

Reproduced from the Library of the  
Editor of [www.theSamaritanUpdate.com](http://www.theSamaritanUpdate.com)  
Copyright 2011

### **THE THINKER**

A Review of World-Wide Christian Thought.

Vol. I. January to June.

London:

James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street.

1892. London:

Henderson & Spalding, Limited, Printers.

3 & 5, Marylebone Lane, W.

(p. 385) THE SURVEY OF THOUGHT.

THE DATE OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.—Dr. W. D. Wilson, writing in *The Church Eclectic*, for April (published in Utica, U.S.), says: "I call attention to what seems to me a controlling fact, though I do not remember to have seen it so much as referred to on either side of the controversy. The fact to which I refer is the existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch. I suppose that every scholar knows of the existence of this document. Now, when came it into existence? Surely not at the time of Ezra, when most of the writers of the extreme school supposed the Pentateuch to be written; for then, as in the times of our Saviour, the Jews would have no dealings with the Samaritans (see Ezra iv.). The Samaritans would no more have received the Scriptures from the Jews at that time than we would now receive the Koran from the Mahometans, the new bible of the Mormons, or the forged Decretals of the Romanists, as part of our Bible. Of course, therefore, the Pentateuch must have been in existence before that time in Samaria at least, if not in Judaea and among the Jews. Nor does there seem to have been any possibility of the Samaritans having received it from the Jews at any time after the Separation under Jeroboam; that is just at the close of Solomon's reign (B.C. 950). The Samaritans not only had a copy of the Pentateuch at that time, but it must have been old enough to have secured for itself a reception as the word of God. The Samaritans did not dare to reject it, though they did alter it in a few respects, so as to make it less severe and explicit in condemning just such things as they were doing. But if it not only existed at that time (B.C. 950), some four hundred years before the time when our critics claim that it was produced, but had at that early date come into such reverent estimation as is shown by the use they made of it, it must have been written by Moses, or, at least, in his time, and under his direction. The Samaritans did receive the Pentateuch, but they did not receive the Scriptures that were written after the Separation, and which were received by the Jews, and are now received by us, as part of the Old Testament Scriptures, such as the Psalms, the later Historic Books, and the Prophets. Now we have this copy of the Pentateuch, and can compare it with the Hebrew copy, from which our translation is made. And this Samaritan Pentateuch differs from the Hebrew scarcely, if at all, more than the different copies of the early New Testament manuscripts, as the Sinaitic and the Alexandrian, differ from each other; not enough to raise the slightest doubt that they all originated from one source, and are copies of an early copy. As I said, I have never seen this point stated, and I do not see how it can be answered or evaded."

**Comments on this section from the Editor of theSamaritanUpdate.com**

This is referenced #5279 in *A Bibliography of the Samaritans, Third Edition, Revised, Expanded, and Annotated*, by Alan David Crown and Reinhard Pummer, ATLA Bibliography, No. 51, The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford. 2005

### **THE THINKER**

A Review of World-Wide Christian Thought.

Vol. II. July to December.

London:

James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street.

1892. London:

Henderson & Spalding, Limited, Printers.

3 & 5, Marylebone Lane, W.

4 references in this section of the book:

*DATE OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.* by H. D. ASTLEY, M.A. pp.6-8

*DATE OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.* by CANON S. GARRATT, p. 112-114

*SAMARITAN ACCEPTANCE OF THE PENTATEUCH.* by REV. H. HAYMAN, p. 206-211.

*DATE OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.* by H. D. ASTLEY, p. 299-308

(p. 6) **BIBLICAL THOUGHT.**

#### ***DATE OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.***

BY REV. H. D. ASTLEY, M.A.

IN the May number of THE THINKER (a Magazine which all students of theology have hailed with delight) the Editor gives the first place in his Survey of Thought to a paper by Dr. W. Wilson, of Utica, U.S., on the above subject. The Doctor calls attention to what seems to him a "controlling fact" (in the controversy as to the origin of the Old Testament), viz., "the existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch." He argues that it could not have been received from the Jews in the time of Ezra, for by that time the Jews had already come to have no dealings with the Samaritans, nor at any time subsequent to the division of the kingdom under Jeroboam (*circ.* 950 B.C.). He then proceeds to assert that "the Samaritans" had a copy of the Pentateuch *at that date!* Here let me point out a confusion of thought on the part of Dr. Wilson—for surely he must be well aware that the Israelites of the northern kingdom from 950 to 720 B.C. (when Samaria fell, and the people were taken captive to Assyria) were a very different race from the mongrel people of later days to whom alone the name of "Samaritans" is (p. 7) applicable. But *where* does the Doctor learn that the northern Israelites were in possession of a book practically indistinguishable from the Pentateuch in the days of Jeroboam, 950 B.C.? Proceeding, however, on this assumption, he argues that on his premisses the "Samaritan Pentateuch" must have come down in its completeness from the time of Moses, and thus thinks he has discovered a difficulty which the advocates of the Higher Criticism will find it hard to

overcome. He concludes by saying, " I have never seen this point stated, and I do not see how it can be answered or evaded."

