on Ezekiel*, Cambridge Bible Series, Chapter xxiii, 21, and xxxviii, 8, the only passages in which Ezekiel uses the word, we find that what Dr. Davidson says, "can hardly be supported from usage" in Hebrew, is exactly what is supplied by the Samaritan translation and proves to be Ezekiel's meaning, at the same time affording us the reason for his avoiding its use in the sense of punishing. This is just an instance of the light we may expect on the exegesis of the Word when we use aright the Samaritan dialect.

Among other grammatical changes in the Samaritan Pentateuch is that of הִיאַ, when used for the feminine, to that of הִיאַ, the usual third singular feminine pronoun. The wonder is that this has not been done in the Massoretic text also where the only change that is made in the case of the feminine is in the pointed text to give the vowel points of הִיאַ. The presence of the archaism strongly testifies to the antiquity and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and to the fidelity with which the ancient sacred writings were kept.

With respect to the Mosaic authorship I have ventured to say, and I repeat to this audience, because it is strictly true: "The evidential value of this pronoun הִיאַ epicene in the Pentateuch is greater than if Moses had signed every page of the Pentateuch, infinitely greater, because a forger might have done that. But no forger that ever lived could have devised anything so simple yet as efficacious as this הִיאַ."

One critic supposes this to be a glaring *non sequitur* and triumphantly asks: "Does an epicene pronoun prove J E D P to have been all written by one man and that man Moses?" I

venture to think the critic's logic is at fault, not mine. What have the materials which Moses used in his writing of the Pentateuch got to do with his authorship? The pronoun proves the date. No other name but that of Moses is ever given within the covers of the Bible as the human author of the book of the Law. If the date then is proved to have been not later than the time of Moses, that is better evidential value than if he had signed every page.

I do not detain you further on the point except to say that the literary analysis has become bankrupt and the work founded on it must be thoroughly re-examined.

Let me now indicate to you in connection with this ancient pronoun what I cannot help regarding as some of the farthest-reaching factors in philology which have yet come to light. For part of the proof of what I say those especially interested may be referred to my essay on the third personal pronoun published by the Oxford University Press.\*

The investigation of that pronoun has convinced me that Semitic-Indo-European languages were originally one, that the great division of our race at the confusion of tongues, recorded in the Bible, receives remarkable confirmation from the fact that while the original materials are the same, the main differences of these languages are due to mental and other characteristics which come to light in the study of their construction. Everything in Indo-European is subordinated to the Time-Spirit, intense activity and inquisitiveness are its main characteristics. In the verb the pronominal element is always last. In Semitic, on the other hand, everything is made to hinge on the kind of action and its connection with the agent, whether it is complete or incomplete, whether the agent acts directly or acts, or is made to act, by another, with a multitude of ramifications all turning on the relation of the agent to the action; and the element of time may be said never to be expressed by the verb. The pronominal element in the verb may precede or follow the verbal noun. These characteristics indicate an original difference of thought and action, and agree with the great philological cataclysm indicated in the Bible among those who used the original language. Deeper investigation into the causes will probably make plain that the great cause of difference in language was essentially religious. The worldly-minded of that day would be carried one way, the God-fearing another. The

\* *A Research into the Origin of the Third Personal Pronoun* 𐤇𐤃𐤁.  
London: Henry Frowde. Oxford University Press, Amen Corner, E.C.  
(1s. 6d. net.)

weighing of actions and their relation to the doer is worlds away from the restless activity which, desiring to crowd the canvas, views everything in relation to time.

As is well known, the third singular personal pronoun in the Pentateuch is written the same for masculine and feminine.

It had been assumed that the pronunciation was the same also. But it occurred to me to question and investigate this assumption with the result that the whole original construction of Semitic-Indo-European language has become like an open book.

The labours of Indo-European scholars have made this possible. In particular the investigation of what are called Ablauts paved the way for me to extend my investigations in Semitic to Indo-European. I found that there were innumerable traces of there having existed at one time a means of expressing active and passive in the widest sense of these grammatical terms, that this was originally done by two diphthongal sounds, *au* to express the active, *ai* to express the passive, these being inserted between two consonants.\* On investigation, what are called middle-vowel verbs in Semitic yielded practically the same variation of vowels as philologists had already found in Indo-European to have belonged to the original parent language.

