

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

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

VOL. LII.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W. 1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1920.

618TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, APRIL 12TH, 1920
AT 4.30 P.M.

DR. T. G. PINCHES, M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The HON. SECRETARY announced the Election of the following Members and Associates :—Members : Miss Pelham-Burn, William P. Annear, Esq., F.C.I.S., Alexander Ross, Esq., Colonel W. Sidebottom, J.P., Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., and J. Norman Holmes, Esq. Associates : Lieut.-Col. Arthur Ford-Moore, Frederick J. Bramall, Esq., Robert McCormack, Esq., the Rev. Ivo F. H. Carr-Gregg, and the Rev. George B. Macgarr.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. J. E. H. Thomson, M.A., D.D., to read his paper on "The Samaritan Pentateuch." He requested his friend the Rev. DONALD ROSS, Stratford, to read it for him as his voice was weakened with bronchial catarrh, which Mr. Ross accordingly did.

*THE PENTATEUCH OF THE SAMARITANS: WHEN
THEY GOT IT, AND WHENCE.* By the Rev. J. E. H.
THOMSON, M.A., D.D.

WHO are the Samaritans? At the present time in an obscure quarter of the city of Nablus there are collected together in mean dwellings some 150 souls who claim to be Samaritans—the descendants of the Ephraimite Tribes of Israel. As late as the first half of the seventeenth century there were wealthy communities of Samaritans all over Syria and Egypt. These, however, have all disappeared save this one diminishing, poverty-stricken group. Are they then what they claim to be, genuine Israelites? The orthodox Jewish opinion is that this claim is false; it is maintained that they are the descendants of the Mesopotamian colonists sent by the successive Sargonid Princes of Nineveh to supply the place of the deported Israelites. Many Christians agree with them in this opinion. It is maintained that it is supported by 2 Kings xvii. When this chapter is carefully read it will be found that the evidence it gives in support of this conclusion is not so clear nor undubitable as is thought. Although deportation is asserted, there is nothing said about its being total. All that is asserted is that "God rejected all the seed of Israel until He had cast them out of His sight" (1 Kings xvii, 20); this refers rather to spiritual

privileges—of these all Israel, North and South, were to be deprived. It is expressly applied to Judah as well as to Israel, but we know that *all* Judah was not deported by Nebuchadnezzar; “the poor of the land which had nothing” were left. Moreover, the last verses of this chapter in 2 Kings is addressed to those with whom JHWH had made a covenant. “Howbeit they did not hearken, but they did after their former manner. So these nations feared the Lord and served their graven images” (2 Kings xvii, 40, 41).

Besides, there are grave difficulties of various kinds which beset this view. In the first place it would contradict many other passages in Scripture. In the account of Hezekiah’s Passover it is told that he sent an invitation to Ephraim and Manasseh, “the remnant of you that are escaped out of the hand of the Kings of Assyria” (2 Chron. xxx, 6). From the Ninevite marbles it is evident that Jewish chronology is too long by nearly forty years. This is occasioned by joint reigns as, for instance, Jotham with his father Uzziah, and Jehoram with Jehoshaphat; it seems not unlikely that during the latter years of the life of Ahaz, Hezekiah was his colleague, and that he emphasized the first year of his independent reign by the celebration of a Passover. The first year of Hezekiah as reigning alone may well have been 720 B.C. Whatever difficulty there may be about the chronology of Hezekiah’s Passover there can be no doubt that the Passover of the reign of Josiah was after the fall of Samaria, and the deportation, whatever its extent, had taken place. In the account of it which is to be found in 2 Chron. xxxv, 17, it is said, “The children of Israel that were present kept the Passover”; to show that the writer had in his mind the distinction between Judah and Israel in v. 18 we read, “all Judah and Israel that were present.”*

Further, in Jer. xli, 5, there is mention of men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria, who were bringing offerings and incense to the House of the Lord; this was after the fall of Jerusalem. There are other passages in Jeremiah that seem to have little meaning unless there were still a remnant of the Ephraimite Tribes, whom the prophet thus represents as

* I do not think that evidence from Chronicles is to be dismissed on the plea that the book is non-historical. At all events it is clear that at the time when the chronicler wrote it was believed that a very considerable number of the Ephraimites had escaped from the hands of the Assyrians.

repentant (xxxii, 18): "I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself, 'Thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised. . . . (19) Surely after I was turned I repented,'" and the Divine answer, "Is Ephraim my dear son? Is he a pleasant child?" Such language implies that the Ephraimite Tribes were still to a great extent occupying their own land, and had recently suffered severe chastisement, such as would have been implied in the deportation of the cream of the inhabitants; and that they were now repentant.

Further, there is the evidence of Josephus. Notwithstanding that he had said (Ant. IX, xiv, 1) that Shalmaneser "transplanted all the people into Media and Persia. . . . And when he had removed these people out of their land, he transplanted other nations from a place called Cuthah," he says (X, iv, 5): "Josiah went also to all the Israelites who had escaped captivity and slavery under the Assyrians, and persuaded them to desist from their impious practices. . . . When he had thus purified all the country, he called the people to Jerusalem, and there celebrated the Passover." His evidence is all the more valuable that all through his history Josephus manifests an animus against the Samaritans, always calling them Cuthæans.

The evidence from the monuments supports our contention. Sargon, who conquered Samaria, says that he deported "27,290 persons *from* the inhabitants," implying that he left some. He further says that he appointed a deputy and required from the inhabitants the same tribute as formerly—a deputy would not be appointed over empty fields, or tribute exacted from a waste. Even after the slaughter incident to their successive invasions the Assyrians had left a remnant. Reference might further be made to the physical difficulties connected with the removal overland of a population of not less than half a million a distance of approximately six hundred miles; and then deporting colonists over a similar space to supply their place. It would be enough for the purposes of the Assyrian Government that all the men of wealth or influence, all the prophets, all the priests, all the scribes, should be removed.

It is to be noted that when Zerubbabel refuses the help of the Samaritans in building the Temple, he does not do so because they are not Israelites, but on the ground alone that only to the Jews was the permission granted to rebuild the Jerusalem shrine.

For these reasons we assume the claim of the Samaritans to be genuine Israelites to be valid.

The Samaritan Pentateuch. The main interest in this disappearing fragment of a nation is the fact that they possess a recension of the Pentateuch peculiar to themselves. While in all essential points it agrees with the ordinary Massoretic recension it differs from it in numerous comparatively unimportant respects. Whence did they get it? and when? Did they get it from Jerusalem after Ezra had brought back the last important body of repatriated captives? This is the Critical contention; this explains how the Samaritans had the "Priestly Code" which they maintain was brought from Babylon by Ezra.

In regard to the time when the Samaritans got the "Torah" (to give the book in question its Jewish name), one account is drawn from Josephus. He (Ant. XI, viii, 2) says that Manasseh, the brother of Jaddua the High Priest, excited the anger of the religious of Jerusalem by marrying the daughter of Sanballat, the Governor of Samaria, and was compelled to betake himself thither. He adds that many of the priests and Levites were entangled in such marriages. For his son-in-law Sanballat got permission to erect a temple on Mount Gerizim in which Manasseh officiated as High Priest. It is not said that Manasseh conveyed with him to Samaria a copy of the Law as completed by Ezra. Of course, were there no other reason to doubt the story, Manasseh *might* have brought a copy of the Pentateuch. But is the story true? It appears to be a repetition of what happened in the time of Nehemiah's Governorship when he chased the grandson of Eliashib the High Priest, who also had married the daughter of Sanballat. The Assouan papyri refer to the sons of Sanballat as exercising authority in Samaria. This applies to the time of Darius Nothus, the son of the Artaxerxes who had sent Nehemiah to Jerusalem. It could not be the same Sanballat that had been governor under Artaxerxes, who was governor now in the reign of Darius Codomannus. It is unlikely that the Assyrian name would be repeated in the family when the Assyrian Empire had disappeared. Moreover, it is hardly credible that, after the drastic treatment meted out to Samaritan marriages by Ezra and Nehemiah, within a century a great number of the Levites would have repeated the offence. Josephus' account of events of this period is confused to the last degree. We need not dwell further on it; suffice it to say that the narrative of Josephus is here utterly unhistorical.

Most critics agree that it was in the reign of Artaxerxes that

Manasseh, to give him the name which Josephus gives him, fled to his father-in-law. It is not said in Nehemiah that he did; he certainly might have done so—that, however, is not to say that he probably did so. As according to the Critical hypothesis Ezra had brought the completed Law, and had now been several years in Jerusalem, no chronological difficulty stands in the way of the assumption that Manasseh took the completed Torah with him to Samaria. There are, however, what seem to be overwhelming psychological obstacles to acceptance of this.

