

3. Prayers.
4. Read the Old Testament Lesson, looking out all references.
5. Learn by heart six verses of Holy Scripture.
6. Spend half an hour at Hebrew.
7. Spend one hour at some *solid, difficult* book.
8. Read a chapter after midday meal and prayer.
9. Read the Evening Lesson in Greek before going to bed.
10. Visit "house to house" three afternoons or evenings a week, giving the other days to the sick, the congregation, etc.
11. Aim at great particularity and definiteness in intercessory prayer.

Who will guard the guardians? who shepherd the pastors? We are longing for help for our own souls and for our own work. Our Bishops are overworked; they cannot, for want of time, be to us what we long to be to our flocks. By the time the episcopal influence has been distilled to us through the filtering-beds of Archdeacon and Rural Dean, and diocesan magazine and Charge, it has lost the power which personal contact between soul and soul alone can impart. We have great, great needs. "My God shall supply all your need." He will; but we must be "faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." We must know what our special perils are, and in God's power must fight and so overcome them.



The Water-mark in the Pentateuch.

BY THE REV. G. H. ROUSE, D.D.

IT is said that on one occasion the question of the genuineness of a will came before a court of law. The evidence seemed forcible in its favour, and the decision was about to be given on that side, but the judge first asked to see the document. He held it up to the light to see the water-mark, and he found

that the paper was manufactured at a time later than the date of the alleged will. This fact at once settled the question in dispute.

We submit that we have a similar water-mark as to the date of the Pentateuch, unnoticed, like any other water-mark, when attention is not directed to it, but perfectly clear when looked at carefully.

It is well known that in ancient Hebrew writing there were no signs for the vowels; but among the consonants in the Hebrew alphabet are two which, like the letter *y* in English, sometimes represent a consonant and sometimes a vowel. We will call them *w*, with the vowel sound *ū*, and *y*, with the vowel sound *ī*. Separate forms for these two consonants occur in very early times.

There is in Hebrew a pronoun of the third person which, like *ille* in Latin, is sometimes demonstrative (= *that*), and sometimes personal (= *he* or *she*). The masculine form is *hw*, and the feminine form is *hy*.

But whereas in all the books from Joshua to Malachi these two pronouns are uniformly distinct, in the Pentateuch, for the most part, *hw* represents both the masculine and feminine, whereas *hy* occurs very seldom. The latter is found eleven times, the former occurs 195 times.

The fact is undoubted. The latest and best Hebrew Lexicon, commonly called the "Oxford Gesenius," edited by men who belong to the class popularly called "Higher Critics," says: "In the Pentateuch *hw* is of common gender, the feminine form *hī* occurring only eleven times." And the editors, with all their high scholarship, have to add, "The origin of the peculiarity in the Pentateuch is uncertain."

On the neo-critical theory the facts are as follows: In all the Old Testament books, from Joshua onwards, the feminine pronoun is always properly used; it is in form distinct from the masculine. The Hexateuch is the outcome of the literary work of at least six persons, and more if we include revisers. According to the most recent phase of criticism, it is the work of a

number of different *schools* of writers and revisers—that is, of a very large number of persons. These lived in different centuries. They were all accustomed to read and speak and hear the feminine pronoun. Yet the book which is the resultant of all their labour, almost uniformly, through all the first five books of the six, uses the masculine in place of the feminine pronoun, in the JE, D, and P portions alike; and yet, strange to say, it uniformly employs the feminine pronoun all through the sixth book.

The effect is this: The book is written in good Hebrew; in many parts the language is very beautiful, representing the highest type of Hebrew; and yet there are 195 instances of what, to the readers of the book when it was issued, would be as ungrammatical as *hic mulier* in Latin or *ce femme* in French.

Not only so, but where the masculine is used for the *personal* pronoun, the sentences would sound as grotesquely absurd as the following: “Adam called his wife Eve, because *he* was the mother of all living.” “The Egyptians beheld the woman that *he* was very fair.” “Why didst thou not tell me that *he* was thy wife? Why saidst thou, *He* is my sister?” “Said he not unto me, *He* is my sister; and *he*, even *he*, said, He is my brother.” “*He* is the daughter of my father.” “Isaac intreated the Lord for his wife, because *he* was barren.” “He knew not that *he* was his daughter-in-law.”

There is another and kindred peculiarity in the Pentateuch; it is this: the same word is in several places used for *young man* and *young woman*, while from Joshua to Malachi different words are used. This would sound the same as if *lad* were used in English for both genders. We therefore have here and there expressions which would sound to the Jewish readers of the Hexateuch thus: “And the *lad* ran and told *her* mother’s house”; “The *lad* and her mother.” These sentences occur in Gen. xxiv. 28 and Deut. xxii. 15—that is, in both JE and in D.

The result of the whole would be that, if the Hexateuch were brought out at the time to which the Wellhausen school of

critics attribute it, it would, if in its present form, sound to the people of that time as strange as if a memoir of Queen Victoria were to begin thus: "Queen Victoria was born in 1819. He was the daughter of the Duke of Kent. After the death of her father the lad was brought up by her mother."