What, then, is the most probable date and the most likely origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch? It certainly is a remarkable fact that such a document should be in existence, and still more so that those who possess it should reverence no other part of the Old Testament as Holy Scripture. How may it be accounted for?

Without pretending to any special knowledge on the subject, I would refer Dr. Wilson and the readers of THE THINKER to Prof. H. E. Ryle's recently published book on the *Canon of the Old Testament*, pp. 91-93. The Hulsean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge is discussing the question of the formation of the "First Canon," and he is engaged in proving that it consisted of the Pentateuch only. After referring to the facts that (1) it was always a distinct group, (2) the object of peculiar reverence in the post-Exilic writings, and (3) in later Jewish literature, and that the name Torah, Law, was often applied in later days to the *whole* Hebrew Canon of Scripture, has come to the very point which is here under discussion, and his words are so important that I must beg leave to quote them *verbatim*. He says: "The Canon of Scripture recognized by the Samaritan community, even down to the present day, consists of the Pentateuch alone. It has been very generally and very naturally supposed that the Samaritan community obtained their Torah, which, save in a certain number of comparatively unimportant readings, is identical with the Jewish Torah, *from the renegade Jewish priest, of the name, according to Josephus, of Manasseh, who instituted on Mount Gerizim a rival temple worship to that on Mount Moriah (Jos. Ant. xi. 7, 8).* Josephus has placed this event in the days of Alexander the Great, but here he is a victim of the strangely erroneous views of chronology which the Jews of his and of later times have commonly entertained respecting their nation's history, in the interval between the return from the Exile and the victories of Alexander. We need have little hesitation in connecting Josephus' account with the ejection by Nehemiah of the grandson of the high priest, Eliashib, who had married the daughter of Sanballat, and had thus disgraced the family of the high priest (Neh. xiii. 28). This latter event happened almost exactly a century before the age of Alexander's victories. It is hardly likely that two events, so similar in character and yet so near in point of time, narrated the one by Nehemiah and the other by Josephus, should be unconnected with one another. We may safely assume that the events are the same, and that the grandson of Eliashib is the renegade priest, Manasseh. When this priest, *at the head (p. 8) probably of a disaffected Jewish faction,* joined the Samaritan community and established an exact reproduction of Jewish worship, *he would have carried with him the Scriptures that regulated the temple worship, and were read in the services of the synagogue.* Now, if the Canonical Scripture of the time consisted of the Torah alone, *we have here an explanation of the fact that the Torah alone was adopted by the Samaritans to be their Scripture.* They adopted that which the schismatic Jews brought with them. The Scriptures which were adopted by the Jews *after* the occurrence of the schism never found a place in the Samaritan Canon."

After discussing this point more fully, the Professor concludes: "*The expulsion of Eliashib's grandson took place about the year 432 B.C.*" (The italics are mine.) Here, then, we have a full discussion both of the *origin* and *date* of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Without adding comment of my own to Professor Ryle's weighty words I would only ask whether the passage from which I have quoted does not furnish a sufficient answer to Dr. Wilson both as to the date of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and as to its relation to the Hebrew Torah, and whether it does not dispose altogether of the fancied incompatibility

which Dr. Wilson finds between the fact of the existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the views of critics as to the origin and dates of the Pentateuch, and the other books of the Old Testament Scriptures which form the record of God's progressive revelation to mankind?

So far is it from being the case that the existence of such a document as the Samaritan Pentateuch is a "controlling fact" against the views taught by the Higher Criticism, and so far is this from being a point which has "never been stated, and cannot be answered or evaded," that the fact of its existence is shown to be an argument in favour of those views, and its date is shown not to be earlier than the year 432 B.C., when the renegade priest Manasseh, the grandson of Eliashib, led a body of schismatic Jews to Samaria, and founded a copy of the temple worship on Mount Gerizim in the days of Nehemiah.