Take one or two illustrations of the practical value of this discovery. Let us take the word Shiloh, the understanding of which is of great importance in the interpretation of Messianic prophecy. This word now appears to be an old passive verbal noun with the third singular masculine suffix. The key to its meaning lies in the old verbal noun שׂוּל, active, and always occurring in the plural, expressing the parts of a garment which encircled or went round the wearer—the skirt or train. In Isaiah vi, 1, we have “His train or vesture” שׂוּלָיו, “filled the temple.” Now שׂוּלָה is the old passive form, as I have said, with the suffix, and it gives us the, in every respect, suitable and highly poetical meaning “His Investured One.” This glorious prophecy then runs: “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until His Investured One shall come,” viz.: שׂוּלָה, Shiloh, whose שׂוּלָים vesture filled the temple in Isaiah’s vision.

Again take the name קָן, “gotten.” This proves to be the old passive form of the original verbal noun of the bilateral

\* Cf. “Essays,” 6 S., 6 S.I.E., *Research, etc.*, p. 2.

stage of קָנָה,\* "to get," so that the assumption of scholars of the last century that the philology of Biblical writers must be wrong, savouring if not of the assumption that philological wisdom would die with them, at least, that it began very near their time, turns out to be as far as possible from reality.

יְהוָה JEHOVAH, יָה JAH.

Let us now, in this connection, revert to the name Jehovah, which, as we saw, was written in full in the Samaritan translation of their Pentateuch. It is an old form of the imperfect active Qal with the old accusative ending āh, as in Jehudah and the rare form Jaakobah in Chronicles. The form Jah was not derived from Jehovah, but was from the same original root, רוּ, hauv, which became yau or yauv in Babylonian, and dropping the vav became Yah, יָה in Hebrew, in which the original ה was represented by י and the ה was marked with mappiq through confounding it with the root הַה of יְהוָה, with which it had no connection, being merely the representation of the vowel â. The true pronunciation, therefore, I am now persuaded, was the one indicated by the Massorettes when the name occurs without a prefix. The vowel pointing is not that of אֲרָנִי, as there is a simple sheva vocal instead of the composite sheva. The word אֲרָנִי, Lord, seems to have been substituted for Jehovah, not because of its vowel points but because it expressed something of the majesty of the original. The substitution had taken place long before the time of the Massorettes. It is a pure coincidence that two of the vowels are the same, although the coincidence enabled the Massorettes to use, in the case of prefixes, the actual vowel points of אֲרָנִי. The original form of the name in the imperfect would be Jahauv, but proper names of the imperfect form had a tendency to take an accusative ending, hence Jahaúvah, when the accent was shifted to the last syllable, would become Jēhauvâh, and on the modification of the old diphthong *au*, which expressed the active to *ô*, it became Jehovah, יְהוָה.

It would appear, then, that there were two forms of the name, one the form which came from the same root as that of the verbal-noun behind דָּוָא; the second must have been much later as it is compounded from the former and the sign of third

\* Cf. אֲרָנִי, *Research*, etc., p. 29 f.

singular masculine of the imperfect active Qal of the ancient Semitic verb with the accusative ending added as we have seen.

By the comparison of the two forms we arrive at, I think, the certainty that the original name was common to the pre-Semitic-Indo-European. The happy conjecture of Gesenius, which Tregelles tells us he afterwards "THOROUGHLY retracted," turns out to be perfectly correct, our race possessed this revelation of God before the confusion of tongues, and we can now, it seems to me, spell out something of God's marvellous dealing with and training of our lost race, by the history of this name.

A comparison of the philological phenomena connected with Zeus and Jove with the kindred forms of Semitic convinces me that they have the same root as their origin, the v is proved by Indo-European philologists to have been consonantal and the J or Y is shown from Semitic to have proceeded from ה but pronounced with a good deal of breath and tending towards sh, ש.

But this is exactly what we have in the root of the third personal pronoun in Semitic.\* If then we can find the original meaning of the verbal-noun from which that pronoun was derived we shall, it may be, reach the original meaning of the name Jehovah, and, it may be, discover why the revelation of our God as Jehovah, אֲנִי הוֹיָהוּ אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי הוֹיָהוּ, I Am that I Am, had to be delayed until the time, the *set time* of Moses. We shall see that there was nothing arbitrary about this. There was a fullness and a fitness of time and language about it which fills one with wonder, love, and praise.†

The philologist knows that words which express pure being are the very last to be hammered out in the workshop of human life. To bring even one word into being how many hearts must be filled with emotion, how many minds illumined, how many lips and tongues moulded into particular shapes. To bring this supreme triumph of intellect and heart into being, so that the Eternal and Almighty God might use it and fit *one man* to receive it in trust for his whole race, required all the training of the human race, up to that day when on that lonely hillside the heart-broken shepherd, at length trained to be the meekest of men, saw the wondrous "bush" burning but not consumed, heard a voice reaching not the ear only, but the whole inward being, filling with meaning undreamed of the word which had been hammered out, the word "to be."