Even for the sake of argument it is extremely difficult to admit that the Jerusalem priests would accept the new teaching of Ezra. They had for nearly a century been offering gifts and sacrifices according to some ritual; Ezra, who comes to teach them what he maintains is the true ritual, had not only never taken part in a legitimate sacrifice, he never had even seen one. Was it likely that they would submit to all the new regulations without remonstrance? The only thing that they fought against was Ezra's strained interpretation of the marriage law. Inconceivable as it appears to us, still let it be admitted. Would Manasseh convey to his father-in-law this new ritual? When Sanballat got permission from Darius Nothus to build a Temple and made him High Priest, would he (Manasseh) introduce into it the arrangement of rites and ceremonies which had been introduced by the man through whose influence and authority he had been banished from Jerusalem and deprived of his priesthood? What would be thought of the verisimilitude of a tale which represented a man who had been an Episcopalian curate in Scotland but had been, at the Revolution Settlement, hustled out of his church and home by a mob of Presbyterian zealots, coming to London and opening a Presbyterian conventicle there? It would be regarded as a travesty of human nature. The Critical hypothetical history of Manasseh is as preposterous:—unless human nature differed then from what it is now.

But a difficulty in accepting the Critical hypothesis emerges from another quarter. Would the Samaritans accept the amended Pentateuch at the hands of Manasseh? The Samaritans since the days of Esar-haddon had been worshipping JHWH; and their claim to have done so is not denied by Zerubbabel. Worship in those days meant sacrificial offerings and this meant a certain fixed ritual. If that brought by Manasseh differed from that to which they had been accustomed for a couple of centuries, would they have readily given up their own for this

new ritual offered them by one who had himself fled from it? The books of Ezra and Nehemiah reveal how strong the animus was which divided the Israelites of the North from those of the South. Did a study of the history of the Samaritans exhibit them as ready to accept the religious views of their neighbours, there might be some plausibility in the Critical opinion. On the contrary, the whole history of the Samaritans demonstrates the opposite. They were forbidden to exercise the rites of their religion by the heathen Emperors of Rome; yet they persisted in doing so. They endured savage persecutions at the hands of the Christian Emperors of Byzantium; still they maintained their faith. Though the Moslems have so much in common with the Jews, and on the whole favoured them, they persecuted the Samaritans. Despite all this, they have continued the rites and ceremonies of their faith. Is it at all likely they would take anything quite new from the hands of a runaway priest like Manasseh? If, on the other hand, their mode of worship was the same as that in Jerusalem, then we can understand the reception of a legitimate Aaronic priest. Only if so, the Samaritans must have had the Priestly Code, and indeed the whole Pentateuch before Manasseh came to Samaria.

It may be assumed that the Samaritans did not get their religion or the book which taught its observances from Jerusalem, or through Manasseh, the Jewish priest. Is there any other region whence, or time when, it could come to them? When the Samaritans, as related in Ezra iv, 2, claim to be allowed to assist in rebuilding the Temple in Jerusalem, they assert that "since the days of Esar-haddon king of Assur" they had done sacrifice to the JHWH God of Israel. Though their claim to help is rejected, it is not because their assertion is false, but because it was only to the Jews had Cyrus given permission to rebuild the Temple. When we turn to 2 Kings xvii we find the justification of this claim. The colonists who had been sent to replace the deported Israelites complained to the King of Assyria that JHWH the God of the land had sent lions among them "Because they know not the manner of the God of the land"; that is to say, the mode in which He may be worshipped acceptably. In answer, Esar-haddon sends them a priest or priests to instruct them in the proper sacrifices and ritual, to render JHWH propitious to them. Although it is not said that the King of Assyria sent the Torah with these priests it seems for several reasons highly probable. The Sargonid Princes of Nineveh

were great collectors of religious and ritual formulæ. The great mass of the clay tablets which make up the huge library of Asshur-bani-pal are transcriptions of sacred texts; directions when to offer sacrifice and how to do so; or sacred poems containing cosmology and mythology; very much what the contents of the Pentateuch must have seemed to the Ninevite monarchs. They would not have regarded the priests as properly equipped if they did not carry with them directions in writing in regard to all matters of ritual and worship. Nor would the colonists on their part have been ready to trust the ministrations or instructions of this unlettered priesthood.*

Should it be objected that, according to what we have already stated, there were a very considerable number of the Israelite inhabitants still remaining in Northern Palestine—could they not have instructed the colonists? But they were only the poor of the land, illiterate peasants, shepherds, ploughmen, vine-dressers. Those who could read and write would have been carried away by Sargon. The colonists would not be satisfied that the remembrances of these poor people were adequate to assure them that they were worshipping the God of the land with correct ritual. To the heathen, correctness of ritual was of the highest importance. Hence of the whole Pentateuch, the Priestly Code, that which is declared to be the latest in date of all its component parts would be that alone which would be of value to these colonists.

If these priests brought the Torah, whence did they get it? They must have taken it with them into captivity. The Samaritan history distinctly says that the High Priest conveyed the great Roll of the Law to the *Merj Ninwe*, the "Meadow of Nineveh." Certainly, if there was a Torah it would be carried with them into their exile. It must be assumed that they had had it before. If so, there will be, not improbably, signs in the literature of the

* We wonder that no ambitious *privatdocent* has propounded the theory that it was from these priests and at that time that the Jews got their Torah; and that consequently the Samaritan Pentateuch was really the earlier. In proof of this the alleged fact might be adduced that the stories of Creation, the Fall of Man, the Flood, etc., were brought from Babylonia, whence the Sargonid sacred formulæ were derived. What more likely, then, than that this was the time when these stories were imported into Palestine. Of course, this would imply a total reconstruction of Hebrew history and a re-writing of the prophecies. But Wellhausen has accustomed us to all that!

Northern tribes that the contents of the Five Books were known. The two prophets, Amos and Hosea, are the uncontested remains of Northern prophetic writing. Though Amos was a native of Judah his sphere of activity was the North, and his message would necessarily be conditioned by the amount of knowledge possessed by his audience. He assumes those whom he addresses to know something of the Pentateuchal history; he refers again and again to the fact that as a nation they had been brought out of Egypt and were for forty years in the wilderness (ii, 10; iii, 1; v, 25); he knows of the destruction of the cities of the plain, Sodom and Gomorrah (iv, 11). It is to be noted that in this last case the same word is used in the prophecy in speaking of the overthrow as is used in Genesis. He knows also that Isaac as well as Jacob is the ancestor of the nation. What is most marked in regard to Amos is the numerous references he makes to the sacrificial ceremonial, using technical terms in doing so (Amos iv, 4; v, 21, 22); criticizing even somewhat minute deviations from what was legally enjoined (iv, 5). The order of Nazirites (ii, 11, 12) is noticed, and one of its leading features is referred to; yet the whole section in the book of Numbers relating to the Nazirites is attributed to the Priestly Code. Not less remarkable is the testimony borne by Hosea to the contents of the Pentateuch. His references to patriarchal history are specially to be noted. He is particularly interested in the personal history of Jacob (Hos. xii, 3, 4: "He took his brother by the heel in the womb . . . he had power over the angel and prevailed." In this case what is most to be observed is that the words used are an obvious echo of those which occur in the Genesis narrative, and these words, it may be remarked, are very rare (compare Gen. xxv, 26; xxxii, 28). Yet more interesting from the full knowledge manifested is Hos. xii, 12, "Jacob fled into the country of Syria, and Israel served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep" (compare Gen. xxvii, 43; xxviii, 5; xxix, 18, 27). Like Amos, Hosea knows of the overthrow of the cities of the plain, but in his reference he does not name the two more prominent cities, but Admah and Zeboim (Hos. xi, 8). He refers to the fact that Israel was brought out of Egypt (Hos. xi, 1; xiii, 4). Later events in the early history of Israel are noticed; thus the sin of Baal-Peor is referred to (Hos. ix, 10) (compare Num. xxv, 3, 5; Deut. iv, 3). Hosea, moreover, has repeated references to the Torah, as Hos. iv, 6, "Thou hast forgotten the Law of thy God,"

viii, 1, "They transgressed My covenant and trespassed against My law"; further, the Law is a thing already committed to writing—viii, 12, "I have *written* unto him the great things of My Law." There is an endeavour to invalidate these references by asserting that these things *might* be traditions. Of course, possibility is a very wide thing; we have to do not with possibilities but with probabilities. When Hosea, as we have just seen, speaks of God having written to Israel "great things in His Law," it is beside the question to refer to the possibility of unwritten tradition. This is confirmed by the way in which the words of the Pentateuchal narrative are echoed in the prophetic reference. If it were a question of secular literature, such evidence would be regarded as conclusive proof that the prophets had *read* the Law, and expected that their hearers had read it also. It is even stronger when consideration is directed to the sacrifices and feasts named by Amos with technical exactitude. Amos was not a priest, does not claim to be a regular prophet, brought up in the prophetic schools. Yet plain man as he is, he not only himself knows the technical terms for the sacrifices but expects that those whom he is addressing are acquainted with them also, and with all the regulations in regard to them.

