589th Ordinary General Meeting,

Held in Committee Room B, The Central Hall, Westminster, on Monday, April 16th, 1917, at 4.30 p.m.


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 נְכַנְכַ, הֹו', 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... נְכַנְכַ. Oxford University Press, 1912. 1s. 6d. net.*
could have devised anything so simple yet so efficacious as this 

\[ \text{Iv'v} \]

3rd sing. epicene pronoun. Hebrew, it is now certain, compared with Arabic, is like an old medieval 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 

\[ \text{Iv'v} \]

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 

\[ \text{Iv'v} \]

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 \( a \), as in primitive
Indo-European, always resumed the old feminine ending \( t \), thus
retaining the feeling of its being feminine. For example,
\( 
\text{מַגִּשׂ}, \quad sūsāh, \quad \text{is "mare," but "the mare of the king" is}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\text{מַגִּשׂ הַמָּלֵךְ, where the th, another form of}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
t, \quad \text{is resumed because of this idiom.}
\end{equation}

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 Hiphil, 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 Hiphil! 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 Profes-
sor Sayce's Assyrian Grammars, \textit{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 \( הָוהֵי, \end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\text{and, as is there}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
pointed out, the original materials of the extensive pronominal
systems have been the same.

Then philologists will also find that the pronominal root
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\sqrt{hō} \end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\sqrt{shō} \end{equation}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\text{has remarkable affinities, not only with pronouns in}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\text{Semitic and Indo-European, but just as remarkable affinities to}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\text{the groups in these languages with the verbs for \textit{being} and for}
Along these lines they will see that the former developed out of the latter. The original material was the same, and the ablauts \textit{au} and \textit{ai} with their modifications run through the whole development. They answer such questions as—Why is \textit{pio} the passive of \textit{facio}? What is the connection between \textit{sum} and \textit{fui}? What is the derivation of \textit{πονέω}? Why is there no perfect of \textit{ἐμι}? What is the philological connection between \textit{Θεός} and \textit{Deus}?

\textit{Συνη}, \textit{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. \textit{He}, \textit{she}, \textit{it}, \textit{qui}, \textit{quae}, \textit{quod}, \textit{δ}, \textit{η}, \textit{τo}, are derived from the same source as \textit{Συνη}, \textit{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 \textit{Συνη}, \textit{hv'}, outside the Pentateuch. It occurs in the eighth chapter of 1 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 \textit{Συνη}, \textit{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.
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 נְתֵן, הַוָ', 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 נְתֵן, הַו', may have been omitted by a copyist, supplied in the margin by a later hand as נְתֵן, הַו', and then transferred to the text. This may have been the case with Genesis xx, 5, where the Samaritan Pentateuch omits one נְתֵן, הַו', and, as its invariable custom is for the feminine, changes another נְתֵן, הַו', into, נְתֵן, הַו'. Great weight must be attached to these exceptions, because they show that there was no prejudice against writing נְתֵן, הַו', 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, הֹאֵו-וָ for the masculine, הָאֵו-וָ for the feminine. During the sojourn in Egypt, by a well-known phonetic law the change in נְתֵן, הַו', had taken place in Canaan of the ו or ו into י after the ז-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 הָיְתָה, ה'v', 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:

Ivvi,ו שֵׁלֶלֶת אֶתְוַיִּד אֶת-יְסֶר אֶת-יְשַׁר הָיָם q̱ə-yin w̱a̱t-ṯo̱-m̱e̱r q̱a-ṉi-thi 'eth-Jehovah literally—"And
she bare Cain, and said I have gotten a man, even Jehovah."
The proper name כָּיִנ שֵׁלֶת אֶת-יְסֶר אֶת-יְשַׁר הָיָם, 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 כָּיִנ שֵׁלֶת אֶת-יְסֶר אֶת-יְשַׁר הָיָם, qa-ni-thi, "I have gotten,"
back to its biliteral form qn, and gives כָּיִנ שֵׁלֶת אֶת-יְסֶר אֶת-יְשַׁר הָיָם 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 thi, follows the verbal noun. In the imperfect the
pronoun would come first in the form of שֵׁלֶת אֶת-יְסֶר אֶת-יְשַׁר הָיָם. 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 incompleteness 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 נָנָה, 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 נָנָה, qā-nē-thā, from which we separated the pronominal element כו, thā or th. This first pers. sing. pronoun is represented in Ethiopic by נ, क, and the k is that of 'ā-no-kḥā, 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 נ, 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. ב'ו, 'ānō, the first part of 'ā-no-kḥā, is evidently an old nominative form ending in ıs=u. It also is widely distributed in Semitic and Indo-European.