\* See list of "Essays," 7 S.I.E., *Research, etc.*, p. 2.

† Cf. "Essays," 7 S.I.E., *Research, etc.*, p. 2.

The Creator, the Upholder, the Redeemer, takes hold of this word,  $\text{יהוה}$  brought into being by His creature man, and claims it as a fit expression through all time, yea, through all eternity, of Him Who Is and Was and Is to Come, minting anew the well-known sound Jehovah, which expressed a past and forgotten revelation, the Maker, or He Who will Make (which appears to be the original meaning of the word),\* which in the meanwhile had been superseded by  $\text{אל שדי}$ , God Almighty or All Sufficient, and  $\text{אל עליון}$ , the Most High God, into  $\text{יהוה}$ , Jehovah,  $\text{אהיה אשר אהיה}$ , I Am that I Am, The Being in Whom all other beings have their being, the name expressing an inexhaustible fullness which He shall be revealing in promise and fulfilment to His people and through His people to all ages.

It has been by comparison of the philological development of  $\sqrt{\text{הר}}$ ,† as a pronominal root, by the help of ancient Egyptian, which forms a sort of halfway house, with the Indo-European pronouns that I think I have been able to trace and identify the origin and meaning of that ancient pronoun and many of the verbs “to be” in the different languages: “function” in the pronoun taking the place of “sematology” or meaning in the verb. It would take too long to tell the different steps of the investigation, but many philological derelicts have been picked up by the way, reasons for the variations of many irregular verbs have come to light, while the absolutely convincing proof of the whole lies in this, that the deeper and more thorough the research the more thorough the interpenetration of pronouns and roots is seen to be. Just to mention one far-reaching example:‡ The old feminine ending, that of the parent language, was in the Indo-European separated for use as a neuter, but the Semitic usage of the construct state which brought back the th or t made this impossible in Semitic, hence there was arrested development in this direction and Semitic languages have no neuter. This very fact, however, has preserved for us a proof of their original identity with Indo-European. Thus these discoveries in philology widen our basis of comparison much as in astronomy the base-line of measurement was lengthened by discoveries in that science.

What I should like to do in the remaining time at my disposal would be to plead for a new term for the criticism which follows.

\* Cf. “Essays,” 7 S.I.E., *Research, etc.*, p. 2.

† Cf. “Essays,” 7 S.I.E., *Research, etc.*, p. 2.

‡ Cf. “Essays,” 6 S.I.E., *Research, etc.*, p. 2.

textual criticism. The term I would advocate is "Further" criticism. And as a specimen of the absolutely necessary "Further" criticism I would venture to call your attention to a passage in the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy xx, 19. Not one point, letter, or accent in this passage requires to be changed in order to give a thoroughly satisfactory rendering. Indeed the meaning is so obvious when the right key is applied that one is amazed that it has not hitherto been observed. Yet commentators have been so far from seeing this meaning that Canon Driver has almost a whole page in his commentary on Deuteronomy devoted to its elucidation, and even then the result is not satisfactory. The change which he finally adopts of the pointing from  $\text{הָאֲדָרִים}$  to  $\text{הָאֲדָרִים}$  is as far as ever from the true meaning.

We are the more amazed at its not having been seen because of the delicacy of the scientific instruments which have been fashioned, largely by Dr. Driver's own work and by others, such as the late Professor A. B. Davidson.

Two causes have operated towards obscuring the passage. One is the prejudice created by a misapplied humanitarianism expressed very forcibly by Dr. Kitto, for instance, in his *Daily Bible Illustrations*, volume on "Isaiah and the Prophets," p. 253: "In all ancient sieges, even in those conducted by the Jews themselves, as early as the time of Moses, trees in the neighbourhood of the besieged cities were unsparingly cut down by the besiegers to aid in filling up ditches, and in the construction of mounds and embankments, and of towers and military engines. It is, however, a beautiful incident in the law of Moses that the destruction of fruit-trees for any such purpose is absolutely interdicted." Then the passage from Deuteronomy xx, 19, 20, is given in a footnote as in the Authorized Version.

The other cause is the prejudice which criticism has built upon this other. It has taken advantage of the prejudice of misapplied humanitarianism to build up a very showy proof of the ignorance of Elisha the prophet of this law, and therefore of the non-existence of the Pentateuch in his time. The clue to the meaning of the passage does not lie in its humanitarianism but in its utilitarianism. It is one of the finest examples of sanctified common sense to be found. Elisha presumably knew Hebrew and knew the correct meaning of the passage before us if it was in his hands. There is no want of harmony between his prophetic utterance in II Kings and this passage.