We can thus claim to have shown that it is so highly probable as to be almost a certainty, and that is the utmost that can be attained in regard to the remote past: that the whole Torah, not only all the books, but all the strata into which Critics have split it up, was in the possession of the Ephraimites in the reign of Jeroboam II. The case of Amos, not only as an individual, but as a prophet whose exhortations implied a certain amount of intelligence and information in his audience, requires us to believe that the acquaintance with the Law was widespread, embracing all strata of society. But this implies a very considerable space of time. Even the century during which the dynasty of Jehu ruled, is insufficient to account for it. Ahab or his father Omri would be unlikely to introduce a legal system which condemned alike their practices at home and their foreign alliances; scarcely more likely to do so were the short-lived dynasties which had preceded. We are thus led to conclude that the Pentateuch was a possession which Israel had in common before the division of the Kingdom. If, as Dr. Burney (*Kings*, p. 105) admits, the ceremonies of the Dedication of the Temple agree with the enactments of the Priestly Code (he explains this in the usual high-handed Critical fashion by alleging

interpolation from post-Exilic hands), this implies that the knowledge of the Law has to be carried back to a yet earlier period.

It may, however, be objected that if Esar-haddon's priests brought the Law, why did they not bring more of the books admitted by the Jews to the Canon, especially Joshua? When the situation is considered, the answer is simple. What the colonists wished was the ritual by which they might propitiate the tutelary God of the land which they had been sent to inhabit; Joshua did not contain any directions as to the sacrificial victims, or the mode in which they were to be offered; it was, therefore, not needed. There would, however, be another reason. If we are correct in our idea that a large number of Israelites were left in the land, the story of the conquest of Canaan was a narrative liable to excite this Israelite remnant to rebel against "the Great King, the King of Assyria." There would be yet stronger reasons of this sort to exclude Judges and Samuel. Moreover, the Law was under the custody of the priests, whereas the other books were prophetic. Not only was there no sympathy between the priests and the prophets in the Northern Kingdom, but the prophets, as a class, would be suspect by the Assyrian police. This exclusion of Joshua, it may be remarked, decisively negatives the theory that Joshua is an integral part of the Law; in other words, it shows that we have to do, not with a Hexateuch but with a Pentateuch.

It seems clear that the Samaritans received again from the priests of Esar-haddon the Law which they had lost in consequence of the Assyrian conquest and the deportation of all more lettered people. But what they received was what they previously had had. They thus did not get it from Jerusalem, nor from the Jews.

There is another line of proof which may be followed when it is endeavoured to assign a date to the Samaritan recension. Any one who has seen a Samaritan manuscript, not to say examined it, observes at once that the characters in which it is written are widely different from the square characters in which our ordinary Hebrew Bibles are printed. The Jews themselves admit that the Samaritan script is older than the *Ashurith* which they use for the sacred Torah. The Talmudic account is fairly familiar to all Semitic scholars (*San*, pp. 21b, 22a). "The Law was first given to Israel in the *Ibri* character and the Holy tongue; again, it was given in *Ashurith* writing and Syrian tongue. The

Israelites chose the *Ashurith* writing and the Holy tongue, and left to the *Hediotæ* the *Ibri* writing and the Syrian tongue. Who are *Hediotæ*? Rabbi Chasda says 'The Cuthæans (the Samaritans).'

This script has a close resemblance to that to be found on the Maccabæan coins. This does not imply any very great antiquity. It stands, however, at the end of a long process of evolution. Every manuscript of the Torah with which we, in these days, come in contact, is the resultant of many successive copyings from manuscripts in all the different stages of the script's evolution. Each one of these steps in descent is liable to leave traces discernible in the latest exemplar. These traces are recognized by comparing manuscripts of differing descents. When letters are like, a copyist may confuse one letter with another. But some letters are like in one script while in another the corresponding characters differ very clearly. A person reading a book printed in German black-letter might be liable on cursory perusal to confuse capital *C* with capital *E*, whereas were the words printed in Roman characters confusion would be impossible. When the Samaritan recension of the Torah is compared with the Massoretic there are numerous cases of difference due to this cause. The most frequent of these are occasioned by the likeness of *Daleth* and *Resh*. These letters are not confusingly alike in the Samaritan or Maccabæan. They are certainly very like each other in ordinary square-character Hebrew; but the confusion could not have resulted from this, as from what we have seen above the square character was later than the Samaritan. In the angular script which preceded the Samaritan, and is found on the sarcophagi of Ashmunazar and of his father Tabnith, the resemblance between these two letters is confusingly great. Examples of this confusion are numerous, as has been said; a few of these may be given. In Gen. x, 4, the last named of the sons of Javan (Greece) is in the Massoretic *Dodanim*, but in the Samaritan the name appears as *Rodanim*; with this the Septuagint agrees, reading *Rhodioi*; in the Vulgate Jerome supports the Massoretic reading, as also does the Peshitta. This is evidence that the Egyptian MSS. from which the LXX made their translation agreed with the Samaritan recension. It may be noted in 1 Chron. i, 7, in the *K'thibh*—the text which is to be written—*Rodanim* is found; it has been corrected by the Massorettes into an agreement with Genesis; our Authorized Version follows this; the Revised agrees with the Samaritan. One other example may be taken. When Joseph was negotiating

on behalf of Pharaoh with the famine-stricken people of Egypt, after he had bought their cattle and their land (xlvii, 21), it is said, "As for the people, he removed them to cities from one end of the borders of Egypt even to the other end thereof." The Samaritan is: "As for the people, he enslaved them from one end of Egypt to the other." In this case also the Septuagint is in agreement with the Samaritan, as is also Jerome; the Peshitta agrees with the Massoretic. This confusion cannot easily be imagined if the copyists had before them a manuscript in the Maccabæao-Samaritan script. To explain the phenomena here presented, we are led to the position that at some point in the descent of the MSS. of both recensions there was a period in which manuscripts, were copied in a script like that found on the Zidonian sarcophagi, about 400 B.C. At this point the leading Jewish scribes read *R* while the Samaritan scribes and those who copied the Hebrew rolls in Egypt preferred *D* in regard to certain words. As there is a consensus of the MSS. on both sides, the one set always retaining the one reading and the other the other, it is evident that from this point there has been no dependence of the Samaritan on the Massoretic recension.

The next most frequent case in which there occurs a confusion of letters is *mem* and *nun*. The most striking example of this is the name of Jacob's youngest son. In the Samaritan he is always called "Benjamim," not as in the Massoretic "Benjamin." In this case the Samaritan stands alone, not having the support of the Septuagint. Both names are significant, while the Massoretic means the "Son of the right hand" the Samaritan has the yet more suitable significance of "Son of Days," a reference to the old age of Jacob at the time of his birth. The fact that Benjamin is a child of his father's old age, is referred to by Judah in pleading with Joseph not to retain him in Egypt. There are other instances of this confusion, as Pithon for Pithom. It also appears frequently in the Septuagint, indeed more frequently than in the Samaritan. This confusion is practically impossible in the Samaritan script; in the script on the sarcophagi of the Zidonian kings the difference between these letters is even more marked. When, however, the earlier form of the angular script, found on the Siloam inscription and the stela of Mesha, King of Moab, is looked at, the confusion is quite intelligible. Mesha was a later contemporary of Ahab. This would lead to the conclusion that the independence of the Samaritan recension must be dated at least as far back as the

days of Ahab, about 850 B.C. There are some confusions which seem to be explicable on the idea that the script in use was the earlier form of the angular which is found on a fragment of a bronze dish, which probably is a century older. If this is so, we are back at the time of the division of the kingdom. This implies that the two streams of copying and copyists continued parallel but separate from the days of Solomon.

On a similar line a peculiarity of the Samaritan script has to be pointed out. The student of Samaritan recognizes at once a clear difference in the mode in which the Samaritan codices are written from that in which ordinary Hebrew manuscripts are. In the Samaritan each word is separated from that which follows by a dot. This peculiarity is seen in the Siloam inscription, and in that on the stela of Meshah. In the inscriptions on the sarcophagi of Ashmunazar and of his father Tabnith the place of the dot is taken by a small character like the letter *zain*. No device of this kind is found in the Assouan papyri, nor on the Maccabæan coins. Nor is it found in the inscriptions on Jewish tombs of the second century. On the other hand, in all the Samaritan inscriptions, from the earliest, the words are separated, not as in MSS. by a single dot like a period, but by two dots arranged like a colon.