Take now what is left of the verb, נָנָה, qā-nē, and if we compare this with the two forms of the proper noun פֶּנַע, Pēnē-ēl, פֶּנֵע, Pēnē-ēl, which we find in Genesis xxxii, 31–32, we find that the ending י, ī, agrees with the first form. Now the first is the form of the genitive case which ends in ī and the second נ, Pēnē, has the old nominative ending in ā. As has been mentioned, there was also in Semitic a case-ending for the accusative in ā. These old case-endings н, ī, and ō, 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 ī 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 $ā$ of the accusative used to compensate for the loss of the $t$.

If the $t$ of $qā-nī$ 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 $ā$ into $ī$; and this is true in Hebrew of all this class of verbs which end in a vowel. But this $ī$ 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 $qēnh$, so that the long $ā$ before the $u$ 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 $guna$ and $vrddhi$ or vowel-strengthening—$a$ and $ā$ 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 $\lambdaέλοντα$, where the $ai$ 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 $qā-nā-thī$ as the old genitive form or the transferred passive.
To elucidate the matter, take away the ʿ in the middle of ʾqā-ni-thāʾ, as well as the pronoun at the end. We are then left with ʾqān. 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, ʾyāqām, “to arise.” Whereas ʾnān, qā-nāh, has gēnēh as the sec. per. sing. mas. imperative, the same part of qām has ʾqām, qūn, in which the original ū, ā, of au active is resumed.

Take yet another type of the older verbal noun, this time one which has retained the ā of ʾnā which originally marked the passive, ʾšām, ʾṣām, “to place.” Here we have ʾsām, ʾṣām, for the same part of the imperative. The sec. per. plur. imper. of qā-nāh does not occur, but would be ʾnām, qēnām, where the accent is at the end. The same part of qām and ʾṣām are qū-nām and ʾṣē-nām, 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 ʾbān, “to be wise.” This was the passive of the biliteral verb “to build.” The active form was ʾbaʿān, baʿān. A discussion of this verb and some of its derivatives will be found by those interested, in my Research into ʾnaḥ, 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, ʾnaḥ, bā-nāh. The original passive form of the verbal noun was exactly what we have in ēnān.

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 נֶחֶד, kv', in its epicene use with its subsequent development of נָחֵד, kv', 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 נֶחֶד, kv', 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 יָנַן, hâ-nan (ן), "to give graciously," יַל, gal, "to be swift," were at first formed from the ordinary biliteral verbs, like יָשֵׁם, qâm, "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 *i* from the original passive throughout, except in a few
shut syllables. Note, too, the nomen verbi of the second or
intensive form in Arabic, *tag-ti-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
*han-nō-thē*, the verbal noun *hanno* ends in *ō*, a common
modification of the old nominative in *ū*. 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 *ē*.
The “connecting vowel” in the fem. plural of *sā-bhabh*,
*tesubbēnah* is *ē*, 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 *bēnōthē*, “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 *ē*; 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 *ē* 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 \textit{moneo}. The \( e \) is none other than our old friend the genitive. But why should the perfect of \textit{moneo} be \textit{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 \textit{domui} perfect of \textit{domare}, rare as the perfect of a verb in \( a \), is probably a survival of what was once much more extensively used. Indeed, the \( u \) itself may have developed out of the \( u \) with the pronominal \( i \) affixed.