The words  $\text{רַבִּים יָמִים}$ , "many days," give us the clue to the meaning. There is no ambiguity about them. They mean a

“long time.” Applying then the principles of Hebrew grammar to the first part of this verse, you have the translation “when by a *protracted* siege of a city thou art engaged in capturing it in war, thou shalt not destroy the trees thereof by forcing an axe against them, when (עץ) thou canst eat of them, then (ך) thou shalt not cut them down.” The position of ואתו is very emphatic here. If we take עץ as collective we must take the suffixes in the plural when translating. Then comes the crux of the whole passage, which is, after all, so absurdly simple. “For the (fruit) tree of the field (supply in that case, viz., of a *protracted* siege) is the man” (the article is generic)—What man?—the well-known man “who goes before you in siege-work.” I never yet heard of an army that could do without a commissariat department. In the case of a *protracted* siege the fruit trees were sure to be useful and should not be cut down.

The whole passage confirms one's faith in the remarkable fidelity of the Massoretes in the preservation of the old pronunciation even when they did not understand it. Needless to say, the whole edifice of inference from the supposed ignorance on Elisha's part of this law vanishes. We require to re-examine in this manner much of the hasty prejudiced work done in the name of Higher Criticism.

In pleading for a new name for such work—for the scientific investigation that follows textual criticism or the scientific settlement of the text of God's Word, I do not disparage the work which former generations of scholars have done. Above all, I would not for a moment disparage the work done by such a scholar as the late Professor W. Robertson Smith and the splendid stand which he made for freedom of investigation. That freedom is to be emphasized and must be held fast at all hazards, for truth has nothing to fear. The tragedy of Robertson Smith's life, however, was that freedom to investigate was confused with power to win truth. In the arrogance of apparently encyclopædic knowledge he identified truth with his own defective views, which are now proved untrue. The outcome of this has been that the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, has been by the acceptance of his defective views torn out of the hands of the Church. The millions of our land and all Christian lands who have severed connection with every branch of the Christian Church, and the comparative dearth of conversion within her borders, proclaim in our ears that without the foundation of the truth of the Old Testament, which our

Lord declared He came to fulfil, the living faith in Himself which He requires from us can neither be attained nor maintained, for the exceeding need of a sinner must be seen ere the Saviour can be welcomed. The natural man cannot see the Kingdom of God. All the great revivals have had their foundation on the truth of God's Word in both Old Testament and New.

"Further Criticism" will take her place as a handmaid in the service of the Spirit of Truth, which the world cannot receive, and in the ministry of the Word of which our Lord Jesus Christ said, in His great intercessory prayer, "Thy word is truth."

Having mentioned the name of the late Professor Robertson Smith, I cannot refrain from mentioning one whom I count quite as worthy of the regard of the Church and who was the first to recognize the importance of the work on account of which I have the honour to be addressing this distinguished audience, I mean Professor George G. Cameron, D.D., who succeeded Professor Robertson Smith in the Hebrew Chair of the Free Church College, Aberdeen, and who, writing to me of my work, said:—

"Most thoroughly do I agree with you that criticism should be true to history. What has prevented me from the first and to this hour from accepting the advanced views is the fact that they leave to us practically no reliable history."

Here is a man who, during his whole Professorship since 1882, while keeping himself informed of all the views that were sweeping others away like a flood, quietly and tenaciously held on to his faith and to its foundations, who now, instead of finding his views antiquated and consigned to the dust-heap as he lays aside the duties of his chair, finds to his intense satisfaction that his views are in harmony with the results of the most recent investigations of scholarship, while the views which were so ostentatiously brought forward now form but a "castle in the air"; and it seems to me must soon cease even to be thought of except among antiquarians.

The "inverted history" of the Higher Criticism is proved by the Samaritan Pentateuch and its connected data to be the greatest mistake in criticism yet made, the "Rainbow Bible" to be but an iridescent cloud.

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN, before the paper was read, described it as revolutionary, original and fresh, and at the close remarked that

the applause that had been given was a proof of what he had said. He added that the paper should now be discussed by competent men, and he hoped the Higher Critics would take due note of it.

Dr. THIRTLE said: The paper just read brings before us a subject of profound importance, in its bearing upon the antiquity and authenticity of the books which compose the Pentateuch. We have listened to strong and cogent reasons for maintaining that the Samaritan Pentateuch goes back to pre-exilic times. The book is demanded for use several centuries before the days of Ezra, when some would suggest its possible origination. Our attention has been directed to circumstances which indicate that, while Hezekiah was still reigning in Judah, the constituent books of the Pentateuch had been adapted to the special prejudices and practices of the people of the Northern Kingdom of Israel. If at that time there was a garbled recension of the Pentateuch, then assuredly there was also the authentic Pentateuch lying at the back of the version. The existence of counterfeit coin implies the antecedent existence of coin that is standard and true.

