A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

JOURNAL OF

THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute,

OR,

Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

GENERAL SECRETARY:
E. J. SEWELL.

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

VOL. XLIX.

589TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, APRIL 16TH, 1917,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. JOHN TUCKWELL, M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the preceding Meeting were read and confirmed.

The SECRETARY announced that Mr. Patrick Morgan, Mr. Charles Stuart Thorpe, and the Rev. H. Oxland had been elected Associates of the Institute.

The CHAIRMAN regretted that the Rev. J. Iverach Munro, M.A., author of the paper to be read, on "The Witness of Philology to the Truth of the Old Testament," was unable to be present. In his absence, he would ask the Secretary, Mr. E. J. Sewell, to read the Paper on Mr. Munro's behalf.

THE WITNESS OF PHILOLOGY TO THE TRUTH OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. J. IVERACH MUNRO, M.A.

IN the preface to an account of a research into the origin of a pronoun imbedded in the five books attributed to Moses, published by the Oxford University Press in 1912,* I remarked: "As the Rosetta Stone was the means by which scholars deciphered the Hieroglyphic writing of ancient Egypt, so הוּא, *hv'*, used in the Pentateuch for both masculine and feminine, has been the means of opening up the primitive structure of all Semitic languages, and not only so, but also of establishing the essential unity of primitive Semitic-Indo-European speech.

"With regard to the Pentateuch, this pronoun, with the light it throws on the structure of Semitic speech, is like the invisible ink which shows on exposure to heat, or the water-mark in paper. Its evidential value 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

---

* *Research into the Origin of* . . . . הוּא. Oxford University Press. 1912. 1s. 6d. net.

could have devised anything so simple yet so efficacious as this הוּא, *hv'*, 3rd sing. epicene pronoun.   Hebrew, it is now certain, compared with Arabic, is like an old mediæval building partly in ruins.   Arabic is like the same building restored by a modern architect, many of the original lines and tracery being obliterated in the process."

Every item of relevant knowledge which I have gathered in the interval, and all well-informed criticism on the subject, have confirmed these statements.

Let me remark that no criticism which asserts that I regard הוּא, *hv'*, as the root of the pronoun is worth consideration, because I bring many items of proof, which in combination make it certain that the root was $\sqrt{hv}$ or $\sqrt{shv}$, *sh* being one letter. Not only so, but the whole research goes to show that this pronoun, as well as the main stock of primitive Semitic-Indo-European speech, was biliteral in its consonants, while between these the diphthongs *au* and *ai* were used, expressing *active* and *passive* respectively.   Hence criticism of that description convicts the critic of failure in the most elementary duty of fidelity to what is stated, as well as of lack of apprehension of the bearing of philological facts.

Now, with regard to my comparison of הוּא, *hv'*, to the Rosetta Stone, this comparison lies in the importance revealed by the research and analysis of the one as establishing the fundamental unity of primitive Semitic-Indo-European languages, with the importance revealed by the decipherment of the other, which led to the opening up of ancient Egyptian inscriptions and literature.

The detection of the real cause of the change which universally took place in Semitic languages in the feminine form of the 3rd sing. personal pronoun from *v* to *y* opened up the whole structure of the primitive speech, while the method of expressing *active* and *passive* with the biliteral consonantal roots, and the shedding of the feminine ending *t* which was so extensively developed in Indo-European in the formation of neuter pronouns, in addition to establishing the essential unity of pre-Semitic-Indo-European language, reveals to us the interesting and important fact that, just as to the child everything is living and acting upon it, so to man, in his advent upon this earth, everything was alive, and his speech could as yet only distinguish, grammatically, masculine and feminine, the feminine form of the personal pronoun agreeing with the old passive.

What had prevented Semitic speech from developing a neuter pronoun and neuter nominal inflexion, was the peculiar idiom

by which, when two nouns, the second of which was in the genitive, combined to form one phrase, the first, if it had shed the original feminine ending *t* and become *ā*, as in primitive Indo-European, always resumed the old feminine ending *t*, thus retaining the feeling of its being feminine. For example, סוּסָה, *Sūsāh*, is "*mare*," but "*the mare of the king*" is

סוּסַת הַמֶּלֶךְ, *sûsath hammelekh*, where the *th*, another form of *t*, is resumed because of this idiom.

Indo-European, on the other hand, when once the *t* had gone from the feminine, never resumed it.

On such apparent trifles does the development of language depend. The scientific philologist cannot be too careful in avoiding question-begging epithets, statements, and comparisons which close investigations that ought to be left open. For example, by way of warning, Hebraists were accustomed to speak of Piel and Hiphîl, the intensive and causative parts of the Hebrew verb, as though the language had been constructed intentionally, like Esperanto. In fact, one gentleman, in an edition of a standard Hebrew grammar from which he has expunged every valuable philological note by the original author, actually cites Esperanto in illustration of the Hiphîl ! A more effective way of stifling real investigation could not easily be conceived. Neither of these parts of the verb had originally anything to do with intensive or causative. They were passives, and the Piel of hollow verbs, which are the most primitive in all languages, in Assyrian remained passive in meaning (*see* Professor Sayce's Assyrian Grammars, *in loc.*). Many of their peculiar uses can only be properly understood when their historical development is ascertained.

The users of the language simply developed the materials they had.

The old diphthongs of *au* and *ai* can be traced throughout the ablauts of Indo-European nouns and verbs, and these correspond in a remarkable degree with primitive nouns and verbs in Semitic, that is, with nouns and verbs, with two consonants and a vowel sound between. Those interested will find illustrations in my essay on הוּא, *hv'*, and, as is there pointed out, the original materials of the extensive pronominal systems have been the same.