To estimate the meaning of what has just been said the circumstances must be considered. Let it be supposed that, unlikely as it is, the Samaritans have been so impressed by Manasseh, and by the superiority of the ritual which he has introduced, that they adopted the completed Torah which he has brought from Jerusalem: would not this tend to make everything about the newly-received sacred writing in a sort sacred too? One would expect that every trick of writing, every peculiarity of spelling, in fact, as the Massorettes, with the copy of the Torah which for some reason they took as their model, even the very blunders of the sacred text, would be carefully reproduced, and mystical reasons found for them. But this is not the case. In fact, it is with Deutsch represented as if it were a reproach to it that the Samaritan Torah has no suspended letters, no *majuscules* or *minuscules*. As we have said above, the two streams of manuscript descent have kept quite distinct.

Having considered the differences which distinguish the writing of the Samaritans from that of the Jews, and made deductions from them as to the date of the separation of the two recensions, a difference of another kind claims attention. The Samaritans

not only write Hebrew differently from the Jews, they also read it differently. Although Hebrew is rich in gutturals, as are all Semitic tongues, the Samaritans when they read the Torah or the Aramaic Targum omit them; or what is the same thing, pronounce them all as if *aleph*. When eight hundred years ago Benjamin of Tudela visited Nablus, he remarked on this peculiarity of the Samaritans. It may be that even in the Gospels evidence for this may be found. The Woman of Samaria may have recognized our Lord to be Jew because the first word He would use in requesting a drink begins with a guttural: if He made the request in Aramaic, which He probably would, "*Habi lay mayo eshthe*." Striking evidence of this is afforded by the Samaritan hymns, many of which are alphabetic, some supposed to date even to pre-Christian times; very few of these do not blunder in the position of the gutturals, many begin with *ain* instead of *aleph*. There is evidence enough that all along the Jews pronounced the gutturals. Indeed, they seem to have had a greater number anciently than in more recent times.

The tendency which leads a person, reading aloud from a dead language, to assimilate the sound of the vowels and consonants to those of the living language which he ordinarily uses, is well known. The effect of this tendency is seen in the different ways in which the Classical languages are pronounced in England and in Germany. But in the case before us the tendency has been resisted. For more than a millennium the Samaritans have been surrounded by those who speak Arabic. It is now and has for centuries been their language for all ordinary purposes; very few of them know Hebrew at all. Yet Arabic is richly endowed with gutturals—more so than either Hebrew or Aramaic.

When did the Samaritans adopt this mode of reading Hebrew? It could not have been under the "Rule of the Children of Ishmael," to give the Mohammedan supremacy its Samaritan designation. As we have seen, Arabic would naturally have tended to increase the prominence of these sounds. For nearly thirteen centuries the Samaritans have lived under Mohammedan rule. For more than nine centuries they were under Greek rule. So far as language was concerned, the Roman Empire was a continuation of that of the Seleucids. The Greeks had certainly three of the four gutturals *chi* and the soft and rough breathings. Moreover, they seem to have pronounced *gamma* as the Arabs do *ghain*. We have seen reason to believe that during the Græco-Roman rule the Samaritans did not use the gutturals.

In the Assyrio-Persian period which preceded, Aramaic was the language of government, and it has all the gutturals. The Assyrian is sometimes represented as not using the gutturals, but this is not the case, as the name Sennacherib shows, which, as transliterated into Greek and Hebrew, shows the guttural. The Samaritans must have got this fashion earlier than the rule of Assyria or Babylon, and from some other quarter.

To the north-west of Palestine dwelt the Phœnicians, a people whose influence on world-culture is not to be measured by the scanty strip of territory they inhabited. They spoke Hebrew in a dialect which, judging by the inscriptions which have come down to us, was more nearly identical with that of Israel than is that represented on the Moabite stone. They appear to have had this Samaritan peculiarity. The evidence for this may be found in the Greek alphabet. Classic tradition ascribes the introduction of the alphabet to the Phœnician, Cadmus. The names of the letters and their order suit the tradition. In the Cadmæan alphabet there are no gutturals; yet the Greek language had gutturals, and the Greeks were necessitated to add the Palamedean letters and the breathings. The signs in the Cadmæan alphabet which had no sounds, the Greeks utilized to indicate vowels. The origin of this way of pronouncing Hebrew thus appears to have been an imitation of a fashion of the Phœnicians. The influence of Tyre on Israel was predominant under the rule of the dynasty of Omri, and especially during the reign of Ahab. If, then, the Ephraimites had at that time the sacred Law, they would read it much as the modern Samaritans do. It must be remembered that, notwithstanding the prevalence of Baal-worship, JHWH was regarded as the national God. All the sons of Ahab whose names we know have Jehovistic elements. The prophets who prophesied before Ahab at the gate of Samaria did so in the name of JHWH. There is, therefore, nothing incongruous in the Law being read in the days of Ahab.

There swept over Palestine the terrible flood of the armies of Assyria; Samaria was captured, and all the leading and educated classes were carried away into exile. Colonists were sent to occupy the land, and keep in check the remnant of the Israelites. The language of these colonists would certainly be Aramaic. The result of their residence among the Israelites was the rise of a dialect of Aramaic which contained a large Hebrew element. As there was, according to the Critical hypothesis, no sacred

book to keep it alive, Hebrew would disappear. The priests of Esar-haddon had come certainly, and "taught them the manner of the God of the land," but according to the ruling theory they brought no sacred books with them, consequently there would be no reading to fix a special mode of pronunciation. To this community, which by hypothesis knew no Hebrew, came Manasseh with the completed Law—the Law of JHWH, the God of the land. Manasseh would necessarily read the Law in the Jewish way. Would not his audience, when they accepted the ritual, accept also the way of reading the book which laid down the regulations of this ritual? The Samaritans have done nothing of the kind; they have retained the mode of reading Hebrew which they had inherited from their Israelite ancestors. People so obstinate about the pronunciation would not without strenuous resistance accept the whole Levitical ritual thus being forced upon them.

Such, then, is our case. We maintain that it is in direct contradiction to human nature as we know it that Manasseh, as the Critical hypothesis demands, banished by the Law introduced by Ezra, should preach that Law in the place of his exile. It contradicts all that is known of the Samaritans that they would, at the bidding of a Jewish priest, change their ritual of worship. We have shown from the evidence deduced from the confusions of letters, from which have arisen the differences of the two recensions, that there have been two streams of manuscripts quite independent, their date of separation seeming to be about the time of the schism of the kingdom. Further, we have seen that the mode in which the Samaritans read the Law shows also a marked difference from the Jewish; we have found that this points back to the same period.

On the other hand, not a tittle of evidence is adduced for the allegation that Manasseh, or whoever was the son-in-law of Sanballat, conveyed the Law to Samaria. The only evidence that he conveyed even himself thither is the unconfirmed assertion of Josephus, in a narrative otherwise confused and unhistorical. The Assouan papyri confirm the Biblical date of Sanballat; there is mention of his sons. In the appeal which the Israelites of Assouan say they had made to Samaria there seems to have been no reference to a High Priest: as they had appealed to the Jewish High Priest as well as to Ostanés, the civil governor, it might have been anticipated that, as the matter of their appeal regarded the desecration of a temple, the Samaritan High Priest,

the son-in-law of Sanballat, would have been named. Of course when Nehemiah drove him from his presence, Manasseh *might* have gone to Samaria, and *might* have taken the Law with him, and *might* have persuaded the Samaritans to adopt it; but possibility is not actuality. On the basis of this mere possibility or series of possibilities—highly improbable most of them are, as we have already seen—is erected the whole history of the reception by the Samaritans of the Priestly Code with the rest of the Jewish Torah! It is as much a work of imagination as Dumas' *Three Musketeers*. If this piece of imaginary history is not true, then the whole chronology of the Wellhausen hypothesis is destroyed, and Ezra had no more to do with the compilation of Leviticus than Wellhausen himself. That this is really the case, I think we have proved.

DISCUSSION.

MR. THEODORE ROBERTS instanced the Samaritan woman, in John iv, 12, claiming Jacob as "our" father (not dissented from by our Lord) as supporting the Lecturer's conclusion that the Samaritans were genuine Israelites. He referred to the use by New Testament textual critics of independent lines of transmission to ascertain the original text as showing that the Lecturer's use of the Samaritan Pentateuch to prove the antiquity of the Pentateuch as a whole was a valid argument.

He instanced the disregard of the Scriptures during the Middle Ages, and their rediscovery by Luther, with its tremendous results, as showing that the idolatry of Israel and Judah was quite compatible with the existence of the Pentateuch at that time.

He considered that the suggestion that the purest and most austere literature in the world was the result of a forgery by Jeremiah, as the Higher Critics contended, proved that they had a mind "void of moral discernment," which he believed was a true translation of the word rendered "reprobate" in Romans i, 28.

MR. J. O. CORRIE, B.A., F.R.A.S., said:—Our Lord took occasion to define His mission in the words, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. xv, 24). Yet He had spent two days in Samaria, preaching and teaching (John iv, 39-42). Was not that a recognition of Samaritans being of the house of Israel?