### **Comments on this section from the Editor of theSamaritanUpdate.com**

Although H. D. ASTLEY is referenced under #202 of this book, this section p.6-8 is not mentioned in *A Bibliography of the Samaritans, Third Edition, Revised, Expanded, and Annotated*, by Alan David Crown and Reinhard Pummer, ATLA Bibliography, No. 51, The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford. 2005

(p. 112) *DATE OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.*

BY REV. CANON S. GARRATT, M.A.

IN the July number of THE THINKER, Mr. Astley objects to the statement of Dr. W. Wilson, of Utica, U.S., that "the existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch" is a "controlling fact" in the controversy as to the origin of the Old Testament. I have long been as much astonished as Dr. Wilson at the manner in which this fact has been ignored, and am equally astonished at the manner in which the grounds for believing in the antiquity of the Samaritan Pentateuch are ignored by Professor Ryle in the words which Mr. Astley quotes.

Professor Ryle says, "It has been very generally and very naturally supposed that the Samaritan community obtained their Torah, which, save in a certain number of comparatively unimportant readings, is identical with the Jewish Torah, *from the renegade Jewish priest of the name, according to Josephus, of Manasseh, who instituted on Mount Gerizim a rival temple worship to that on Mount Moriah (Jos. Ant. xi. 7, 8).*"

There are two entirely distinct questions respecting the Samaritan Pentateuch. One relates to the value of its various readings, those in which it differs from the Hebrew Pentateuch. Jerome, Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyril, among the Fathers, valued them greatly, as in more recent days have Kennicott, Walton, Le Clerc. On the other hand, the Talmud, Gesenius, and most modern critics consider them worthless, as having been introduced into the Samaritan text to serve Samaritan purposes. But this is not the question referred to by Professor Ryle in the passage quoted, and does not in any way affect Dr. Wilson's argument.

The other question is, How and when did the Samaritans obtain their Pentateuch?

Professor Ryle says that the very general and very natural supposition (p. 113) is, that they obtained it from the renegade Jewish priest Manasseh, who lived, according to Josephus, in the time of Alexander the Great, and, according to Professor Kyle, in the time of Nehemiah. Such a view has been maintained by some well-known critics, but is neither the natural supposition for a believing student of Scripture, nor that which is

generally taken by ordinary uncritical people. In Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, in an article very hostile to the Samaritan various readings, the directly opposite statement is made, that " the popular notion," and " the opinion" of J. Morinus, Walton, Capellus, Kennicott, Michaelis, Eichhorn, Bauer, Jahn, Bertholt, Steudel, Mazade, Stuart, Davidson, and others, is that the Samaritan Pentateuch "came into the hands of the Samaritans as an inheritance from the ten tribes 'whom they succeeded."

That this should ever have been doubted by men believing the Old Testament to be the Word of God is strange; but it is quite intelligible that the " higher criticism" should ignore that which, if true, is, as Dr. Wilson says, "a controlling fact," absolutely fatal to it.

The proof of it is to be found in the Book of Kings (2 Kings xvii.). Strangely enough, what is there said is treated in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* as the basis of a separate hypothesis on the subject, whereas it only proves the truth of the "popular notion" and the opinion of the critics already enumerated, that the Pentateuch came into the hands of the Samaritans as an inheritance from the ten tribes. Two hundred and seventy-five years, or thereabouts, before Nehemiah's time, the ten tribes had been carried away captive by the King of Assyria, and Samaria peopled by Gentiles from various nations. These Gentile inhabitants were infested by lions, sent, as they thought, by Him whom they regarded as the God of the country, for their neglect and ignorance of His worship. "Then the king of Assyria commanded, saying, Carry thither one of the priests whom ye brought from thence"—therefore, not an inhabitant of Judah, but of the land of Israel—" and let them go and dwell there, and let him teach them the manner of the God of the land. Then one of the priests whom they had carried away from Samaria came and dwelt in Bethel, and taught them how they should fear the Lord " (2 Kings xvii. 27, 28).

This was in the beginning of the reign of Hezekiah over Judah, when, according to the " higher criticism," Jeremiah, or some one else, was forging the Book of the Law, or some part of it, to be hidden and found in the days of Josiah. Of course, therefore, if these critics are right, the Israelitish priest could not take the Book of the Law to the Samaritans; and if he did do so, they are wrong. But that he did do so, and that the book he took them was no new book, but the book which the ten tribes possessed before they were carried away captive, is made certain by what follows: "Unto this day they do after the former manners; they fear not the Lord, neither do they after their statutes, or after their ordinances, or after the law and commandments which the Lord commanded the children of Jacob, whom He named Israel." But perhaps these were only traditional commandments, taught by word of (p. 114) mouth, and not from a book. There is not even that escape for the critics. In the command to the Israelites, recorded in this passage in order to explain what the priest taught these Gentile inhabitants of Samaria, afterwards called the Samaritans, the Israelites are told of "the statutes, and the ordinances, and the law, and the commandments which He wrote for you." The ten tribes had had the written Book of the Law, and had disobeyed it; it was brought to the Samaritans, and they disobeyed it too. "So these nations feared the Lord, and served their graven images, both their children, and their children's children: as did their fathers, so do they unto this day."