Then philologists will also find that the pronominal root $\sqrt{hv}$ $\sqrt{shv}$ has remarkable affinities, not only with pronouns in Semitic and Indo-European, but just as remarkable affinities to the groups in these languages with the verbs for *being* and for

making.   Along these lines they will see that the former developed out of the latter.   The original material was the same, and the ablauts *au* and *ai* with their modifications run through the whole development.   They answer such questions as—Why is *fio* the passive of *facio?*   What is the connection between *sum* and *fui?*   What is the derivation of $\pi o\iota\acute{\epsilon}\omega$?   Why is there no perfect of $\dot{\epsilon}\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$?   What is the philological connection between $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}s$ and Deus?

הוא, *hv'*, epicene in the Pentateuch, has opened up the original structure of these languages, and to the philologist the traces occur just like fossils in the rock or knots or grain in wood, revealing their original identity quite unmistakably.   *He, she, it, qui, quae, quod, ὁ, ἡ, το,* are derived from the same source as הוא, *hv'*, with its discarded feminine ending to express the neuter.

Now the evidential value of such a pronoun in the Pentateuch is exactly as I have said, for it fixes the latest possible date of its authorship.

There is only one instance of the epicene use of הוא, *hv'*, outside the Pentateuch.   It occurs in the eighth chapter of I Kings, and if genuine, and not a mere copyist's slip, may have been used in this instance from the Pentateuch.

This pronoun does not say Moses wrote the Pentateuch.   It does infinitely better than that.   It proves that the Pentateuch was contemporary with him.   And, if so, then the unity that pervades it, and proves it to have been the production of a single author, also proves that author to have been, substantially, Moses.   No other is ever even mentioned between the boards of the Old Testament.   It is true that some other must have written the account of his death in the last chapter of Deuteronomy.   It is also true that Moses must have used materials for his work : it is an historical work.   Again and yet again there is the express statement that he was commanded to write in " the " book or in " a " book.   It comes to very much the same thing.   Written materials prove to have existed, and are expressly stated to have been put by Moses in " the " or " a " book, which would be required for the production of just such a work as this.   The essential point is that הוא, *hv'*, proves the materials to be not later than Moses' time.

There are many other philological evidences of the antiquity of the Pentateuch.   Any who would like to see them may be referred to the late Principal Douglas's translation of Keil's " Introduction to the Old Testament " (T. and T. Clark, Vol. I, pp. 44–52), a work of much merit, not a mere translation.   One may say that cutting off these in detail is a hopeless task.   The

favourite device of cutting off the heads of opponents does not succeed when these opponents are facts written in a book. They arise and face scholars in unbroken array.

I may mention that the feminine form of הוא, *hv'*, occurs in the Pentateuch eleven times in all. I have found that in every instance it could be explained, either by its having been inserted from the margin as a gloss, for example, Genesis xiv, 2, "Which is Zoar"; or הוא, *hv'*, may have been omitted by a copyist, supplied in the margin by a later hand as היא, *hy'*, and then transferred to the text. This may have been the case with Genesis xx, 5, where the Samaritan Pentateuch omits one הוא, *hv'*, and, as its invariable custom is for the feminine, changes another הוא, *hv'*, into, היא *hy'*. Great weight must be attached to these exceptions, because they show that there was no prejudice against writing היא, *hy'*, wherever it might occur.

The evidence shows, then, that when Jacob and his family went down into Egypt the old sounds of the pronoun were still used in Canaan, *hau-wa* for the masculine, *hai-wa* for the feminine. During the sojourn in Egypt, by a well-known phonetic law the change in הוא, *hv'*, had taken place in Canaan of the *v* or *w* into *y* after the *i*-sound. Israel in its detached position in Goshen had kept the old pronunciation. On their coming into contact with the highly civilized though morally corrupt Canaanites, the old-fashioned pronunciation was given up.

Then the structure of the Hebrew language itself confirms the Mosaic date of the Pentateuch, as well as the original unity of Semitic-Indo-European. This is a far-reaching argument. Its force can only be appreciated when the analogous case of the Koran is considered. What has rejuvenated, developed, and unified Arabic? Without a doubt the Koran. It is *the* religious book of the Mohammedan world. It is accepted universally among Mohammedans both for religion and as the standard of Arabic. Now what the Koran did philologically for Arabic, preserving the language of the Koraish tribe of a particular date for use and comparison, the Pentateuch did for Hebrew. It fixed the language. The archaisms which undoubtedly exist are as nothing to the established grammatical uniformity which the influence of some standard work accepted by Northern Israel as well as Judah could alone have secured. There exists no other work that could have done this but the Pentateuch. Now the kind of Semitic which is used in that book is indeed in an advanced stage of, what may be called for want of better terms, philological decay. But it bears the marks of being a very

ancient stage, for, not to speak of הוּא, *hv'*, the Hebrew verb has preserved proofs of its origin which do not exist elsewhere, and which have ruled the language in all that remains of the literature.

A concrete example will perhaps be the most interesting method of exposition, and will afford the opportunity of indicating various points of similarity and contrast in the development of the languages. Take the second part of the first verse of the fourth chapter of Genesis: וַתֵּלֶד אֶת־קַיִן וַתֹּאמֶר קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת־יְהֹוָה, *wat-tēledh 'eth-qa-yin wat-t'ō-mer qā-nî-thî 'îsh 'eth-Jehôvah* literally—" And she bare Cain, and said I have gotten a man, even Jehovah." The proper name קַיִן, *qa-yin*, Cain, here, is in the old passive form of the verbal noun, viz. two consonants with the diphthong *ai* between, marking the passive. Not only so, the narrator distinctly traces the verb קָנִיתִי, *qā-nî-thî*, " I have gotten," back to its biliteral form *qn*, and gives קַיִן, *qayin*, the passive meaning " gotten." This takes us back to the time preceding the division of languages, when the verbal noun was fluid, and the pronoun, another verbal noun, could precede or follow it.