The Very Rev. Dr. M. GASTER said:—I should like to express

my appreciation of the invitation to be present at the lecture of Professor Thomson. Before I proceed in making the few remarks which I deem necessary I should like at once to state that I accept in the main the results arrived at by the Lecturer as far as the antiquity and the independent origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch is concerned. I shall have, of course, to make some reserves, but before doing it, I wish emphatically to express my disagreement with Mr. Wiener's remarks both in tone and substance.*

We are not discussing here, as Professor Thomson rightly remarked, the character and reliability of the Samaritan Pentateuch, but its antiquity. All scholars are agreed that the text as preserved has undoubtedly been manipulated for sectarian purposes; and in the Samaritan Literature, of which unfortunately so little is known besides the Pentateuch, we have even a clear indication as to the time when in all probability these changes have been introduced. I say it is unfortunate, for a better knowledge of that Literature would prove of the utmost importance for the exegesis and interpretation of the Pentateuch itself, as it represents a somewhat different tradition from that which has been handed down to us, and with which we are more familiar through the Greek, Latin and other Versions.

It is a pity that Professor Thomson has omitted in his lecture some of the arguments with which he attacked Gesenius' famous thesis, which for close upon a century have decided in the eyes of scholars the character of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and have thus far been the most formidable argument against the assumed independence of the Samaritan Pentateuch. It is now a fact that, up to that time and until quite recently, our knowledge of that Pentateuch rested solely on the Walton edition, for which only three MSS. had been used, and of these neither the oldest nor the best had been taken as the basis of the edition. It has been a long-standing desideratum to obtain at last a critical edition, and this is happily now being realized. Professor v. Gall has now issued that critical edition, and has used close upon 138 complete and fragmentary MSS. for this monumental work.

Now this has a direct bearing on the lecture before us. The result of this edition is, that, like the Jewish Massoretic Text, all the Samaritan MSS. go back to one single archetype. We have thus

* Mr. Wiener's communication, given on pp. 165-167, had already been read.

before us a text deliberately and carefully compiled on lines parallel to those followed by the Jews, and the similarity goes even further, for I have been able to study the Samaritan scrolls, not only the text in book form, and I have satisfied myself that also in the writing of these scrolls there is a distinct approximation to the rules laid down for the writing of the Jewish scrolls. This is the case also of the famous old scroll ascribed to Abisha, and I venture to say I have been one of the very few who have seen and read this copy, and therein the same rules can be observed. All these texts, and therefore the archetype, contain already those deliberate changes and alterations which are introduced in order to justify the claim of the Samaritans for the sanctity of Mount Gerizim, and such other minor details of a ceremonial character by which the Samaritans have been separated from the Jews. These have afterwards been elaborated by Samaritan scholars and scribes, and I have been lucky enough to discover among them many archaic treatises which throw an unexpected light on the origins of primitive Christianity. I am preparing for publication one of these works dealing with the ceremonies and practices, at which I have been working for the last ten years. And among others we learn from it incidentally the time when, according to their tradition, the Jews had "corrupted" the sacred text. This is much more fully stated in their chronicles, of which I also possess some remarkable copies. They state that neither Eli who, as they allege, had established a Schismatic Tabernacle, nor Solomon, who built a Temple in the wrong place, had tampered with the wording of the text. This was left to Ezra, who was the first to alter the text. Here we have at any rate a definite *tempus a quo* from which we have to work backwards if we are to trace the antiquity of the Samaritan Pentateuch to its remoter origin. It is obvious that the Samaritans would not accept a new-fangled Law if, as the Higher Critics allege, it was the work of Ezra. Nor do I connect Manasseh, the son-in-law of Sanballat, with this Pentateuch. The story told by Josephus is unquestionably wrong in its chronology, and the Manasseh mentioned by him is the man mentioned by Nehemiah. In the chain of the Samaritan High Priests, published by me, which gives the names and dates of these High Priests beginning with Adam, and being carried down to the late High Priest Jacob, Manasseh does not figure at all as

a High Priest, and could therefore not have exercised any influence upon the religious system of the Samaritans, which must have rested upon a sacred book long before in their possession.

I venture to differ from Professor Thomson about the priests who are supposed to have brought back with them from the captivity the old Pentateuch. The Cuthæans and other nations settled by the Assyrian Kings in Samaria were only a military garrison like the Persian and Jewish garrison in Assouan, and that is why the Jews from that garrison appealed to the Military Government in Palestine, Sanballat and his sons, for protection, whilst they also approached the Jewish High Priests in Jerusalem. Those nations worshipped gods in the shape of animals, and therefore they asked for native priests to come and banish these wild beasts. The people themselves continued to live in large numbers on the old soil, and when Hezekiah attempted a reconciliation between North and South, by altering the date of the Passover so as to fit in with the calendar of the Northern tribes, a number of the latter responded to the appeal, whilst the majority of these tribes, still mentioned by their separate names, refused mockingly that invitation. The historic unity of Israel and Judah was a commonplace among these tribes. All throughout the historic period of the Bible they were conscious of their common origin; their festivals were the same, which all rest on historic reminiscences, like the going out of Egypt or the giving of the Law; and in the Bible their history is recorded as being part of that of the common stock. Israel and Judah were both the descendants of the same forefathers; they were indissolubly linked together, and Jeroboam had to take forcible measures to prevent Israelites from going to Jerusalem. All this points to one fact, that they must have been in possession, not merely of traditions, but of identical laws and prescriptions, for sacrifices, for purity and impurity, for the observance of festivals and other details, which make up the life of man.

That the Jews as well as the Israelites may have been ignorant of the Law is not to be wondered at. The religious evolution of every nation follows the same line. The book containing ethical principles is long in existence before the people are trained up to the ideal position in which that law becomes to them sacred and inviolate. From paganism and heathen superstitions which surrounded them on all sides, the Israelites and Jews had slowly

to emancipate themselves. The progress was slow and contrary, influences very powerful; hence the surprise and wonder when the old scroll of the Law hidden away in the recesses or in the foundation of the Temple was suddenly brought to light by the High Priest Hilkiah. This certainly does not mean that the book was then written. On the contrary, the very effect it had on the people shows that they must have known of the existence of such a book, and now felt the guilt of having disobeyed its ordinances.

I also fully agree with the Lecturer that the Samaritans know only the Pentateuch as a sacred book, but I regret to find that he has evidently been misled by those who, with arrogant levity and complete incompetence, have attacked my discovery of the Samaritan Book of Joshua. There is not the slightest doubt about the genuineness and antiquity of that book. A continued study, and especially a minute comparison with the Greek, has removed every vestige of doubt which may have been lingering on.

With this book the Samaritans begin their history, which in some of my MSS. is continued from that period to our times. To them, therefore, the Book of Joshua has no sacred character; it is a part of Secular Literature, and thus the idea of a Hexateuch also becomes impossible, from the point of view of the Samaritan tradition. They, like the Jews, know only the Pentateuch as the Sacred Law of Moses.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that the Torah was in the possession of the undivided house of Israel long before the Schism. It is absurd to assume that the spiritual life of a nation can be moulded by a patch-work, and the highest conception of morality and human happiness can rest upon a fraud, however pious the intention may have been of those who are credited with having committed it. Our thanks are due to Professor Thomson for his excellent paper, and for the challenge he has thrown down to the School of Higher Criticism, which is now slowly waning and ebbing away.

Mr. ROUSE said:—The main arguments of this paper are most convincing and admirable. But two subordinate ones that do not materially help its conclusions I feel bound to modify. It could not have been simply because the men whom Zerubbabel and Joshua refused as co-operators did not belong to the tribe of Judah or of Benjamin that he refused them; for the proclamation of Cyrus, to which he appealed, and which is twice quoted in Holy Writ,

invited everyone of Jehovah's people to go up to Jerusalem and help in building His house there—"Whosoever there is among you" (my subjects) "of all His people, his God be with him and let him go up" (2 Chron. xxxvi, 23; Ezra i, 3). And as a fact some men of Ephraim returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon; for we find enumerated among the returners, men of Bethel, Ai, Michmash, all of which were Ephraimite towns (Ezra ii, 27, 28 : cp. Jos. xvi, 1, 2, 7; xviii, 13; Gen. xii, 8; Jos. viii, 12), and men of Jericho who were descendants of Bethelite colonists (1 Kings xvi, 34). Moreover, the would-be builders who were refused had themselves not claimed to be Israelites, but descendants of much more recent immigrants into Canaan: "We seek your God as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto Him since the days of Esar-haddon, King of Assyria, who brought us up hither" (Ezra iv, 1, 2).