I may be allowed to call attention in this connection to a point which strongly confirms the view presented. In the February issue of the *Expository Times*, Dr. M. Gaster, Chief Rabbi of Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Congregations, had an article entitled "The Feast of Jeroboam and the Samaritan Calendar." Therein he made a clear deduction from a careful examination of copies of the Samaritan Calendar, now in his possession. It seems that, as in the case of the Jews, there is a double calendar, the one based on lunar months and the other on solar months; and that in the one case, as in the other, it is the custom, at intervals, to adjust the difference between the two cycles by intercalating a month. While, however, the Jewish practice has been to intercalate a month after Tebet, making that which is ordinarily the twelfth month to become the thirteenth, the Samaritan Calendar discloses a system of intercalating a month after the sixth, called by the Jews Elul, and thus constituting a second Tishri, the month which is ordinarily the seventh becoming the eighth for the year so affected. In this latter month they then hold the Feast of Tabernacles, which among the Jews is uniformly a fixture of the seventh month. Whence comes this practice? Dr. Gaster traces it to the time of Jeroboam, to whose account it is definitely placed in 1 Kings xii, 31-33, where we read

that the king "ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that is in Judah . . . he went up to the altar that he had made in Bethel, on the fifteenth day of the month, even in *the month which he had devised in his own heart.*" Thus in religion as well as politics the North was cut off from the South, revolt and schism went together.

Hence we see that, not only was there a version of the Pentateuch in existence centuries before Modern Criticism has been disposed to allow the Pentateuch to have existed in any form, but also that the Samaritans, who use that version to-day, periodically follow a practice that is explained as to its origin in the First Book of Kings, and shown to have originated little short of a thousand years before Christ!

In conclusion, I would call attention to the fact that, in the second edition of his book on *The Canon of the Old Testament*, Bishop Herbert Edward Ryle speaks of the Samaritan Pentateuch as having been "loudly proclaimed to be the rock upon which the modern criticism of the Pentateuch must inevitably make shipwreck." I cannot say that, in discussing the subject, he does much to divest the rock of its destructive influence or power. About the time the Bishop was writing on the subject, the late Mr. Gladstone gave to the world a series of articles, which were afterwards published in book form, with the title *The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*. Writing from the non-expert's practical point of view, Mr. Gladstone said: "The Samaritan Pentateuch forms, in itself, a remarkable indication, nay even a proof that, at the date from which we know it to have been received, the Pentateuch was no novelty among the Jews. . . . Surely the reverence of the Samaritans for the Torah could not have begun at this period; hardly could have had its first beginning at any period posterior to the schism. . . . Nor can we easily suppose that, when the Ten Tribes separated from the Two, they did not carry with them the law on which their competing worship was to be founded. In effect, is there any rational supposition except that the kingdom of Israel had possessed at the time of Rehoboam some code, corresponding in substance, in all except pure detail, with that which was subsequently written out in the famous manuscripts we now possess?"

Mr. Gladstone, as we see, appreciated the critical importance of the Samaritan Pentateuch. It is indeed unthinkable that the

natives or their successors in the cities of Samaria should have received the Book from their avowed enemies the Jews ; neither can we conceive it possible that they should hold as sacred a volume that came into being among the Jews after the national revolt and schism. Everything tends to show that their religious life radiated round a book which was the property of ALL ISRAEL in antecedent times. So it was taken away into Assyria, and so it was received back at the hands of the priests of whom we have heard this afternoon.

Mr. ROUSE said: A striking evidence brought before us in this full and lucid paper, that the Hebrew Pentateuch preserved by the Samaritans was written before the age of all Rabbinical traditions, is the fact that in the early translation which they use along with it the Samaritan people have the name *Jehovah* every time that its four consonants occur in the original. It is clear that they did not obey a tradition which is as old as the Septuagint (280 B.C.), by reading the title *Adonai* (Lord) instead of the sacred name in their Hebrew text ; for, had they done so, they would in their translation certainly have written *Adonai* itself, or a word of like import in the corresponding passages, even as the Grecian Jews in their Septuagint everywhere wrote *Kyrios* (Lord) instead of *Jehovah*.

That the northern kingdom of Israel (as stated by a previous speaker) reckoned their year from a month other than that with which the Jewish Kingdom began it, I was strongly convinced some years ago when comparing the notes of contemporaneity made in the Books of Kings between the two royal lines ; and I found that in several cases I solved a great difficulty by making the northern year begin with the eighth Jewish month.