In this instance, the perfect of the verb, the pronoun in the form of *thî*, follows the verbal noun. In the imperfect the pronoun would come first in the form of א, *'e*. In the development of the Indo-European verb the pronominal part always came last, for example, λύω, " I loose," λυ, the verbal noun, ω expressing the pronoun. There is also another fact to be noticed, namely, that the Indo-European verb has always a reference to time, present, past, or future, the Semitic only to action, finished or unfinished. By putting the verbal noun first, the completion of the action was emphasized by the Semite ; by putting it second, its incompletion was shown.

We may note also that because the Semites prefixed as well as affixed the pronouns to their verbs, they virtually made it impossible for them to employ prepositions, etc., to modify the meaning of the stem, but apart from this there was nothing inherently different from Indo-European. Hence its expansion took the form of triliteralism. Let me indicate how : New words had to be formed to express new ideas, but just as in Old Edinburgh, because the city walls prevented expansion in horizontal directions, that expansion took place vertically, so in Semitic the pronominal suffix shut off syllabic additions to the end of the verbal noun, and pronominal prefixes in like manner

forbade syllabic additions at the beginning. We can trace the process from biliteral into doubling of the last consonant, then the use of the old case-ending, as in the verb קָנָה, *qā-nāh*, with which we are dealing, the 3rd perf. masc., the *ā* of which may well be the old accusative ending, and there is always the possibility of the transference of the significant vowel-sound from between the biliterals to the end of the stem. Then came the bold introduction of the third consonant which became so popular as to be adopted by the Semitic-speaking world.

With this in mind, let us now return to our Verb קָנִיתִי, *qā-nî-thî*, from which we separated the pronominal element תִי, *thî* or *tî*. This first pers. sing. pronoun is represented in Ethiopic by כֻ, *ku*, and the *k* is that of אָנֹכִי, *'ā-nō-khî*, *I* in Hebrew, represented by the γ of ἐγώ in Greek, *ego* in Latin, etc. The *q* of *qui, quae, quod* is from the same source; and as Mr. Sewell pointed out in his interesting paper on Pompeii, this Latin *q* is found in Oscan (but is not confined to Oscan) under the form of *p*. See "Transactions of the Victoria Institute," 1913, p. 122. So that philologists will see from this one instance how widely extended are the sounds springing from $\sqrt{hv}$, for the *q* is simply the *h*-sound pronounced further back in the mouth until it has reached the guttural *q*, while the *p* is the result of a journey by small stages in the opposite direction, forward in the mouth, until finally the closed lips are brought into operation in the Oscan *p*. אָנוֹ, *'ānō*, the first part of *'ā-nō-khî*, is evidently an old nominative form ending in *ō=u*. It also is widely distributed in Semitic and Indo-European.

Take now what is left of the verb, קָנִי, *qā-nî*, and if we compare this with the two forms of the proper noun פְּנִיאֵל, *Pĕnî-'ēl*, פְּנוּאֵל, *Pĕnû-'ēl*, which we find in Genesis xxxii, 31–32, we find that the ending ִי, *î*, agrees with the first form. Now the first is the form of the genitive case which ends in *î* and the second פְּנוּ, *Pĕnû*, has the old nominative ending in *û*. As has been mentioned, there was also in Semitic a case-ending for the accusative in *ā*. These old case-endings *u*, *i*, and *a*, for nominative, genitive, and accusative, were part of the common stock of the parent speech of Semitic-Indo-European, and with the endings *m* and *n*, along with the original feminine *t* ending, play a most important part in the development of verbs, nouns, and participles in Indo-European. Even the *ā* of the feminine

pre-Semitic-Indo-European may be the $\bar{a}$ of the accusative used to compensate for the loss of the t.

If the i of $q\bar{a}$-$n\hat{i}$ be the genitive form of the verbal noun it is particularly interesting, because Hebrew adopted the genitive form of ending for plural masculine nouns, and does not now distinguish cases by their endings. But there is another explanation, as we shall see.

Here, in this particular type of verb, while the old passive meaning of *Cain* is distinctly remembered by the writer of Genesis, and the noun used accordingly, the verbal noun contained in the verb itself has changed the old nominative ending $\hat{u}$ into i; and this is true in Hebrew of all this class of verbs which end in a vowel. But this i may have been originally the ai of the passive transferred to the end of the stem, as in Sanscrit. If this were so, it would prove a very ancient date for the original expression.

Along with this change there also arose a shifting of the accent, as is seen in the imperative קְנֵה, *qĕnēh*, so that the long $\bar{a}$ before the n becomes a very short, indistinct vowel.

All these phenomena are present in Indo-European.

Here I may say that the discovery of the original vowels in the parent language of Indo-European by the philologists engaged in these studies has proved of the greatest value. It laid a scientific basis for the comparison of the vowel-sounds in Semitic and Indo-European. What in the latter has hitherto been a meaningless array of interconnected sounds yields up its original forms with meanings in the light of Semitic.

Observe also that Sanscrit, with its *guṇa* and *vrddhi* or vowel-strengthening—a and $\bar{a}$ prefixed to i and u with their modifications—is an invaluable witness, along with the preservation in Arabic of the original forms of the verbal nouns in ai and au, to the feeling in all these languages that the ai and au sounds belonged to the words. The meaning passed out of mind, the feeling remained; hence such curious forms as λέλοιπα, where the οι combines active and passive together. The philological value, then, of such a statement as is before us in Genesis iv, where the original passive form in Cain is preserved, and its passive meaning remembered, along with the later development of the verb, cannot be over-emphasized. That transitional stage is such as corresponds with that of Sanscrit, when it transferred the i of the passive from the middle of the stem to the end, and this holds whether we regard the i of $q\bar{a}$-$n\hat{i}$-$th\hat{i}$ as the old genitive form or the transferred passive.

To·elucidate the matter, take away the *î* in the middle of
קָנִיתִי, *qā-ni-thî*, as well as the pronoun at the end. We are
then left with קָן, *qān*. Now the *ā* here is movable as the tone
is shifted. Contrast this with the older type of verb having two
consonants and a vowel-sound between; for example, קָם, *qām*,
"to arise." Whereas קָנָה, *qā-nāh*, has *qĕnēh* as the sec. per.
sing. mas. imperative, the same part of *qâm* has קוּם, *qûm*, in
which the original ו, *û*, of *au* active is resumed.