On the other hand, to the passages cited, which prove that a considerable portion of the Israelites belonging to the northern kingdom was left in Canaan by the Assyrian Kings, one may well add the following: Firstly (referring to an event in Josiah's reign), "And they . . . delivered the money which . . . the keepers of the threshold had gathered from the hand of Manasseh and Ephraim, and of all the remnant of Israel, and of all Judah and Benjamin, and of the inhabitants of Jerusalem" (2 Chron. xxxiv, 9). Secondly (after the burning of "the house of Jehovah" in the fifth month of Zedekiah's eleventh year), "And it came to pass on the second day after he" (Ishmael) "had slain Gedaliah" (which was in the seventh month of that year) "and no man knew it that there came men from Shechem, from Shiloh, and from Samaria . . . with meal-offerings and frankincense in their hand, to bring them to the house of Jehovah"—that is, probably, to a tent set up at Mizpah, the seat of government, covering the ark of the covenant, which is never said to have been destroyed, or, like the other furniture of the sacred house, to have been carried to Babylon (Jer. xli, 4, etc. : cp. ver. 1; ch. xxxix, 2, 9; and lii, 12, etc.). Thirdly, the prophecy in Isaiah ix, 1, quoted as fulfilled by the preaching of the Lord Jesus in Matthew iv, 15: "The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, toward the sea beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations; the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; and upon them that dwelt in the land of the shadow of death hath the light shined." "Galilee of the nations" it was

doubtless prophetically called, because in our Lord's time there were a number of Greek towns therein. But, in sending out His Apostles *for the first time* to preach, and to heal, He bade them avoid the Gentiles: "Go not," said He, "into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. x, 1, 5). To these, as He says elsewhere, He in His earthly ministry was sent (Matt. xv, 24: cp. 22).

(The Lecturer hereupon asked Mr. Rouse whether he held the Samaritans to be simply foreigners in our Lord's time, and he answered, "No: they were intermingled with Israelites, as we gather from Josephus (Ant. XI, viii, 7): 'Now when Alexander was dead . . . the temple upon Mount Gerizim remained; and if anyone was accused by those of Jerusalem of having eaten things common, or of having broken the Sabbath, or of any other crime of the like nature, he fled away to the Shechemites.'")

The CHAIRMAN (Dr. T. G. Pinches, M.R.A.S.):—I am sure we have all listened with considerable interest to Dr. Thomson's exceedingly valuable paper, and this notwithstanding that the title must have seemed, to many, to have been, in a sense, somewhat unattractive. I think, however, that we may regard both the paper and the discussion it has called forth as being among the most important of the communications with which the Institute has been favoured. We are therefore not only beholden to the Lecturer, but also to those who have taken part in the discussion, and especially to Dr. Gaster, who has given us, from the riches of his library, and from his own brilliant memory, details concerning the Samaritan Pentateuch which tend to support the author's contention, that the Samaritans are of really Israelitish descent. Unfortunately, Samaritan is not my subject, and I have only made use of the language for comparative purposes, but from the domain of Babylonian literature I can bring forward one illustration of a point touched upon by the Lecturer—that of the use of *hú*, "he," for *hí*, "she." The same thing occurs in Babylonian, especially in inscriptions of a late date, but in this case it is not due to the confusion of letters which resemble each other, like the Hebrew ך and ם, but to the deliberate intention of those who used the language. The words in question are the possessive pronouns -*šu* and -*ši*, the latter being in certain texts

replaced by the former.* This, however, as I have observed, is a minor point, and perhaps not worthy of mention.

I will now ask Colonel Mackinlay to propose the vote of thanks to Dr. Thomson for his noteworthy communication.

Lieut.-Col. MACKINLAY said :—I am sure we all heartily concur in the statement of our Chairman that the paper we have just heard is one of the most valuable, if not itself the most valuable, which has ever been read before this Institute, and we sincerely thank the learned author.

His three lines of argument summarized on p. 152, based respectively on human nature, the errors of copyists during the ages, and the use of gutturals, all converge to the same result. They are most systematic, topical and convincing.

I have the greatest pleasure in proposing a hearty vote of thanks to Dr. Thomson.

(This was carried by acclamation.)

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. HAROLD M. WIENER writes :—I regret that I am unable to endorse the main conclusions of Dr. Thomson's paper. The mass of material available for its criticism is so large that all I can hope to do in the limited time at my disposal is to select two or three outstanding points and make them as short as possible.

1. According to the Hebrew Pentateuch, there are ten commandments. The Samaritan, however, has an eleventh, designed to give dignity to Mount Gerizim, their religious capital. There are also other alterations of the Pentateuchal text made with the same object. I have never heard of anybody who regarded these as original, and consequently I think it unnecessary to waste time in showing from the history how impossible it is that the eleventh commandment should be anything but a forgery. If, however, the Samaritans in fact accepted a Pentateuch attributing to the direct utterance of God Himself a command which was deliberately forged, it seems to me impossible to place any reliance at all on *a priori* arguments as to whether the Samaritans would or would not have accepted Levitical ritual.

2. From another side it is easy enough to show the relative worthlessness of the Samaritan Pentateuch. From a number of crucial

* See, for example, *W. Asia Insc.*, V., pl. 25, lines 41 *cd* and *ab*.

readings one may be selected. In Deut. xxxiv, 1ff., we read that the Lord showed Moses the land as far as Dan. The Samaritans substitute the following statement: "And the Lord showed him all the land from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the River Euphrates, and unto the hinder sea." It requires no prolonged consideration to decide which of the two statements is the earlier and the more credible. The physical impossibility of a view from Moab to the Euphrates speaks for itself. The Samaritans here have rewritten the narrative under the influence of Deut. xi, 24, which they have regarded as a canon of emendation. They have applied it similarly in Gen. x, 19.

3. A third class of arguments may be derived from certain linguistic considerations. It is well known to all students of the Hebrew Bible that the Pentateuch is distinguished from the later books by the use of certain peculiar Jewish forms, such as a special word for these epicene writings of the words for "she," "girl," etc. In these matters, which are generally regarded as archaisms, the Samaritan Pentateuch invariably substitutes the forms found in the later books of the Hebrew Bible. Here it is clearly the less original of the two.

It would be easy to multiply arguments drawn from the comparison of the two texts. I pass to other matters.

4. On p. 150 it is argued "that the whole Torah . . . was in the possession of the Ephraimites in the reign of Jeroboam II." I am unable to accept this statement in anything like its present form, and I have a very definite alternative case to put up. It seems to me that there are two narratives in Kings, both of which I accept as absolutely historical, which entirely dispose of this view. The first is 1 Kings xii, 26-33. We there read that Jeroboam I introduced three great religious abuses, (1) the idolatry of calf-worship, (2) a non-Levitical priesthood drawn from the dregs of the people, and (3) a feast on the fifteenth day of a month which he devised of his own heart, viz., the eighth, resembling in other respects the first in Judah, *i.e.*, Tabernacles, which falls on the fifteenth day of the seventh month. These departures from the Torah incidentally prove its existence, for how could such acts be regarded as making Israel to sin if they were not contrary to any existing law? It seems to me, however, that the very last thing that monarch or priesthood would be likely to do would be to circulate copies of the

Torah which conclusively proved the sinfulness of their entire cult and the illegitimacy of their whole sacerdotal order. Such men could have no use for the Decalogue with its prohibition of images of Deuteronomy, with its insistence on a Levitical priesthood. In the absence of any complaint, we may properly hold that in matters of sacrificial ritual they did not depart unnecessarily from Leviticus, and that, except as specified, there was habitual observance of the provisions of the Law. But I cannot believe that that was based on copies extant in the northern kingdom, for their evidence would have been far too damning to the whole system. I conclude, therefore, that such knowledge of the Torah as existed in Northern Israel was based on custom and oral tradition.

The second material passage is the famous narrative of Hilkiah's find, in 2 Kings, xxii 8ff. His statement is that he had found, not a copy of the Law, but "*the book of the Law.*" That is the correct description of only one writing of all that have ever existed in the world, viz., of the Mosaic autograph. Every other document containing his work is not "*the book of the law*" but "*a copy of the law.*" The subsequent narrative makes it clear that the law had disappeared from view altogether for a time, and that no copies were extant even in Judah. In the circumstances, it is impossible to infer that copies were circulating in Northern Israel.

One point more. It is one thing to adduce evidence to show that the deportation of Israelites was not complete, it is quite another to infer that therefore full-blooded Israelites accepted the eleventh commandment of the Samaritan Pentateuch and joined the sect that worships on Mount Gerizim. The Samaritans were cast out from the worship of which Jerusalem was the centre, and adopted this device to meet their religious needs. It does not in the least follow that men who were entitled to participate in the Jewish observances, and were under no necessity to enter on a heretical course, accepted as a command of God something that was proved by all their history and traditions to be a shameless forgery.

For these and many other reasons, I find myself regretfully compelled to reject Dr. Thomson's hypotheses, but I need scarcely add that I am entirely at one with him in his opposition to Wellhausenism.