It is impossible to believe that all these grammatical irregularities and these grotesque absurdities, were in the Hexateuch at the time when, according to present theories, it was brought out. All sections of thought would agree to this. But it is an undoubted fact that these peculiarities exist now.

On the neo-critical theory, then, they must have been inserted at some time. We ask, When could that time have been?

It is inconceivable that these alterations could have been made at a time when Moses was believed to be the writer of the Pentateuch. Moses was so much venerated by the Jews that none of them would dare to alter his writings in such a way as to make them in many places ungrammatical or even absurd.

Nothing would be gained by the alteration, and much would be lost; and even if the alteration were made by some, the Jews who possessed other manuscripts in which there was nothing ungrammatical would not accept it. It must be remembered that *all* manuscripts of the Pentateuch have the peculiarity we are considering, and that the present consonantal text of the Old Testament is substantially the same as it was in the first century.

Since the alteration could not be made when Moses was universally believed to be the writer of the Pentateuch, we are brought back at least to the age of our Lord, because in His time this belief was universal.

The alteration, then, must have been made between the time of Ezra and the time of Christ. At the time of Ezra, on the modern view, the Hexateuch was known to have been issued recently; in the time of our Lord it was universally believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. A universal false belief as to an ancient book could not grow up in a day; hence

the belief in the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch must have existed more or less for many years before Christ. Antiochus Epiphanes made it a special aim to destroy all copies of the law in existence, thus showing both that many copies were spread abroad, and also that in his time, about 170 B.C., the law of Moses was held in the highest veneration. Neo-critics, therefore, have to show how it was possible that in three or four hundred years the universal belief in the non-Mosaic Hexateuch could change into the universal belief in the Mosaic Pentateuch. But in addition to this difficulty we have the further one, which we are now considering, How can we account for the change from the grammatical to the ungrammatical Pentateuch?

The problem thus put before us is this: In Ezra's time the Hexateuch was known to have been prepared by a contemporary, and was in pure grammatical Hebrew; three or four hundred years later the Pentateuch was ungrammatical in 195 places, and was universally believed to have been written by Moses. How did this change take place?

First, what could have been the motive for it? It could not have been done in order to confer honour upon Moses, because the change would have cast dishonour on him; it would have implied that he was so poorly educated that he could not even write his mother-tongue grammatically. It could not have been done in order to give an archaic tone to the Pentateuch, because the neo-critics repudiate the idea that the phenomenon is archaic. As a matter of fact, the usage of the feminine pronoun had been universal for a thousand years, and any reader who read the altered text would not think the alteration archaic, but ungrammatical, and in places grotesque; it would, therefore, not have answered the purpose of making the readers think it archaic. Moreover, if the change had been made intentionally for any reason, why was it not made thoroughly; why was the feminine pronoun left in eleven places?

Next, if any man had been so bold as to make the alteration, could the effort have succeeded? There would have been several copies of the Hexateuch in existence, as it would have

been the authorized history and legal code of the people. If, therefore, one copy of the book had been made ungrammatical, there would have been other copies in existence to show the mistake.

A somewhat similar position to that which the neo-critical system requires in the case before us would be the following : Suppose that at the close of the first century the whole Church believed that the Four Gospels and the Book of Acts had been written in their time, as a connected narrative, and the whole of them were in grammatical language. In the fifth century the universal belief of the Church is that the Four Gospels were written by our Lord Himself, and the Book of Acts by some man. The Book of Acts is written in good style all through, but the books believed to have been written by our Lord are ungrammatical and in parts grotesque. The mistakes would be as strange as would be in English "he say," "thou are," and as if the clause, "And when *he* saw him *he* was troubled," was spoken of the Virgin Mary in Luke i. 29.

It is inconceivable that such a change in the belief of the Church could take place ; and we submit that it is just as inconceivable that the correct language of the Hexateuch should have been changed into the erroneous style of the Pentateuch, and its authorship attributed to a man so highly venerated as Moses.

The "traditional" view of the case is very simple, and solves the whole difficulty ; *the usage in question is archaic.*

The "Oxford Gesenius" says :

The origin of the peculiarity in the Pentateuch is uncertain. It can hardly be a real archaism, for the fact that Arabic, Aramaic, and Ethiopic have distinct forms for masculine and feminine shows that both must have formed part of the original Semitic stock, and consequently of Hebrew as well, from its earliest existence as an independent language. Nor is the peculiarity confined to the Pentateuch ; in the manuscript of the later prophets, of A.D. 916, now at St. Petersburg, published in facsimile by Strack (1876), the feminine occurs written *hw'*. In Phœnician both masculine and feminine are alike written *h'*, though naturally this would be read as *hū* or *hī* as occasion required. Hence, as the Septuagint shows that in the older Hebrew manuscripts the *scriptio plena* was not yet generally introduced, it is

probable that originally *h'* was written for both genders in Hebrew likewise, and that the epicine *hw'* in the Pentateuch originated at a comparatively late epoch in the transmission of the text—perhaps in connexion with the assumption, which is partly borne out by facts, that in the older language feminine forms were more sparingly used than subsequently.