Take yet another type of the older verbal noun, this time one
which has retained the *î* of *ai* which originally marked the
passive, שָׂם, *sâm*, "to place." Here we have שִׂים, *sîm*, for the
same part of the imperative. The sec. per. plur. mas. imper. of
qā-nāh does not occur, but would be קְנוּ, *qĕnú*, where the accent
is at the end. The same part of *qâm* and *sâm* are *qû-mú* and
sî-mú, the accent being retained on the stem syllable. These
are just examples. The very same changes present themselves
as meet us in the ablauts of Indo-European. The *a*-sound may
take the place of both *au* and *ai*—that is to say, may be used
for an original active or passive, or, in the later forms of the
verb, may disappear, leaving a very short, indistinct vowel-
sound. Here again Semitic throws its light upon these
changes.

Did time permit, it would be interesting to trace the historical
development of Hebrew. Much material is available for
this purpose. Let me point out how a derived meaning may
monopolize the original verbal noun, while the original physical
meaning passed on with its development to the secondary form
of the word.

Take the verb בִּין, *bîn*, "to be wise." This was the passive of
the biliteral verb "to build." The active form was בּוּן, *baun*.
A discussion of this verb and some of its derivatives will be
found by those interested, in my *Research into* הוא, p. 29 ff.
The metaphorical meaning of being "built" in understanding—
that is, "to be wise"—here took possession, while the original
meaning "to build" passed on with the later form, בָּנָה, *bā-nāh*.
The original passive form of the verbal noun was exactly what
we have in Cain.

Now we have in these most ancient forms of the verb—
biliterals enclosing *au* or *ai*—what justifies one in saying,
"Hebrew, it is now certain, compared with Arabic, is like an old
mediæval building partly in ruins. Arabic is like the same

building restored by a modern architect, many of the original lines and tracery being obliterated in the process."

In tracking הוּא, *hv'*, in its epicene use with its subsequent development of הִיא, *hy'*, for the feminine, I found an ancient form of verbal noun corresponding to the verbal noun which Indo-European scholars had found to be the most ancient forms of those languages, but with the definite evidences of a meaning in the original system of vowel-sounds which they had proved to exist in the parent speech. Arabic, by its preservation of case-endings and its wealth of noun forms, some of which enshrine philological treasures of the utmost value, has preserved for us invaluable aids for the understanding of Hebrew, but it has also preserved evidences of its having built up its verbal system from a later stage of phonetic decay than that preserved in Hebrew. For some of these evidences those interested may be referred to my essay on הוּא, *hv'*, pp. 12, 13, 15, 16. In this connection, when we compare Hebrew verbs having two consonants and a vowel between, with verbs having two consonants which double the second, we find these classes to be very closely allied. When, further, we compare these with the corresponding verbs in other Semitic languages, we find that the language in the Pentateuch has preserved evidences of the most ancient forms of the verbal nouns which lay at the root of Semitic as well as Indo-European.

The two allied verbs mentioned have in the so-called "connecting vowels" in the perfect and imperfect, evidences of the original structure of pre-Semitic Indo-European which are quite unmistakable. We find that the early speech already possessed a nominative, genitive, and accusative in *u, i,* and *a,* as well as the diphthongs *au, ai* between the consonants. Arabic and other Semitic speeches had lost them.

Verbs like חָנַן, hā-nan (חָן), " to give graciously," קַל, *qal,* " to be swift," were at first formed from the ordinary biliteral verbs, like קוּם, *qûm,* " to arise," by the union of the *i*-sound or the *u*-sound contained in the passive and active respectively, being combined with the last consonant, just as the Piel or intensive, which was originally passive, doubled the second letter when it eliminated the *i* or *y.* There is no mystery about the process whatever. The development of sonants, liquid and nasal, in Indo-European arose from the same source, *au* and *ai,* but instead of doubling the consonant the nasal or liquid sound was introduced or emphasized.

The Hiphil, or causative, which also was originally passive, did not double the second, and has preserved for us a curious

but convincing alternation, when one has the key, of *a*- and *i*-sounds in the ordinary verb, while in vowel-Ayin verbs it has long *î* from the original passive throughout, except in a few shut syllables. Note, too, the *nomen verbi* of the second or intensive form in Arabic, تَقْتِيل, *taq-tî-lun*. The long *i* here is a remnant of the original passive form. Now take the first person sing. perfect of these verbs. The verbal noun here precedes the pronoun, and must therefore have been in the nominative case before the pronominal noun, which in turn must have been in the genitive. This is·what we would expect, and when we come to make the investigation we actually have חֲנוֹתִי, *ḥan-nô-thî*, the verbal noun *ḥannô* ends in *ô*, a common modification of the old nominative in *û*. Now, when in the perfect, the noun preceded the pronoun, and was therefore in the nominative, then in like manner in the imperfect, where the verbal noun followed the pronoun, we would expect that noun· to be in the genitive, which it actually is, modified to *é*. The "connecting vowel" in the fem. plural of סָבַב, *sā-bhabh*, "to turn," תְּסָבֶּינָה, *tesubbénah* is *é*, the genitive.

These peculiarities, and others which are too numerous to discuss, in these two classes of verbs, run right through the Hebrew Bible from the Pentateuch to Malachi, or rather, taking the Hebrew order, to II Chronicles. In Daniel there seems to be a revival of the most ancient type in בִּינוֹתִי, *bînôthî*, "I understood," which is not Hiphil, but the old passive form of the verbal noun with the pronominal suffix, Dan. ix, 2. The two classes of verb run into one another, and were originally one. The so-called " connecting vowels " occur also in the derived forms of the verb, but were disappearing from the first. In fact, the Pentateuch secured them just when they were about to disappear from Hebrew, as from Arabic and other Semitic languages.