The Israelitish priest, carried captive by the king of Assyria, was sent back by him to bring these Gentiles into obedience to the Book of the Law (according to the "higher criticism," non-existent or being just forged), which the ten tribes had long known, and been sent into captivity for disobeying. If this is true, the whole fabric of the " higher criticism " falls to the ground, because the Book of the Law existed before the time when it is the fundamental assertion of this system that it began to be forged; and since the book existed among the ten tribes long before, the idea of its being forged in Hezekiah's

reign, purposely hidden, and then fraudulently brought to light as a new discovery in Josiah's reign is a baseless imagination. The ten tribes had what we call the Samaritan Pentateuch before they were carried away captive, and, if so, we cannot doubt that the Jews had also what we call the Hebrew Pentateuch. The two texts must therefore have parted company not later than the time of Rehoboam and Jeroboam, which, as Dr. Wilson says, is "a controlling fact" in the controversy. Whether the ten tribes, or the Samaritans after them, made alterations; or whether, on the contrary, the Jews, as Jerome thought, did so, has nothing to do with the question. The passage in Kings proves the existence of the Pentateuch among the ten tribes, and that fact, I venture to think with Dr. Wilson, is decisive of the whole controversy. It is not necessary to the ordinary belief, but it is fatal to the "higher criticism."

### **Comments on this section from the Editor of theSamaritanUpdate.com**

This reference is #1724 located in *A Bibliography of the Samaritans, Third Edition, Revised, Expanded, and Annotated*, by Alan David Crown and Reinhard Pummer, ATLA Bibliography, No. 51, The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford. 2005

(p. 206) **SAMARITAN ACCEPTANCE OF THE PENTATEUCH.**

BY REV. H. HAYMAN, D.D.

THE adoption of the Pentateuch by the Samaritans is a distinct fact from the translation known as the Samaritan Pentateuch; as distinguishable as is the recognition of Holy Scripture as furnishing the Church's standard of faith, from the many vernacular versions of it which have from time to time appeared. Some recent writers on the subject seem not duly to have observed this distinction—an important one, because there is no more debated question in ancient literature than the date of the Samaritan version, whereas the whole tenor of the Ezra-Nehemiah record implies that the Pentateuch was either known before the Captivity to the heathenish immigrants into the seat of northern Israel, or else became known to their successors and adopted as authoritative not later than the period of Ezra's activity in popularizing it. If it was known before the Captivity, it must have of course existed before, and the alleged concoction of the legislation sometimes called the "Priestly or Priests' Code" by a priestly conclave among the exiles in Babylon falls to the ground. If it was first adopted by the Samaritans upon its promulgation by Ezra in 444 A.D., with the aid of interpreters who "gave the sense," the question arises, is such a fact consistent with such an alleged concoction?

Before discussing this, some elementary facts of the Return from Babylon claim our notice. After the list of families, &c, of those "that went up out of the Captivity" (Ezra ii. 1), we have the official classes distinguished as—1, Priests; 2, Levites; 3, Singers; 4, Porters; 5, Nethinim; 6, Solomon's servants (*ib.* 36-55). Now, this represents a state of facts in 536 A.D., or over ninety years before the Ezraic promulgation. It is contended by some critics that the grading of 1 and 2 of these as distinct ranks had no place in history before Ezra's promulgation enforced it, and that during the whole period of the monarchy every Levite was a Priest. But we see that the distinction existed from the first moment of the Return, and in the case certainly of the Priests, and almost certainly of all the rest, was founded on genealogy attested by registers (*ib.* 62). Now, this implies that the distinction was carried *through* the registers in question and traced up to some priestly, &c, ancestor