Pastor Munro will be glad to hear that one of his audience has already advanced a little way on a special research that he has indicated—to prove that Hebrew in its early form was the original language of mankind. The late Pastor R. Govett of Norwich wrote a book entitled *English Derived from Hebrew* in which a mass of evidence was gathered in favour of the view ; and having perused the same, I mentioned it to the late Professor Skeat, who, however, objected that the author had made his evidence inconclusive by contenting himself in nearly all cases with giving only the consonants of the Hebrew words. The following instances of three

kinds of changes in words culled from this book will, however, serve to show its startling and convincing character: transference of a name—*akrab*, Hebrew for *scorpion*, has become in English *crab*; transference of letters—*nakhash*, Hebrew for *serpent*, is in Latin *anguis*, in English *snake*; metonymy—*ōsen*, Hebrew for *ear*, has become the Swedish *āsna*, the Latin *asinus*, and the English *ass*, all names for the beast with the long ears. To this I may add a few of my own observations (some of which possibly may be found in Govett's work, though I do not remember them there):—

of retentions—the Hebrew *hem* (they, them) became the Anglo-Saxon *hem*;

the Hebrew *zeh* (this, that) became the Anglo-Saxon *se* and by inversion the Latin *is*,

while its plural *elleh* became the Latin *illi*,

of changes—*attah* or *atta'* (thou) became the Latin *tu*, etc., while the suffix *k*, *ka* and *k'* (thy) became the Red Indian *kit*; the Hebrew *arets* (earth or land) became in English *earth*, but was inverted in Latin to *terra*; the Hebrew *shekhen*, a dwelling, became the Greek *skēnē*, a tent, doubtless because a tent was the first kind of dwelling used by all Noah's descendants.

Chancellor LIAS writes:

I was intending to come up in order to congratulate the author of this most valuable paper on his work, but I did not feel quite equal to the effort. One sees all too little of such work. So far as I know, the Victoria Institute in England and the *Bibliotheca Sacra* in America are the only outlets for the not only legitimate but necessary "criticism of the critics" at the present moment. I wish that the advocates of what Professor Robertson, of Glasgow, once called the "saner criticism" would endeavour to call into existence in this country a periodical for the defence of the authority and genuineness of the Holy Scriptures.

I have not made a special study of the Samaritan Pentateuch, nor have I read the dissertation of Gesenius on the subject. But I have long and closely studied German criticism of the Old Testament, and, as Canon Garratt told the Institute in 1904, I have expressed my opinion on the importance of the Samaritan Pentateuch in the critical question, and the obvious inadequacy of recent utterances of the critics on this point. The present paper contains the only adequate

treatment of the question which, so far as I know, it has ever received. It brings out the two important facts that the language of the Samaritan Pentateuch was carefully revised, and that the revision was carried on in Hezekiah's time; as well as that the Northern dialect, with which we meet in the Elijah and Elisha section of the Historical Scriptures, characterizes its contents. The paper brings out very clearly the bearing of these facts on its having been revised under the circumstances recorded in II Kings xvii, 24-41. The allusion of the writer to the "pitfalls" presented by the contents of Ezra, Nehemiah or Chronicles will, I fear, escape those of his readers who are unacquainted with Hebrew. I lately wrote a paper in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* to show that neither did Ezra and Nehemiah display the peculiarities attributed by recent critics to the supposed post-exilic "P," nor did "P" in any single instance fall into the mistakes made by Ezra and Nehemiah in their undoubtedly post-exilic Hebrew, especially in their abnormal use of prepositions. So serious are some of these mistakes that it is clear that the revisers sometimes cannot translate the impossible Hebrew of those writers. In the seventy years of the captivity the art of writing Hebrew had been largely lost.

On page 188 I note that an argument based on a fact ascertained by so competent a Hebrew scholar as Gesenius, can hardly be described as "a theory only, unsupported by facts." The argument, again, in p. 187, is not one which the modern critic can pass over, as he is so fond of doing, *sub silentio*. The argument based on Ezekiel's unusual use of *pakad* is very weighty indeed. The argument from the well-known fact that the third person singular of the pronoun is the same in masculine and feminine in the Pentateuch only is stated more forcibly than I have ever seen it stated before. It might have been added that the word for *youth* and *maiden* is the same throughout the Pentateuch. The feminine termination of the word appears first in the later Scriptures. In Gen. xxxiv the modern critic, in sublime unconsciousness of the important fact, assigns some portions of the chapter to the pre-exilic and some to the post-exilic writer. The fact is that the Hebrew of the whole chapter is characteristic of the Mosaic age. I am further glad to find that the paper confirms a conclusion to which I have independently come, expressed in a work which I have not yet published, that Jah is not a mere abbreviation of Jehovah.