Turn now to primitive Indo-European verbs, and you find from their endings that they too had the *u*, *i*, and *a*, the *u* and *i* often modified to *ō* and *e*; but, with the exception of the nominative *u*, these were not required in the strict formation of the verb, as the pronominal element invariably followed the verbal noun. Accordingly, you find them there but put to new uses. They are the vowels of the so-called Thematic Stems in Greek. These are the old case-endings put to new uses.

They are also found in the " conjugations " in Indo-European. Verbs ending in *a* have just the old accusative ending, in *e* the

genitive, in *u* or *o* the old nominative. Perhaps more interesting and convincing still, you will find the old genitive in one part of the verb and the nominative in another. The language had lost all idea of their origin, but there they are side by side. Take the *e* in Latin, for example, of *moneo*. The *e* is none other than our old friend the genitive. But why should the perfect of *moneo* be *monui*, *u* taking the place of *e* ? The answer is that they built their wall with the stones they had, and took the *u* of the old nominative as their perfect. The form *domui* perfect of *domare*, rare as the perfect of a verb in *a*, is probably a survival of what was once much more extensively used. Indeed, the *vi* itself may have developed out of the *u* with the pronominal *i* affixed.

These facts illustrate one set of *a* s, *i* s (*e* s), and *u* s (*o* s) in Indo-European, and some of their uses. Professor Sayce says, Preface to the second edition of *Introduction to the Science of Language*, p. x : " But as de Saussure was the first to notice, there was more than one ĕ and more than one ŏ in the parent speech. There was, on the one hand, an ĕ and an ŏ which interchanged with one another, as in λέγετε and λέγομεν, the ĕ, as Fick has discovered, marking an originally accented syllable, and the ŏ an unaccented ; while on the other hand we find traces of another and independent ŏ as in πόσις, *potis*, as well as of another and independent ĕ."

The facts do not appear to warrant mere accent as the cause of interchange of ĕ and ŏ, but the two sets undoubtedly exist. We have already illustrated one, the other is found between the biliteral roots—for example, πόσις, to use Professor Sayce's instance. These roots themselves form a most important part of the proof of the original identity of Semitic-Indo-European, which I can do no more than refer to here. Colonel Conder has, however, laid us under an obligation in this respect by his valuable paper "On the Comparison of Asiatic Languages," Vol. 27 of the " Transactions of the Victoria Institute."

These vowels play an important part in the development of Semitic, and the philologist cannot be too careful in making sure whether the *u* is that of the old nominative ending or the active *u* of the primitive stem ; or to speak more exactly as well as more comprehensively, to which set of vowels any ablaut belongs.

To show how far-reaching and important the distinction is: There is in the Hebrew triliteral verb of the first form, or *Qal*, a passive participle of the form *qā-tûl*, that is with *ā* in the first syllable and *û* in the second. The *û* in the second syllable is

merely the $\hat{u}$ of the nominative of the biliteral noun.   To explain
this: only one other Semitic language, Ethiopic, has developed
this form in the Lamedh-vowel verbs, cf. בָּנוּי, $b\bar{a}$-nui, " built."
This form, accordingly, served as a model for a passive participle
of the first form of the verb in Hebrew and Ethiopic, but the
$\hat{u}$ in it was just the old nominative $\hat{u}$ with the pronominal i suf-
fix.   The real passive had lain in the first syllable in which $\bar{a}$
had in course of time become treated as tone-long.   Hebrew,
therefore, never lost a first-form passive in $\hat{u}$, as has been
assumed by Hebraists, because it never developed one, and the
forms of passive participle in $\hat{u}$ of biliteral verbs were a later
development on the analogy of $b\bar{a}$-$n\hat{u}i$, $q\bar{a}$-$t\hat{u}l$.   But in many cases
the old passive in $\hat{i}$ is in the written text, $k\check{e}th\hat{i}bh$ as it is called,
the later $\hat{u}$ being recommended to be read.   The real $\hat{u}$ $active$ of
the old biliteral stem was preserved in the $\hat{o}$ of the active form
of the participle בּוֹנֶה, $b\hat{o}$-neh and this $\hat{o} = au$ active.   Here, too,
Hebrew has preserved the more ancient sounds.   The old
passive of Hebrew and every other Semitic-Indo-European
verbal noun was in ai.
   Now when our passage, " And she bare Cain, and said, I have
gotten a man, even Jehovah," is more narrowly scrutinized, we
see that the writer has no doubt about the connection between
קַיִן, $qain$, and קָנִיתִי, $q\bar{a}$-$n\hat{i}$-$th\hat{i}$.   This suggests to us, we have
already noted the possibility, that the verbal noun $q\bar{a}$-$n\bar{a}h$ was
at the time of the writer (and I wish to emphasize this in the
name of science, because any indication of the writer's opinion
is extremely valuable, he being a contemporary witness) at the
stage of being passive in meaning, and the $\hat{i}$ at the end of the
stem may, to him, have marked the transference of the passive $\hat{i}$,
represented in $Cain$ to the end of the stem.   In this case, the
original pronunciation would have been $q\bar{a}$-nai-$th\hat{i}$, the Hebrew
unpointed text, קניתי, remaining unchanged.   Compare Arabic
رميت ra-mai-tu, " I have thrown," غزوت $\dot{g}a$-zau-tu, " I have
attacked," the latter representing the transference of the old
active, the former the old passive, to the end of the stem.
   The construction of the passive noun with the pronoun,
which constitutes the verb, now becomes plain, which literally
would be " gotten of me."   Then אֵת, $'eth$, which is used before
Cain and Jehovah, and which is just the old discarded feminine
ending of the pronoun hai-$wath$, hai-$w\hat{o}th$, later hai-$yath$, hai-
$yoth$, $yath$ occurring in Aramaic, $iyya$ in Arabic, Hebrew $'eth$
and $\hat{o}th$, should in these early writings have its full deictic

significance. In this passage we can only do so with the name
Cain by emphasizing it. Then if we take *'eth-Jehovah* as a case
of the extremely common *constructio praegnans,* as I think we
should, we have the translation, " even the promise of Jehovah,
that is the seed of the woman who was to bruise the serpent's
head." The full passage would be then : " And she bare Cain
(*gotten*) and said I have gotten a man, even the promise of
Jehovah," which thoroughly agrees with the context.