The Rev. Professor A. S. GEDEN, D.D., writes:—It seems to me that Dr. Thomson is certainly correct in his contention that, in great part at least, the Samaritans were descendants of Israelites not

deported to Mesopotamia after the capture of Samaria. These would undoubtedly be the larger portion numerically of the nation. The language of the kings of Assyria in the monuments, and their words recorded in the Biblical narrative, are grandiloquent exaggerations, in very remote relation probably to fact. Analogy would suggest that the leading men of every class, the teachers, statesmen, *literati*, the men of wealth and influence, would be carried away. It would be beyond the power, even if it were within the will, of a king of Assyria to transport a great multitude from Palestine across the intervening desert. If a modern instance may be cited—the captive march of our British and Indian soldiers from Kut to Asia Minor—not a third of them in such a case would have survived the journey. Those who were left behind, leaderless and ignorant, were incapable of combination, and found themselves at the mercy of the new settlers, who dispossessed them of their lands and reduced them to the condition of serfs. In all probability a large number, perhaps the great majority, perished of starvation and neglect. Inter-marriage took place between the older inhabitants of the land and the new comers from the east. And it is the fact of this mixed descent which aroused and maintained the antipathy of the stricter Jews of Jerusalem towards their descendants. The measures which Ezra took towards his compatriots who had been led astray were designed to secure them from the influence and consequences of an evil example.

The fact that the Samaritan Canon of Scripture has never contained either the Prophets or the Writings goes far to prove that the Torah was already at the time of the Exile in the possession of the northern peoples, and that they did not receive it either as a gift or as imposed upon them by the Jews returned from Babylon. If they had taken over the books of Moses from the latter, the pre-exilic prophets at least would surely have come into their hands at the same time, and with an equal if not superior recommendation. The *data* are not available for a final judgment. The truth, however, would seem to be that a veto of communication, due partly to mutual suspicion and dislike, existed between the two peoples which was a complete bar to the acceptance on either side of authority or authoritative writings from the other. The Samaritans adhered to their limited “Bible,” written and handed down in their ancient script. The rabbis of Jerusalem and their successors gradually built up a new and greatly enlarged Canon of sacred

books, which they wrote in the newer fount of script learned and practised in Babylonia.

There is much further in Dr. Thomson's most interesting paper which invites comment. I must confine myself, however, to an expression of general agreement with his conclusions, and the hope that the uncertainty and obscurity in which so much of the history of this people is involved may at some future time be removed.

Professor H. LANGHORNE ORCHARD, M.A., B.Sc., writes:—Our hearty thanks are due to the author of this scholarly and interesting paper. The reasoning is clear, cogent, convincing. The gross improbability (and even absurdity) of the down-grade criticism of the Samaritan Pentateuch is well shown, and the author has made out a strong case for his own theory. *Daleth* and *Resh*, *Mem* and *Nun*, are unimpeachable witnesses. Their evidence is conclusive; so also is that furnished by the absent gutturals and by human nature.

We shall thoroughly concur with the last sentence in the paper.

The Rev. CHANCELLOR LIAS, M.A., writes:—I will commence with a few criticisms, and then I will express my opinion of the great value of this paper. We know far too little of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The mere comparison of the Pentateuch in the original with the Authorized and Revised Versions is sufficient to show at what a low level Hebrew scholarship remains when compared with other studies at the present day. I am inclined to think that Dr. Thomson exaggerates the claim of the Israelites in Palestine (p. 144) to be genuine. No doubt this was due, as Dr. Thomson contends (*ibid.*), to the hostility of Josephus. When he lived, the hostility of the Jews to the Samaritans, which had been pronounced ever since the days of Nehemiah and Sanballat, had had time to become chronic. Then Dr. Thomson remarks on the substitution of *Daleth* and *Resh* between the Samaritan and the Massorite text. I had not thought that it had begun so early. I had understood that the Jews brought the square characters back with them from Babylon, where they were then in use. But of course Dr. Thomson will have consulted new sources of information since I glanced at the subject—I never did more. But Dr. Thomson has never remarked on Ps. xxii, 16, where the Massorettes have substituted “as a lion” for “they pierced.” A very bold emendation. But few English people are

aware that it is produced by the lengthening of the shortest letter in the alphabet by doubling its length, (the "jot" of our New Testament) into ך.

I will now make a personal grumble (similar to the amusing attempt by Sir G. MacMunn to pay a compliment to a renowned scholar by calling the invention of a German *savant* a "late recension" of the Pentateuch). Dr. Thomson has said on p. 2, very modestly, but, unknown to him, at my expense, "I do not think that evidence from Chronicles is to be dismissed on the plea that the book is non-historical." Now I do not know whether Dr. Thomson has ever heard of a book called *Lex Mosaica*. It was published more than a quarter of a century ago. But I am happy to say many of the contributors to it are still alive. I happen to be one of them. And in the commencement of the essay allotted to me I venture to question the late Dr. Driver's assertion that "the authors of the Hebrew historical books (save Ruth and Esther), do not re-write the matter in their own language, they excerpt from the sources at their disposal such passages as are suitable to their purpose."* Now, Chronicles is not excepted in any way from this assertion, and I must refer my readers to pp. 210 and 211 in my essay (if it be not a great impertinence on my part), in which I show (1) that the Chronicler sometimes "re-writes the narrative in his own words"; (2) that he adds a few words of his own or of another author; (3) that he leaves out unnecessary circumstances; (4) he inserts passages from other portions of his narrative; (5) (and Dr. Robertson Smith vouches for this) he flatly contradicts his authorities; and so on. But the most important fact of all is that, like all respectable modern historians, he *mentions the authorities he uses*.

Nor does Wellhausen come out of the fray with honour. His rollicking insolence and irreverence to authorities, none of them less than 2000 years old, and some of them much more, is unbecoming in any one claiming to be an historical scholar. If we follow him into his inquiry into the composition of the Pentateuch, we find a not less ridiculous infallibility assumed in his assignment of the "sources."

* I am compelled by considerations of space to be brief in my quotation and my answer to it.

I have left myself no room to speak of the paper which has been read. But you have all of you heard it. What I do not quite agree with I have criticized. The rest is so excellent that it need no panegyric from me. From p. 145 to the end Dr. Thomson's criticism of the critics is withering. And the members of the Institute as a body will heartily endorse the last six lines, in which those pages are summed up.

The Rev. A. H. FINN writes:—With the general trend of Dr. Thomson's able paper, and especially with the conclusion at which he arrives on p. 158, I can most heartily agree, but there are some details in the argument which I am unable to accept.

P. 144 : " For these reasons we assume the claim of the Samaritans to be genuine Israelites to be valid."

Dr. Thomson sets out very clearly the evidence which seems to indicate that at the deportation of the northern tribes some Israelites were left in the land, but that the present Samaritans are the descendants of these, without any admixture, seems to me very doubtful. It is true that Zerubbabel (Ezra iv, 3) does not reject those who wanted to help in the rebuilding of the Temple on the ground that they were not Israelites, but that is only because they had made no such claim. They had merely asserted " we do seek your God as ye do ; and we do sacrifice unto Him since the days of Esar-haddon, King of Assyria, *which brought us up hither*" (Ezra iv, 2). In other words, they identify themselves with the Assyrian colonists of 2 Kings, xvii, 24, and it is inconceivable that Israelites would have done this. Nor is it quite accurate to assert that Zerubbabel rejected their help " on the ground alone that only to the Jews was the permission granted." All he says is " we ourselves together will build . . . as Cyrus, King of Persia, hath commanded us"; that is, their building was in accordance with and authorized by Cyrus' command, but it does not assert that the command was issued " only to us to the exclusion of all others."

Again, the letter of Ezra iv, 7-16, clearly emanated from the colonists whom the " noble Osnapper brought over." There is every probability that the Sanballat who allied himself with Ammonites, Arabians, and Ashdodites to oppose Nehemiah (Neh. iv, 7, 8) was similarly of Assyrian descent and not an Israelite, and it

is clear that Nehemiah classed his daughter among the "strange women" whom it was forbidden to marry (Neh. xiii, 27, 28). It is of course *possible* that there may have been some amount of intermarriage between the Assyrian emigrants and any Israelites that remained in the land, but there is not the slightest hint at this in history, and it seems to me far more probable that the Samaritans of New Testament times and our own day are a mixed race descended partly from the Assyrian colonists and partly from the renegade Jews mentioned by Josephus; hardly therefore "genuine Israelites."

On pp. 151-2 Dr. Thomson seems to adopt the view that the "Ibri character" mentioned in the quotation from the Talmud was the ancient Hebrew script, and the "Ashurith," what is now called the square character. But if so the Talmud statement would not agree with the facts. At what time could it be said that the Law was given "in Ashurith (square) writing, and *Syrian (Aramaic) tongue*"? Also, if the "Hediotæ" are to be identified with the Samaritans, it would not be true that they retained "the Ibri writing and the Syrian tongue"; for, even if the Samaritan character is the "Ibri," the Samaritan Pentateuch is not in Aramaic but in *Hebrew*, "the Holy tongue."