I will conclude by saying that I have never come across a Hebrew scholar more capable of meeting—and *beating*—the critics on their own ground, than the writer of this paper. He has laid the Institute and all who are interested in the “saner criticism” of the Hebrew Scriptures under a very heavy obligation indeed.

The Rev. Dr. IRVING writes :—

It was refreshing to find the empirical methods of the Higher Critics confronted by such an able piece of work from such a thorough student of the subject, in which the methods of inductive science stood out in marked contrast with the tissue of conjecture and negative reasoning, which scholars of a certain Teutonic cast of mind are so fond of weaving; such arguments as they adduce being too often resolvable in the last resort to the “conceits” of the critic himself. The more the methods of inductive science are used, the less we have to fear for the cause of Truth.

#### LECTURER'S REPLY.

The LECTURER, after considering the above, replied as follows :—

I am thankful for the highly appreciative reception of a paper which is necessarily of a dry and technical character. It was a pleasure to come from the utmost corner of the land to share with you knowledge concerning the Word of God, and proofs of its truth and authenticity which are, to my mind, unanswerable.

We are under great obligation to Mr. Bishop for having invited so many scholars with other views to hear the paper and take part in the discussion. We may say that they have had the courage of their convictions and have remained at home.

To Professor Wm. H. Bennett we owe special thanks, however, because although he did not come, he wrote, referring the Institute to Mr. Chapman's excellent (from its own point of view) book *An Introduction to the Pentateuch*. But this book is quite oblivious to the new facts and arguments brought forward in my *Samaritan Pentateuch and Modern Criticism*, published by James Nisbet and Co., London, 1911, so that it can hardly be said to answer them. Mr. Herbert Loewe, in a signed article in the *Cambridge Review*, recommends the impartial reader to read my work along with Mr. Chapman's.

Professor Bennett also gives references to the *Church Quarterly Review*,

April, 1912, January, 1913, which I am glad to have, because it gives me the opportunity of saying that the critical hero of the hilarity at the lions was the writer of the April article. You seemed to share my suspicion as to what he would do in the presence of even one lion. But I further welcome the opportunity the reference gives me of saying that the Editor, then Principal Headlam, withdrew "unreservedly" the objectionable words which the reviewer had used. The article does not discuss a single argument in the book. The January number contains an apology for the language used in the former number, but repeats in substance part of the offence without any attempt to face the arguments. His criticism on my essay on **אֵרָא** makes one expect that the epicene use of it has disappeared from the Pentateuch. One is reassured to find it still there.

I am somewhat surprised that any self-respecting Briton should have given the reference to the article on my essay on **אֵרָא** in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1912, No. 23, as it is simply a silly supercilious skit, utterly unworthy of such a great nation of scholars as Germany is. The writer is so absurd as to represent me as claiming to have made the discovery that **אֵרָא** is epicene in the Pentateuch!!! If the misrepresentation was intentional, it is highly discreditable as well as silly. Professor Bennett may have desired that I should have the opportunity of showing the folly of the article, and I thank him on that account. I need scarcely say that my discovery was not what has been perfectly well known for two thousand years—at least to everyone conversant with the subject that **אֵרָא** is epicene in the Pentateuch—but was the result of an investigation into the reason for that anomaly, viz., that there was a double pronunciation of it, and the following up of this clue has thrown such light upon the grammatical structure of Semitic and Indo-European languages as to leave no doubt whatever in my mind of their original identity.

This brings me to that part of Mr. Rouse's remarks which deals with strictly philological matters. Though comparative philology has now reached a stage which forbids us thinking of Hebrew or of any Semitic language as the original language of mankind, and the same remark applies to Indo-European language, what is now perfectly certain is that they all sprang from a common source. And I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Institute to the valuable papers of Colonel Conder and Mr. Isaac Taylor, the former

“On the Comparison of Asiatic Languages,” on account of the materials gathered and systematized, the latter “On the Etruscan Language,” as a model of philological investigation.

If any one will take up the study of the pronouns with their variations in Semitic and Indo-European, he will find that the materials are the same but put to different pronominal uses. But the identity can be proved in every department: Mr. Rouse has given valuable examples.