Having illustrated in a very imperfect way these phenomena
of the old verbal system, I may point out that we have two
instances of perfects in *ō* representing the old active vowel in
spite of the doubling of the second consonant, one in Genesis
xlix, 23, וַרֹבּוּ, *wā-rōbbû,* " and they kept shooting," and Job xxiv,
24, רֹמּוּ, *rōmmû,* " they raised " (Davidson's Hebrew Grammar,
10th to 18th Editions, p. 106). These mark a very ancient stage
of the language, when even the doubling of the last consonant
had only modified the *au* to *ō.*

This word רֹמּוּ, *rōmmû,* in Job, contains an excellent
illustration of what was included under the old active—action
proceeding from the agent himself, which here seems to have a
reflexive meaning, not " to be exalted " but " exalt themselves ";
compare רוּץ, *rauts,* " to run," active, but not grammatically
transitive. Indeed, Renan turns out to be right after all in
regard to the early date of the book of Job. The language in
that book bears marks of the most ancient forms we have in
Hebrew. The evidential as well as philological value of these
can hardly be over-estimated. There may be a perfect mine in
a single word. Take, for example, the word for God which
occurs so often in Job, אֱלוֹהַּ, *'Ĕlôah.* This is a word whose
derivation has been a standing puzzle to philologists. That
it has been so, arises from the fact that the book of Job has
preserved for us a form of derivation which had become
obsolete. Every derivative elsewhere with the name, אֵל *'El*
in the first part, has *El* either prefixed without a connecting
vowel as אֶלְדָּד, *'Eldād,* or the connecting vowel is *i,* אֱלִידָד,
'Elîdād. Now *'Ĕlôah* goes back to an older stage of language
—the stage when פְּנוּאֵל, *Pĕnûēl,* was the recognized form for
combining parts of names, where, as we have already seen, *û*
is the vowel of the old nominative ending. Hence we have
in *'Ĕlôah,* an old nominative form of combination, *ô* being

equivalent to *û*—so old that but for the book of Job it would have been lost—so old that, whereas it has kept the old nominative in its formation, its plural, which in use has completely supplanted it, has taken the form of the genitive, and with very rare exceptions is used with a singular verb. *'Elôah* was already old when the book of Job was written, but not so old as to have become obsolete.   When we use the same key which opened the way into the understanding of הוּא, *hv'*, epicene, and the make of the old verbal nouns, it opens the way here also for the analysis and derivation of this word.   Take אֵל, *'Ēl*, the first part of the word.   This is another word for God, and occurs in the book of Job, as Spurrell points out in his valuable *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Genesis*, p. 370, in the proportion of about a quarter of all its occurrences in the Old Testament.   No other word for God occurs so frequently in Job, although *'Ĕlôah* comes very near it, fifty-five of the one, forty-one of the other.

The problem in 'Ĕloah, as has been indicated, is in some respects like that of the epicene third sing. pronoun in the Pentateuch, with this difficulty added, that there is no הִיא, *hy'*, to guide in the search.   But we have the now-ascertained old nominative *ô = û* at the end of *El* = God.   Then we are left with ה, *h*.   It is evident that *h* cannot have been alone.   The next point is, *h* was probably final, because any addition would have affected the plural form, 'Ĕlôhîm.   Hence our problem is solved if we can find the fitting word or name ending in *h*, but beginning with a letter or letters which would disappear or be absorbed in the *ô* of *'Ĕlôah*.   Now in the name יָה, *Yāh*, we have such a word, and just as, in the pronoun, *hai*, with the *i*-sound coming before *v* or *w* in *hai-wā* changed the *v* or *w* into *y*, so here the *û*-sound coming before a *y* has caused it to disappear in its own sound *ô*, and the full name was originally אֱלוּיָה or אֱלוּיָהוּ, *Elû-yah* or *Elû-yahû*, both nominative endings. The *y*-sound between the *û*, later *ô*, and *ā*, disappeared.   The *ē* of 'Ĕl was treated as tone-long like the *ē* in בֵּן, *bēn*, " a son," אַיִל, *'ayil*, later אֵל, *El*, " strong " or " mighty," a *passive* form ; a term including *stative*, was at the root of both, and both אֵל and בֵּן in course of time were treated as tone-long, hence אֱלֹהַּ the sing. of 'Ĕlôhîm, the most frequently used word for God in the Old Testament.

In the paper which I had the honour of reading before the Victoria Institute in 1913, I gave my reasons for concluding that Jehovah is the correct pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton יהוה, *YHVH*, but that יָה, *Yah*, was not derived from it, but from the same root, הַוּוּ, *hauv*, the same source as that of Zeus, Jove, Theos, Deus, etc., and that the meaning when first used was that of "Maker."

It is remarkable that both elements of אֱלֹהַּ should be in the singular number, that the name for God should be in the stative or passive form of the primitive noun, while *Jah* was originally active in meaning.

Does philology bring us here to see a state of things in that far-off time when men had come to regard God as the "Mighty One" indeed, but as indifferent to the sufferings, the sorrows, and the sins of man, and some great religious reformer had come forward with the good news that the "Mighty One" was the "Maker," and could not from His very nature be indifferent? There is no sign of belief in a plurality of gods in this, the oldest Revelation embodied in a composite name. The plurality lies in the later development, when, in spite of the very assertion of the unity, might, and ownership of the "Maker" in the name 'Elôah, men turned away from that Revelation, and fashioned out of their own imaginations such a plurality, using, strange to say, the very word containing the truth to express their error. We are on firm ground here from the teaching of philology itself.