before the Exile. But then, the distinction (p. 207) itself was pre-existent to the Exile. The generation of the Captivity must have gone to Babylon as Priests, Levites, &c, as distinctly marked as they came out. Further, when Ezra himself came out, amongst his company are persons of all the above six classes, except the last, similarly distinguished. Now, is it meant to reject or impeach this evidence in order to make way for the theory of a non-distinct priesthood before? Wellhausen,<sup>1</sup> indeed, sneers at the genealogies, and coarsely insinuates fabrication. But that will convince no one. It is absolutely certain that the hope of a return, whether on the grounds of Jeremiah's prophecy or on others, governed the minds of all the Captivity, except those who had sunk their patriotism in heathenish surroundings during their expatriation. This hope could only be definitely shaped by a continuity traceable backwards ;—but how? By such family records as would make the *status* of each reconstituted Israelite clear—*i.e.*, by genealogies—is the only possible answer. Thus upon genealogical documents the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah largely turn, and embody several such, the longest duplicated, but with many deviations in detail (cf. Ezra ii.; Neh. vii.). Nor is it impertinent here to notice the large extent to which names apparently of a Babylonish type, at all events typically differing from those of the monarchy, prevail in the lists given. This is confirmed by the fact referred to above that in reading the Law, interpretation was needed. The people had become in nomenclature as in speech, Babylonized. If the lists had been priestly concoctions of a later period, it is very improbable that such outlandish names would have appeared. From the standpoint of the Exile, they are features of nature.

The priestly authorities are charged with adding legislative matter to the extent of between three-fifths and two-thirds of the whole when complete. It seems the view of most who so charge them, that they merely reduced to writing what had existed before in practice, which practice grew up in the centuries before the Captivity. If this had been so, what did they gain save trouble in putting this forth in a language now obsolete? That the unknown proverbially imposes easily on the vulgar will perhaps be the answer. But there seems a magnanimous candour in Ezra and Nehemiah which would be above such practising on vulgar credulity, even in the eyes of those who reject their inspiration. But further, as regards the matter of the precepts, we find from Neh. x. 32 foll., that rules were made and a plan organized for the punctual payment and enjoyment of sacred dues, including tithes, firstfruits, and the like. Now, these rest mainly upon the enactments of the "priestly code," especially that "tithe of the tithes" (ver. 37) payable by the Levites to the Priests, (for which see Num. xviii. 26). It seems violently improbable that this system was in force during the period of the monarchy up to the Captivity, at any rate so uniformly that it could be claimed after the total dislocation of the Captivity itself for seventy years as a recognized custom. But if not, it would have imposed a burden, which had all the air of an innovation in the interest of privileged parties, on the laymen of the (p. 208) Return. And we know from Mai. iii. 8 foll. that there was, in fact, reluctance and delay in collecting these dues (cf. Neh. xiii. 10-12). Haggai (i. 9., ii. 15) complains of remissness even in restoring the Temple fabric in which national aspirations centred; and there was in the background a further burden of tribute due to the Persian king (Ezra iv. 13; Neh. v. 4), from which the same privileged parties were by Artaxerxes' letter specially exempted (Ezra vii. 24). Now, putting all this together, it seems morally certain that self-interest would have been too strong for self-denying zeal, on which the whole system of Levitical alimentary ordinances depended; and would have aroused an

---

<sup>1</sup> Prolegomena to the History of Israel, English Translation, 1885, p 148.

insuperable resistance to these impositions, had not the foundation which underlay them been universally accepted as an unimpeachable point of the original charter of Israel. The sporadic way in which the ordinances on this subject lie here and there in the Pentateuch, and the grave and difficult questions which some of them raise—in short, the total absence of arrangement and digestion, is what no council of priests legislating virtually in their own interests would have admitted. This feature is by no means limited to these particular ordinances—of which more hereafter— but in them, if nowhere else, such a council would presumably be precise, lucid, and systematic. In point of fact, if we include the specially sacrificial dues of the ministrants, we must collect and harmonize all the statements scattered in various verses of Exod. xxix., Lev. ii., vii., Num. vi., xviii., Deut. xii., xiv., xviii., and xxvi. 12.

But, further yet, the first Return under Zerubbabel, "in the seventh month," it seems, of their first year, " builded the altar .... to offer burnt-offerings . . . . as it is written in the law of Moses .... and offered burnt-offerings .... morning and evening. And they kept the feast of tabernacles, as it is written, and the daily burnt-offerings by number .... and afterward the continual burnt-offering and those of the new moons and all the set feasts " (Ezra iii. 2-6); besides " free-will offerings," separately mentioned. Assuming Ezra to have either written this or to have incorporated, as some think, a fragment of Haggai, he ascribes a knowledge of the written " law of Moses," in various points regulated by the " priestly code," over ninety years before its alleged first promulgation by himself. We have, further (in Ezra vi. 17,18), a dedication festival some years later (sixth year of Darius, ver. 15); but still, in the Haggai-Zechariah period (ver. 14), in which appears a " he-goat sin-offering " for each tribe, which recalls the ritual of Num. xxix. 5, &c.; and we also read, "they set the priests in their divisions and the Levites in their courses .... as it is written in the book of Moses "—the Levitical reference being satisfied by Num. iii. 17 foil., where the Levites are grouped in families, to which the " courses" of 1 Chron. xxiii. 6 foil. correspond.