In regard to this extract we have to say :

1. The fact that the same peculiarity appears in one manuscript of part of the prophets, written as late as the tenth century A.D., proves nothing ; it might be due to the ignorance of the copyist, or to his belief that the grammar of the sacred Pentateuch ought to rule all through the Bible, or to some other reason which we do not know. The singling out of this one other instance of the peculiarity in question implies that in all other manuscripts we have the same usage as in the current Hebrew text.

2. The fact that Arabic, Aramaic, and Ethiopic have not the peculiarity does not prove that Hebrew could not have had it in its antique form. It is acknowledged that Phœnician, another Semitic tongue, has it. The passage quoted expresses the opinion that “it is probable that originally” one form “was written for both genders in Hebrew likewise”—which means that the form *is* archaic—and it acknowledges that there is some reason to think “that in the older language feminine forms were more sparingly used.”

3. If it be the case that “in the older Hebrew manuscripts the *scriptio plena* was not yet generally introduced,” the question still remains why, when it was introduced, it was put almost invariably wrong in the highly venerated Pentateuch, and invariably right in all the rest of the Bible.

4. We have already shown how extremely unlikely it is that the peculiarity “in the Pentateuch originated at a comparatively late epoch.”

There is, therefore, no objection to the old view—viz., that the usage we have been considering is archaic—and when we take this position everything is clear. The Hebrews of the time of the Egyptian bondage and the Wilderness wanderings usually, though not uniformly, employed only one form for the

two genders of the third personal and demonstrative pronoun. This usage, therefore, characterized the Pentateuch written at that time, or else the Mosaic documents which lie at the basis of the Pentateuch as we now have it. When the Israelites settled in Canaan, they found the feminine form current in their new surroundings, and adopted it; hence it is uniformly employed in Joshua and the subsequent books. Reverence for the authority of Moses, however, prevented any alteration of the old form being made in the Pentateuch.

If this view be taken, there ceases to be any difficulty on the ground of bad grammar or grotesqueness of expression. Phrases which would be ludicrous in common use sound quite natural as archaisms. We should laugh at a man who talked about "a table and his covering," but "the table, and his staves, and all his vessels" (Exod. xxxv. 13) can be read with perfect gravity. If a man said to us, "My father which lives in London," we should be amused; but if he says, "Our Father which art in heaven," we bow in reverence. Thus, the expressions in the Pentateuch, which, if the book were issued at a late period, would be ungrammatical and grotesque, would be perfectly natural, and even have a pleasant flavour of antiquity about them, if the Pentateuch was written before the other books of the Bible.

It must be remembered that the peculiarity we have been considering is by no means the only one which we find in the Pentateuch. In Spencer's "Did Moses write the Pentateuch after all?" more than a hundred of these peculiarities are enumerated (pp. 225 *ff.*). We find there a large number of words and phrases which are found only in the Pentateuch, and we also find many words which in the Pentateuch have a different meaning from that which they have in the other books of the Bible. The most important of these are given in Canon Girdlestone's pamphlet on "Hebrew Criticism." All this confirms the position that the Pentateuch was written before the other books of the Bible, and that the peculiar use of *hw* for both genders is an archaism.

If a fortieth-century critic should wish to ascertain when the English Authorized Version was made, he could easily learn the latest date by noting that the word "its" nowhere occurs in the book; "his" or "thereof" takes its place. But by the end of the eighteenth century the use of "its" was almost universal. He might, therefore, legitimately infer that the Authorized Version was made before that time.

Is not a twentieth-century critic equally justified in inferring from the use in the Pentateuch of the masculine gender for the feminine, which occurs in none of the other books of the Bible, and in no later Hebrew literature, that the Pentateuch dates from a time preceding all the other books?



Ancient Greek Popyri and Inscriptions.

BY THE REV. I. P. BARNES, B.A.

STRANGE as are the changes which the whirligig of time brings with it, none surely are stranger than that one which places in our hands to-day the trade receipts, leases, marriage contracts, and private correspondence of men and women who lived two thousand years ago. And yet this is what the recent discoveries of the Egyptian explorer have done for us. He has gone to the mounds which mark the site of departed cities, and by patient and watchful digging has brought to light from the rubbish-heaps of ancient towns the refuse documents on which were written long centuries ago the business transaction of the trader, or the inmost thoughts of the parent or lover. This is due to two causes—the dryness of the Egyptian climate, and the nature of the material used by the ancient Egyptians for writing purposes. For a period of about a thousand years, extending long before the Christian era, and for some two or three hundred years after it, the writing-paper of the civilized world was made from the papyrus plant; and, indeed, in a still more distant period papyrus was used in Egypt,