On p. 152 it is stated that *Daleth* and *Resh* "are not confusingly alike in the Samaritan or Maccabæan." I am afraid I cannot agree. The difference in Samaritan is not more marked than in the square character, and on the Moabite stone the letters are sufficiently alike to be easily mistaken if not carefully formed. The resemblance seems to run through most Semitic alphabets, and in Syriac the letters are only distinguished by a diacritical point, placed above or below. This similarity of form may possibly be due to a similarity of sound. In one of the South Indian languages there is a letter so nearly combining the two sounds that the Tari palm is also called the Toddy palm; and I believe that negroes in their broken English often substitute *R* for *D*.

There is, however, the possibility that occasionally one of these letters has been intentionally substituted for the other, as I am inclined to think has been the case in the very instance cited, viz., *Rodanim* for *Dodanim*. There is a remarkable instance of such a substitution in the Samaritan Pentateuch. In Exod. xxiii, 17,

and again in xxxiv, 23, the Samaritan reads Ha-Aron (the Ark) where the Hebrew Ha-Adon (the Lord). The Samaritan reading is both unsupported by the LXX, and violates the grammatical rule that a noun in the construct state cannot take the definite article; yet the variation in two separate passages makes it unlikely that this was an accidental confusion of letters that are alike. I cannot help thinking that the alteration was deliberately made because already it had become customary in reading to substitute Adonai for the sacred name JHWH, and the combination Ha-Adon Adonai sounds awkward.*

As to the agreement of Samaritan and LXX, if we only take isolated instances, it is easy to come to the conclusion that where these two agree against the Hebrew, they must be right and the Hebrew wrong: a full and systematic comparison of all the variations (such as I have been at work on for the last five years) leads to a different conclusion. In the great majority of instances, where the Samaritan differs, the LXX agrees with the Hebrew, and where the LXX differs the Samaritan agrees; and this very large amount of disagreement shows that the two texts are independent. At the same time, there are many passages in which the Samaritan and LXX agree against the Hebrew, and these are too numerous and varied to have been arrived at independently. The only reasonable explanation of this is that both Samaritan and LXX are based upon an earlier text which in a good many particulars differed from that which is now received. To have affected the Samaritan, that must have been a Hebrew text, and a careful examination of the character of its divergences tends to show that it was not the true original, but a corruption of the original from which the Massoretic is derived. Even then if the Samaritans could have obtained their Torah from the expelled priest Manasseh (and Dr. Thomson's arguments against the possibility of this are exceedingly weighty), still the Hebrew text underlying it must go back behind the time of Ezra. The probability is that it was the Torah used by the Israelite priest who instructed the Assyrian colonists in Hezekiah's day (2 Kings, xvii, 28), and that may even point to its being the text current among the northern tribes from the time of the disruption in Rehoboam's reign (see *Starting Place of Truth*, pp. 66f. and 90).

* See my *Starting Place of Truth*, p. 32f.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am glad that Members of the Institute, present or absent, have found in my paper so little to which they felt inclined to object. With regard to those present when my paper was read for me, and to whose criticisms I had the opportunity there and then of replying, I shall pass them over.

Although, as Mr. Wiener's criticism was then read, it therefore might be said that I could have answered it (and did to some degree) with those of friends present, yet the answer was necessarily inadequate. I shall therefore consider his objections now more at length. I am afraid Mr. Wiener must have been hindered from reading my paper carefully by the illness which prevented him being present when it was read before the Victoria Institute. Had he been able to do so, he would have seen that I had no intention of putting the Samaritan recension as a whole above the Massoretic, or of denying that there are many late interpolations. These I have considered elsewhere (*Samaritans*, pp. 312-315). We would merely remark that no one reading with unprejudiced eye would regard the direction as to the disposal by the Israelites of "this Law" as an "eleventh Commandment," interpolation although it is. I shall therefore take no further notice of the first three of Mr. Wiener's objections as they deal with matters not in my paper. In regard to objection No. 4, I fail to apprehend its point, especially when taken in connection with his alternative case. Speaking of Jeroboam's "three great religious abuses" he says, "these departures from the Torah incidentally prove its existence." He thinks, however, that "the last thing that 'Jeroboam' would do would be to circulate copies of the Torah." Who ever said that he did? It was generally known independently alike of Jeroboam and of his priests. He thinks that the Roll of the Law found in the days of Josiah must have been the autograph of Moses, that all others were copies, as only it could be called "*the Book of the Law.*" I do not think that at all necessary; it would be enough if it were a copy specially individualized, e.g., by being that placed by Solomon, according to the Egyptian custom, in the foundation of the Temple. Even if it were the autograph of Moses which was found that would not disprove the general diffusion of the Law, or of the knowledge of its contents.

It is to be observed that Mr. Wiener does not combat my initial assumption that the Samaritan Pentateuch is in all essentials the same as that of the Jews. Interpolations are no evidence that the document which has suffered from them is recent, as Mr. Wiener seems to imply; rather the reverse. I respect what I have read of Mr. Wiener's work so much that I am sorry to differ from him so sharply. I can only sympathize with him in the blunders he has fallen into as to the scope of my paper, and regard them as due to illness and haste.*

To Professor Geden, Professor Orchard, and the Rev. Chancellor Lias my sincere thanks are due for their kind words of appreciation. In regard to *Lex Mosaiica*, it is many years since I read it first, but Mr. Lias will no doubt have observed that I rest no opinion either in my Lecture or in my book on the Samaritans on authorities, but on proof, hence I have not noticed the able arguments of the writers of the book mentioned.

I am sorry that Mr. Finn feels himself obliged to differ from me in so many points. His able work on *The Unity of the Pentateuch* I read with great interest when it appeared. In answer to his first objection, I would observe that I do not maintain that "the present Samaritans are descendants" of the remnant of the Israelites "without admixture." Even the Jews cannot claim absolute purity. There seems to have been a considerable admixture in the time of David, e.g., Obed-edom the Gittite, in whose house the Ark abode three months. There is also mention of Uriah the Hittite, Ittai the Gittite, besides the Cherethites and Pelethites. I refer to the message of the colonists elsewhere (*Samaritans*, p. 23). As to his second objection, in regard to "Ibri" and "Ashurith,"

* At the same time Mr. Wiener is not always meticulously accurate in regard to opponents. In his valuable book, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, p. 13, he accuses Mr. Carpenter of error when he says that in Gen. vii, 9, the Targum of Onkelos has LORD for God, as he, Onkelos, habitually paraphrases. This is misleading unless Mr. Wiener regards the English versions as paraphrasing when they print "LORD" instead of "Jehovah." In the passage in question Onkelos has "י" which Levy (*Chaldäische Wörterbuch*) says is used in Talmudic instead of the Tetragrammaton. Jastrow (*Targum Dictionary*) regards it as an abbreviation. Therefore in the case in point it is Mr. Wiener not Mr. Carpenter who has blundered.

I do not feel myself obliged to defend the historical accuracy of the Talmudic statement. I am afraid Mr. Finn had not recently examined either Samaritan MSS. or the coins of the Maccabees recently when he penned his third objection. As more convenient to handle than the Codices, if he will look at the photograph of the Watson Codex in Montgomery's *Samaritans*, p. 288, and be good enough to compare the *resh* (fourth letter) in the top line with *daleth* (second) in the third line, he will see that the Samaritan *resh* was more liable to be confounded with *beth* than with *daleth*. A study of the figures of Jewish coins given in Madden, and in the British Museum Catalogue of the coins of Palestine, will show that the backgoing line which differentiates *daleth* from *resh* is emphasized. I also think he is mistaken when he says that "on the Moabite stone these letters are sufficiently alike to be mistaken." If Mr. Finn will look at any photograph of the Moabite stone he will see that the *daleth* is in every case a triangle while the *resh* always has one side prolonged, e.g., the last letter in the first line is *daleth* and the fifth in the third is *resh*. He will find, I think, that the same thing holds in almost all nearly contemporary inscriptions figured in Lidsbarski, e.g., the Siloam inscription and that of Baal Lebanon. I admit that in the Sinjirli inscriptions the likeness amounts almost to identity, but these inscriptions are a century later in date and removed geographically 300 miles from Palestine. If Mr. Finn cares to look at the *Samaritans* he will find that in the chapter I devote to the relation of the Samaritan to the LXX, I come very much to the same decision he himself comes to. I do not see how Mr. Finn arrives at his conclusion that the Samaritan is derived from "a corruption of the original from which the Massoretic is derived" unless he means that both had a common source and that the Samaritan has suffered more from interpolation than the Massoretic. In thinking that *Rodanim* has intentionally been varied from *Dodanim* Mr. Finn has forgotten that in 1 Chron. i, 7, the *K'thibh* is *Rodanim*.

Let me conclude by again thanking the Institute for their kindness and courtesy.