The letter of Artaxerxes is remarkable for the prominence which it gives to the law, being addressed, not to Nehemiah "the Tirshatha," or lay governor, but "to Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven." Its entire object is religious, like the " Injunctions " of a Tudor (p. 209) sovereign, and breathes almost the spirit of a proselyte. Priests, Levites, &c, with their privileged exemptions, have a leading place. Ezra has " the law and the wisdom of his God in his hand," to which the king gives earthly coercive force, and is charged to "appoint magistrates and judges which may judge all the people that are beyond the river, all such as know the laws of thy God: and teach ye him that knoweth them not " (Ezra vii. 11, 12, 13, 24, 25). In this dichotomy the whole area between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean, with all its races, would seem to be embraced, such as are partly enumerated in ix. 1. Ezra's first care, however, is to purify from their extern admixture the nucleus of returned Israel itself; and, what is remarkable on the theory of a late "priestly code," he receives the suggestion from "the princes," the lay heads of tribes and families, that the pollution of mixed marriages has been largely incurred even by " priests and Levites." Ezra describes himself as overwhelmed with, not humiliation only, but astonishment at the report<sup>2</sup> (vers. 1-5). If we assume a sentiment

---

<sup>2</sup> There is no precept of law precisely prohibiting a priest from marrying an alien. But the late Dean Plumtre, writing on "Priest" in the *ZHcl. of Bible* (ii., p. 919a), is no doubt correct in saying that it "was assumed" to be prohibited.



nurtured in the traditional exclusiveness of a "priestly code," the shock given to that sentiment by the facts described is explicable at once, but not easily so otherwise.

In short, unless we assume this scene to have been got up by a mere faction of purists in concert with Ezra, in order to launch his new Mosaic codicil with more effect, its entire spirit contradicts the theory. Similarly in Neh. viii. 1, the demand for the law comes from the people, and, in compliance with their demand, Ezra brings and reads "the book of the law of Moses which Jehovah commanded to Israel." Then follows the well-known scene at the Water Gate and its consequences, including the expulsion from the restored community of all who refused separation from alien wives. Now, this series of facts is perfectly intelligible and consistent, if we assume that the same "written law of Moses the man of God" which was in the hands of Zerubbabel (Ezra iii. 2) was read before the people and Nehemiah in 444 A.D. But, otherwise, we have difficulties at every step.

All these difficulties, however, fall short in gravity of the one which yet remains. That Ezra alone could have concocted and palmed off on his contemporaries a "code" (so-called) containing novel legislative matter of about twice the bulk of the original, hardly any, I think, has the hardihood to suggest. It is supposed evolved from remembered practice and tradition by some priestly conclave incubating during the Captivity, whose mouthpiece Ezra becomes. Therefore the priests of the Return, between 4,000 and 5,000 in number, must have all known the facts. Among them a powerful faction were in close union with the extern adversaries, and had contracted the affinities with their leaders, Tobiah (Neh. vi. 17-19) and Sanballat (xiii. 28; cf. Ezra x. 18 foil.). Those adversaries, from the first, professed to Zerubbabel their "seeking the God" of Israel, and their "doing (p. 210) sacrifices to Him" (Ezra iv. 2) from "the days of Esarhaddon," and seem to have claimed of Nehemiah to be allowed "a portion and a right" in the reconstituted polity (Neh. ii. 20). Finding this disallowed, they had spared no effort of intrigue, menace, faction, treachery, and open violence (Neh. iv. *passim*, v. 9, vi. 5-14, 18, 19) to mar the restoration of Israel.