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

The facts do not appear to warrant mere accent as the cause of interchange of \( e \) and \( o \), but the two sets undoubtedly exist. We have already illustrated one, the other is found between the biliteral roots—for example, \textit{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 \textit{Qal}, a passive participle of the form \textit{qā-tūl}, that is with \( ā \) in the first syllable and \( u \) in the second. The \( u \) in the second syllable is
merely the ' 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. "bii-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 ' in it was just the old nominative ' with the pronominal i suffix. The real passive had lain in the first syllable in which ' had in course of time become treated as tone-long. Hebrew, therefore, never lost a first-form passive in ' as has been assumed by Hebraists, because it never developed one, and the forms of passive participle in ' of biliteral verbs were a later development on the analogy of 'i;i, qa-tal. But in many cases the old passive in ' is in the written text, kethibh as it is called, the later ' being recommended to be read. The real active of the old biliteral stem was preserved in the ' of the active form of the participle 'i;i, bó-neh and this ' = 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 qain, and qa-ni-thi. This suggests to us, we have already noted the possibility, that the verbal noun qa-nah 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 ' at the end of the stem may, to him, have marked the transference of the passive ' to the end of the stem. In this case, the original pronunciation would have been qa-nai-thi, the Hebrew unpointed text, qa-ni-thi, remaining unchanged. Compare Arabic ra-mai-tu, "I have thrown," ga-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 eth, which is used before Cain and Jehovah, and which is just the old discarded feminine ending of the pronoun hai-yath, hai-yoth, later hai-yath, hai-yoth, yath occurring in Aramaic, iyya in Arabic, Hebrew 'eth and yath, 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 5 representing the old active vowel in spite of the doubling of the second consonant, one in Genesis xlix,23, שְׂבִיבָה, vā-robū, “and they kept shooting,” and Job xxiv, 24, שָׁבָה, rōmmū, “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 6.

This word שָׁבָה, rōmmū, 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 יָרָה, rawts, “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, יְהֹוָה, 'Eloah. 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, יָהֹוָה, El in the first part, has El either prefixed without a connecting vowel as יָהֹוָה, 'Eldād, or the connecting vowel is i, יָהֹוָה, 'Elīdād. Now 'Eloah goes back to an older stage of language—the stage when יָהֹוָה, Penūel, was the recognized form for combining parts of names, where, as we have already seen, i is the vowel of the old nominative ending. Hence we have in 'Eloah, an old nominative form of combination, 6 being
equivalent to $\ddot{a}$—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. 'Elōah 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$v^\prime$, hy', epicene, and the make of the old verbal nouns, it opens the way here also for the analysis and derivation of this word. Take $\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}$, 'El, 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 'Elōah comes very near it, fifty-five of the one, forty-one of the other.

The problem in 'Elōah, 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 $\mathbf{\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}}$, hy', to guide in the search. But we have the now-ascertained old nominative $\ddot{o}=\ddot{a}$ at the end of $El=God$. Then we are left with $\mathbf{\mathbf{h}}$, $h$. 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, 'Elōhîm. 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 $\ddot{o}$ of 'Elōah. Now in the name $\mathbf{\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}}$, Yah, we have such a word, and just as, in the pronoun, hai, with the $i$-sound coming before $v$ or $w$ in hai-wa changed the $v$ or $w$ into $y$, so here the $\ddot{a}$-sound coming before a $y$ has caused it to disappear in its own sound $\ddot{o}$, and the full name was originally $\mathbf{\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}}$, $y\mathbf{h}$, 'Elōhîm, or $\mathbf{\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}}$, $y\mathbf{h}$, Elō-ya'h or Elō-ya'hâ, both nominative endings. The $y$-sound between the $\ddot{a}$, later $\ddot{a}$, and $\ddot{a}$, disappeared. The $\ddot{e}$ of 'El was treated as tone-long like the $\ddot{e}$ in $\mathbf{\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}}$, bê'n, "a son," $\mathbf{\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}}$, $'ayil$, later $\mathbf{\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}}$, El, "strong" or "mighty," a passive form; a term including stative, was at the root of both, and both $\mathbf{\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}}$ and $\mathbf{\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}}$ in course of time were treated as tone-long, hence $\mathbf{\mathbf{h\mathbf{h}}}$ the sing. of 'Elōhîm, 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 יְהֹוָה, YHWH, but that יהוה, Yah, was not derived from it, but from the same root, יהוה, hauw, 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 יְהֹוָה should be in the singular number, that the name for God should be in the stative or passive form of the primitive noun, while Yah 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 יהוה, 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 Homoeousians, 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 הָיוֹת (hayyot), "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 contemporary language. I waive here the argument from style as not strictly in the sphere of philology, but the consumm ate 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, archaeology, 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 reasoning. 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 xxii, 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 satisfactory 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 pāneḥ, face, Eli, of God, but pānim, a plural word reduced to its construct form pēni,
face of, and *El, God.* If Mr. Munro sees the *ego* of Greek and Latin, and even the *k*u 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 Jab 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.