It is legitimate to ask—indeed, necessary, for science is never a mere recording of facts—Have we any evidence as to when this name for God was developed? It seems to me we have. In the latter part of the name, as we saw, we have Yah. When this can be traced to the same source as that of Jehovah, Zeus, and Jove, etc., we are certified that the languages in which they occur were originally one. Have we not, then, in this name the record of a great religious crisis, when mankind was riven, as it has been so often since, by opposing spiritual forces; as when the *Homoousians* and the *Homoiousians*, which to superficial thinking represents the difference of a letter, but really represents the contents of a faith which can save the chief of sinners, and one which can save no one, were striving for the mastery? Or, may it have formed the centre of the preaching of Noah, that the "Mighty One" was the "Maker," and that men should turn to Him and live? We cannot with certainty tell; but this we do know, that the message was accepted so

completely that the words in which it was expressed became the accepted name of God. The plural form into which it developed is a standing evidence of fact that man has fallen, and ever tends to fall, but for the grace of God, from a purer to a lower conception of Him.

Then another element philology teaches us, apart from sentiment, namely, that language must be prepared to receive and conserve the Revelation, and not until the vast conception of " Being " as the source of all being and action had been conceived and expressed in human speech, could the later development of the knowledge of His manifold working, as we have it from Exodus to the end of Deuteronomy, be given. The sounds of the letters of Jehovah and Jah were ancient with an ancient meaning, the new meaning which had in the interval been developed was the meaning in the verb הָיָה, " to be." This gives light to Exodus iii, 14; vi, 3.

Jehovah Himself takes the new meaning to express Himself ; with that Revelation, and taking up all that lay in Genesis, He proceeds to reveal Himself in all that is recorded from Exodus to the end of Deuteronomy.

Philology now, by its confirmation of the truth of the Record, bids us interpret the further Revelation throughout the history of Israel and Judah. The evidence of philology confirms the truth of the narrative, and therefore the reality of the Revelation. The Book of the Law of Jehovah ruled the language, as it ought to have ruled the conduct, of the Chosen People right on to Malachi. Wherever the Hebrew language as distinct from Aramaic is used, the Pentateuch governs the whole, yet in such a way that one could not possibly put the Hebrew of, say, Ezekiel, Daniel, Ezra, the Chronicles, or Nehemiah into the Pentateuch without showing an incongruency which would at once be detected. What is said of the Pentateuch can with equal truth be said of, for example, Isaiah. Philology says of the supposition that the numerous Isaiahs, by theory scattered up and down the book of Isaiah, spoke in the Exile, is a sheer impossibility. They could not possibly have avoided the peculiarities of the language they and their contemporaries spoke. Their genius, supposing them to have existed then, would certainly have found expression, yet as certainly, not by using with a pathos and passion that even yet carry us away, the language so like that of a man who lived a hundred and twenty years before, hundreds of miles distant, and under vastly different conditions, so like that even those who were familiar

with them put them all in one book, but that of those among
whom they found themselves. There is no truer dictum of
criticism than that the prophet addressed himself primarily to
those among whom he lived, and spoke therefore the contem-
porary language. I waive here the argument from style as
not strictly in the sphere of philology, but the consummate
ease with which every resource of the Hebrew of Isaiah's time
is everywhere brought to bear on the subject in hand, is
unique.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN :—We have frequently had the Higher Criticism
and its supposed results brought to the bar of theology, philosophy,
archæology, and history ; and now we have had it brought to the
bar of philology. The paper to which we have listened would
probably be over the heads of many of us, for we should require
more than a smattering of Hebrew to follow all its abstruse reason-
ing. One could only wish the writer had been present to answer
a few questions which might be put to him.

The reference to the two words JEHOVAH and ELOHIM was of
course particularly interesting. It will be well to remember that
JEHOVAH is a proper name, but *Elohim* a common noun. We find
this latter word not only used for the Divine Being but for other
beings also. It is the more interesting to observe this because
from these two words the Higher Criticism started on its
career.

The word *Elohim* is used as many as 2500 times in the Old
Testament Scriptures, sometimes with the article but more
frequently without. In Genesis it occurs 216 times and only 19
with the article ; in Exodus 138 times, and only 29 with the
article ; in Leviticus 53 times, and never with the article ; in
Deuteronomy 371 times, and only 5 times with the article—in 4 of
which it is simply used for emphasis ; in Joshua 73 times, and only
3 times with the article ; in Judges 73 times, and only 15 with the
article.

Now those who believe that inspired writers were under the
guidance of the Spirit of God in regard to the words which they
chose, cannot but think that there must have been some intention

in this different use of the word.   I should like to call your attention
to a few passages which I am sure will interest you.   In Genesis, for
instance, in the story of the Creation, and right on up to ch. v,
Elohim is used without the article, and undoubtedly refers to the
Almighty Creator ; but in ch. v, verses 22 and 24, it is used for
the first time *with* the article.   It is very striking, verse 22, " And
Enoch walked with *the* Elohim after he begat Methuselah . . . . : "
verse 24, " And Enoch walked with *the* Elohim, and he was not,
for *Elohim* took him " (without the article).   In ch. vi, 2, we read :
" The sons of *the* Elohim saw the daughters of *the* Adam that they
were fair . . . . ."   Who were the sons of *the* Elohim ?   And who
were *the* Elohim ?   Read verse 4 : " *The* Nephilim (giants) were in
the earth in those days (they were not there when the spies brought
up their lying report about Canaan), and also after that, when the
sons of *the* Elohim came in unto the daughters of *the* Adam and they
bare children to them the same became *the* Gibborim which were of
old, men of renown."   Again let us ask who were *the* Nephilim, *the*
Elohim, *the* Adam, and *the* Gibborim ?   Then in verse 9 we read of
Noah, that he " was a just man and perfect in his generations, and
Noah walked with *the* Elohim."   And in verse 11, " The earth also
was corrupt before *the* Elohim . . . . . and *Elohim* looked upon the
earth, and behold it was corrupt."