Foremost among the half-hearted, or the renegades who joined them, was the grandson of Eliashib, the contemporary high priest with Nehemiah; other priests who had taken foreign wives are named by Ezra x. 18 as afterwards renouncing them, together with certain Levites (vers. 19-23). The abjuration of affinity contracted would be a deadly outrage in the eyes of these powerful adversaries, and we cannot doubt that not a few of the priests who had taken the step shrank from thus defying them, and cast in their lot, as did Eliashib's grandson, with the hostile faction who were still seeking a quasi-Israelite *status*. Now, if Ezra and the patriotic priests had just at this time been promulgating a "law of Moses," including a priests' code which had no existence before, the renegades would have been in a position to expose the forgery, as they might have without falsehood termed it. They were, naturally, the most influential of all possible advisers on such points with the hostile party, who, assuming them not to have known the Pentateuch at all previously, would be obliged to trust to them as to experts; but who, if they had known a Pentateuch *minus* the "priests code," would never have been led to accept the latter addition at the hands of Ezra. The question is, whether on the former alternative the renegades would not have been led by the position of vantage which they had thus secured to enlighten that ignorance by the information, that the most stringent and minutely regulative portion of the "law" was really composed within the last century and a half, and had only a spurious relation to the really Mosaic institutions. Nor should we forget the charge of Artaxerxes, "teach ye him that knoweth them (the 'laws of thy God') not." The king had shown so strong an interest in the question that an appeal to him,

strongly backed by the mixed populations "beyond the river," and urged presumably and plausibly in the interests of truth as against fabrication, could hardly have failed to secure attention from him. The renegades would thus have been able to monopolize for themselves the spring of royal liberality and patronage which had so beneficently fostered the restoration, and to reduce the patriotic party to a position of discredited impotence. We saw above reasons for thinking that even returned Israel would hardly have accepted the imposition of a novel "priests' code." But what can we say of its acceptance by an outside party whose bitter and unscrupulous enmity was now reinforced by a renegade section, whose political interests and whose virulent passions all united to suggest the opposite course of rejection and exposure? In spite of all these powerful inducements, the Samaritans are supposed to accept the new code through the agency of the renegades, and build it into their rival system of temple and altar, priesthood and worship.

(p. 211) That all the writings subsequently canonized were strenuously resisted by the Samaritans is of itself a presumption that they would have resisted any part of the Pentateuch itself which was not unquestionably archaic in its claims. The genuine antiquity of the document as a whole, reaching back to some period far earlier than the Captivity, was thus tested in the fiery furnace of religious animosity. Jew and Samaritan, who differed wherever they could, agreed in accepting it as a whole, under circumstances in which every human motive which we can trace would have led the latter to resist and reject, had not proof been overwhelming. When this crowning difficulty is added to those previously detailed, I think any candid critic will allow that we need far stronger and more direct evidence than has yet been adduced to accredit the theory of a Pentateuch so largely post-Exilic.

It was remarked above that the sporadic notices in which the "priests' code " deals with the highly important subject, the priestly share of material offerings and dues, is inconsistent with the supposed conditions of that code's origin. This remark, indeed, has a much wider application. It applies to the large majority of all the subjects dealt with. I will be content with a single instance, that of the " vows," of which we have so many instances in sacred history from the time of Jacob downwards. Isolated mention of vows in relation to the law of sacrifice, &c., occurs in Lev. vii. 16, xxiii. 38, and Num. xxix. 39; but besides these we have sections devoted to the subject, but far apart, in Lev. xxii. 18-23, and the larger part of xxvii. Again, in Num. xv. 3, 8, and all xxx., the subject is rehandled, to say nothing of the specially important " Nazarite " vow dealt with separately in vi. 2-21, and of the various sections of Deuteronomy which deal with or glance at the subject (Deut. xii. 6, 11, 17, 26, xxiii. 18, 21-23). Now, can any one believe that a conclave of experts, commanding ample leisure and having all materials of record or tradition in their own keeping, would have discharged their functions in this loose and scattered way? This subject would need a large amount of minute scrutiny to handle it exhaustively; but what is said above will be confirmed by the most cursory student of the sacred text. Viewed jurisprudentially, the law is in very large part a tangle of "retractations " in the strict sense of the word, and hardly anywhere carries a subject consistently and exhaustively through consecutive sections. This fact is a counter argument to the theory we have been discussing, the weight of which is sure to grow with a closer study of the Pentateuchal text itself.

**Comments on this section from the Editor of theSamaritanUpdate.com**

This reference is #2144 located in *A Bibliography of the Samaritans, Third Edition, Revised, Expanded, and Annotated*, by Alan David Crown and Reinhard Pummer, ATLA Bibliography, No. 51, The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford. 2005

(p. 299)

*DATE OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.*

BY REV. H. D. ASTLEY, M.A.

IN the August and September numbers of THE THINKER there are two papers in continuation of the controversy as to the origin and date of the Samaritan Pentateuch, both defending from different points of view the opposite opinion to that expressed by Professor Ryle in the words quoted by me in the July number of this magazine.