In this connection I may say that the question of Mr. Coles, regarding the date of the name Jehovah and its use among the Hebrews, leads me to point out that the form of the name shows it to have belonged to the early period when the Hebrews had the active form of  $\text{הָיָה}$  *hayah*, “to be,” in use, whatever its meaning may then have been. Therefore the name must have been in use before the Hebrew and Aramaic Semites parted. The former took the passive form of the verb to express “to be,” though there are a few instances of the old active; the latter kept the old active form in developing the same meaning. The cause of the difference is one which we see every day. One man says, “I was able to do so and so,” another says, “I was enabled to do so and so.” This distinction the original Semitic-Indo-European could express by the change of the internal vowel sounds. This is the reason why Semitic languages have their *stative* verbs in *i* or *e*, the old passive form. Then, to take an instance in Indo-European, after all remembrance of their origin had vanished, the genius of the Greeks used these old sounds of their verb “to be” to express their optative mood in its different tenses, attaching them to the end of the verbal stem. This is only an instance. I do not prophesy, but only say what I know will be in a few years, these facts of comparative philology will be taught in all the secondary schools and colleges in the world.

Dr. Thirtle has done good service in bringing Dr. M. Gaster’s important paper to our notice. That one proved fact of the difference in the calendars of Jews and Samaritans, without the slightest attempt of the latter to accommodate themselves to the former, makes as clear as noon that they would have attached as little authority to the Pentateuch itself had it not already been in their possession.

The contribution by Chancellor Lias is of great weight, as he shows the importance of many points which I could only mention.

Those who hold the views of what we may call the old Higher Criticism must adjust themselves to facts. If they do not, they will be left behind. Biblical Science will go on without them to take possession of the Truth which is the inheritance of the Church granted to her by her Lord, with the promised power to enter in and take possession. What she needs now is young minds freed from bias, trained in Semitic languages, with some grasp of comparative philology, to work out the problems her Lord has given her ; so that to all ranks and classes His Word shall come with its old authority, truth, and power, and the imprimatur as of old—Thus saith the Lord.

#### SUBSEQUENT COMMUNICATIONS.

The Rev. Professor SAYCE writes :—

As I am not a Samaritan scholar I do not feel qualified to say anything about the Samaritan Pentateuch on the philological side. On the historical side, however, it is difficult to understand how the Pentateuch could have been received and translated by the Samaritan colony, much less regarded by them as of Divine authority, after their quarrel with the Jews in the time of Zerubbabel. People do not voluntarily accept the theological claims of their enemies. The ignoring of this fact is an instance of that want of the historical sense which is characteristic of the Higher Criticism. It obliges us to conclude that the Pentateuch in its present form was known at Samaria and believed there to be the inspired production of Moses before the close of the Exilic period.

The Rev. Dr. M. GASTER writes :—

I take advantage of your kind invitation to write a few words concerning the paper read by the Rev. Iverach Munro before your Institution. Owing to official duties I was unfortunately prevented from being present, and I will now put in writing as briefly as I can my appreciation of that paper. I will confine myself especially to that part referring to the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The great value—and if I may venture to say so the greatest value—of the paper lies in the successful attempt to fix the time for the introduction of the changes which characterize the Samaritan Pentateuch. From a long study of the Samaritan Pentateuch

in special and Samaritan literature in general, of which I possess possibly the largest collection outside of Nablus, I have come to the definite conclusion that we have in the Samaritan Pentateuch the Pentateuch of the Ten Tribes. Leaving graphical differences aside and changes due to mistakes of the copyists and writers, there remains a solid mass of deliberate interpolations and dogmatic changes behind which must lie the work of authors and scholars. The Hebrew differs somewhat dialectically and synthetically from that of the rest of the Pentateuch.

Although some people have been led astray by incompetent writers who decried the Joshua discovered by me as a modern compilation, it is none the less a fact that the language of the Book of Joshua agrees in its main characteristic features with these very insertions and interpolations found in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and differs on the other hand very considerably from the language used by the Samaritans in their own later compilations.

There can be no doubt that these deliberate changes and interpolations, as well as the compilation of a national history, must go hand in hand if the Samaritans were to maintain their claim that they were the true representatives of ancient Israel, and the "faithful preservers" (Shamerim), as they claim, of the old law of Moses. It seems plausible now in the light of Mr. Munro's investigations that the process of interpolation which may have been going on for centuries had been practically concluded at the time of Hezekiah, and on the occasion mentioned in II Kings, to which Mr. Munro refers.

It is of the utmost importance that the internal evidence of the Samaritan and Hebrew Pentateuchs and the intimate relation which exists between these two versions of the Word of God should be more fully investigated *sine ira et studio*, with less prejudice, less bias, less intolerance, than is displayed by those who claim to be the holders of the only Truth: the ever-shifting, changing Higher Critics, who attempt to tear the Bible to shreds, and are lost in the masses of fragments into which they have dissolved the Bible. The Rock of Scripture remains impregnable. If only more workers would come forward of the character, and with the equipment, shown by the lecturer!