Now from these passages it does not appear that the two
expressions " Elohim " and " *the* Elohim " were used to designate
the same personalities.   And this use is still more evident in
Exodus xxi, 6 : " Then his master shall bring him unto *the* Elohim "
(" judges ").   On the other hand, in verse 13, we read : " If a man
lie not in wait, but *the* Elohim deliver him into his hand."   But the
verb is in the singular and the reference is undoubtedly to God.   In
ch. xxii, 8, again we read : " If the thief be not found, the master
of the house shall be brought unto *the* Elohim " (" judges "—not God).
In verse 9 : " The cause of both parties shall be brought before *the*
Elohim (judges) and whom Elohim (judges) shall condemn (verb
in plural) he shall pay double."

So you will see that this word is used, not only for the Divine
Being, but for other persons also.   It is a nut for the Higher
Criticism to crack when it cuts up the Old Testament into " J " and
" E " (" P ") documents.   Now the only definition of the word that
I know of when used of beings inferior to the Deity is given by us

our Lord, and is based upon Psalm lxxxii. In verses 6 and 7 we read : " I have said ye are *Elohim*, and all of you are sons of *Elyon* ; but as *Adam* ye shall die, and as one of the *Sarim* ye shall fall." Our Lord quotes the first part of this verse in John x. Some years ago I listened to a lecture by a Unitarian scholar from Oxford, on the Epistle to the Ephesians, and I asked him afterwards whether we were to understand that he intended that our Lord never claimed to be Divine. He said " Yes, certainly." I said, " Surely in John x He makes that claim," and I referred him to verses 34–36. Of course Greek was not the language usually spoken by our Lord, but Aramaic or " Hebrew " : for " gods " we must therefore read " Elohim." Our Lord's argument is briefly this : " If He called them Elohim unto whom the word of Elohim came, do you mean to say that I blaspheme, I who am indeed the Son of Elohim, and thus so much above those who were merely persons unto whom the word of Elohim came ? " Here then our Lord not only rebuts the accusation of blasphemy, but gives us also the only definition of the word " Elohim " that I know anywhere, and I think it is a satis-factory definition. They were persons " unto whom the word of the Lord came." Who they were as personalities in antediluvian times may still be a mystery, but in later times they were " judges."

I offer these remarks as bearing upon one point of the paper only, which is now open for discussion. I must ask every speaker to be as brief as possible.

Mr. M. L. ROUSE, B.A., B.L. :—The writer of the paper refers several times to the Semitic Indo-European Speech. The Bible—to take the Bible evidence first—after enumerating each family of Noah —Shem, Ham, and Japheth—distinctly says : These were their descendants "by their families, by their languages " ; and in the case of the sons of Japheth it says : " By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands." In a paper which I had the honour to read here some twelve years ago, I showed that Hebrew was the first language of all. Why should the Indo-European be singled out ? The languages were never all one, according to our investigations.

The lecturer's attempt to show a genitive in the Hebrew of Genesis is certainly a failure ; for the *i* of Peniel belongs, not to the governed but to the governing word : it is not *pāneh*, face, *Eli*, of God, but *panīm*, a plural word reduced to its construct form *pĕni*,

face of, and *El, God.* If Mr. Munro sees the *ego* of Greek and Latin, and even the *ku* of Ethiopic imbedded in the Hebrew *ānōkhi* (I), he will surely allow that the Chinese first personal pronoun *ngo* lies hidden there also ; and to the Hebrew suffixes *k, kah* (masculine), and *k, ki* (feminine) for *thy,* he will perceive a strong relationship in the Egyptian suffix *k* for *thy,* and the Ojibway Indian *kit* for *thy.*

If languages outside the Semitic and Indo-European groups were investigated they would, I am sure, yield a multitude of resemblances to Hebrew just as the rest have—developed roots, inverted words, and words applied to different or even opposite uses, just such as we should expect to find through the confusion of tongues. (The changing of *q* or *k* into *p* is of course the result of that confusion ; for no one now turns *p* into *k* or *k* into *p,* as little children often turn *t* into *k.*)

Professor LANGHORNE ORCHARD, M.A., B.Sc. :—I should take the meaning of *Elohim* to be the Mighty, specially applied to God as being supremely mighty, and it is applied in the Psalms to all strong angels. The idea is of strength. I think we ought to thank the author of this erudite and skilful paper very warmly for the light thrown upon the Pentateuch. I cannot see with the Author, in regard to the title of "Jehovah," that the earliest conception and title of God by man would be Maker or Creator. I connect Jah with "I am that I am " in Exodus iii, 14, "I am," meaning Jehovah. I think it should be translated as God tells Moses. I do not think there is in the word any idea of making or creating : I think it is rather connected with God's being eternal, and therefore with His unchangeableness.

Rev. A. GRAHAM-BARTON :—There is considerable divergence of opinion in the educated world as to the first language, but I have a shrewd suspicion that the language spoken in Paradise was Hebrew. We may take history as we please, but we have to sum up the whole of the past in forming our calculations ; and I think that God, who inspired Moses to give his Report, had a ripe language ready for him a thousand years at least after the first man. It is well to note that it would be at least a thousand years from the time when the first man appeared, even from a Biblical standpoint, to the time when Moses appeared, and when he wrote his history.

The CHAIRMAN :—As to the antiquity of the Hebrew language, I am surprised that neither in the paper nor in the discussion has any notice been taken of the oldest language of the Babylonian nation known as Sumerian ; but how we can regard a Semitic language as existing before the Deluge and before the existence of Shem I do not know.   That has always been a puzzle to me.   But if the antediluvian language was Sumerian, or some other unknown tongue, then in the Hebrew we have translations of the language spoken in Eden and at other antediluvian times.

The meeting adjourned at 5.45.