In the August number Canon Garratt affirms his complete agreement with the statement of Dr. Wilson, of Utica, U.S.A., that the existence of that document is a "controlling fact" in the controversy as to the origin of the Old Testament, and he then proceeds to argue against the position taken up by Professor Ryle.

The Canon first refers to the article "Samaritan Pentateuch" in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* to show that the "popular notion," and the "opinion" of a long list of authorities is that the "Samaritan Pentateuch" came into the hands of the Samaritans "as an inheritance from the ten tribes whom they succeeded," and after expressing his surprise that this should be ignored by the "Higher Criticism" as a "controlling fact absolutely fatal to it," he declares that the "proof of it is to be found in the Book of Kings (2 Kings xvii.)."

(p. 300) With the Canon's quotations from this chapter, and his outline of historical events, I have no fault to find, but with his deductions therefrom I entirely disagree. The narrative in the Book of Kings, as I shall endeavour to show, says not one word as to the Samaritan Pentateuch, and is, therefore, quite beside the mark.

What this narrative teaches is, that the new immigrants brought from various countries under the sway of Assyria found themselves much harassed by lions (which had probably increased in number and violence during the wars, and subsequent depopulation of the country), and that they believed this was due to the anger of the god of the land, of whose worship they were ignorant. They therefore sent an embassy to Assyria to make known their pitiable condition, whereupon the king sent back one of the deported priests who "came and dwelt at Bethel, and taught them how they should fear the Lord" (2 Kings xvii. 24-28).

Now, in 1 Kings xii. 26-33 we read that Jeroboam, fearing lest his people should be enticed into renewed fellowship with Judah if they went up to Jerusalem to worship, set up a worship of his own, with a priesthood, and appropriate services at Dan and Bethel. The motive assigned is due to the author of the Book of Kings, who lived at the time of the Captivity. What is historically certain (from the Books of Amos and Hosea) is that Jehovah was worshipped at Dan and Bethel under the representation of golden calves, and that a priesthood was established with a settled service. But this priesthood differed from that of Judah in that it had no connection with the tribe of Levi, for Jeroboam "made houses of high places, and priests from among all the people (R.V.) which were not of the tribe of Levi." Surely we may conclude that this state of things continued during the whole history of the Northern Kingdom, and therefore what we have to note is (1)

that this priest who was sent back from Assyria was no member of the tribe of Levi or priest of the sons of Aaron, but was one of the priests " taken from among all the people" whose order had been founded by Jeroboam I.; and (2) that "he came and dwelt at Bethel," where the calf-worship had been established by the same monarch at the disruption of the kingdom. Whether this priest set up the calf again we are not told—probably he did not—but we must bear in mind that in any case the religion established by Jeroboam, and re-instituted by this priest, whether with or without an image, was a real, though schismatic, Yahveh-worship, and no worship of false gods; and that, therefore, it would rightly be described as teaching the people " how they should fear the LORD" (Heb. יהוה, Yahveh, wrongly, but irretrievably, Anglicized Jehovah).

In ver. 34 where the author of the Book of Kings, writing probably about the era of the Captivity, says, " Unto this day they do after the former manner," &c, we have a hint of the true state of the case; and in agreement with this we find the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin saying to Ezra, "We seek your God as ye do, and we do sacrifice unto Him since the days of Esar-haddon, King of Assyria, which brought us up hither " (Ezra iv. 2).

(p. 301) The people imported into Northern Israel from various countries were therefore instructed by this priest in the religion which had been customary there, and which, like that of Judah at a corresponding date, is concluded on critical grounds not to have been based on the Pentateuch as we have it, nor even on Deuteronomy, but on the earlier codes contained in that portion of the Pentateuch which has been assigned to J E, and which includes Exod. xx.-xxiii. and xxxiv. The main reasons for this conclusion I shall set forth in summing up the critical position at the close of this paper. Here I would ask one question, and it is this: If the Priestly Code, not to speak of Deuteronomy, existed in Israel at any date prior to the destruction of Samaria, how are we to reconcile with this the fact of the worship at Dan and Bethel being established for so many years without a word of protest from the prophets and priests, who must have known its utterly illegal character? On the contrary, Amos and Hosea accept the condition of things they see around them, and merely protest against the abuses and heathen practices which were being introduced. Never once do they say to the people, " You ought to do sacrifice at Jerusalem, and go up to the feasts there; and, as for your priests, they are worthless, for they are not members of the tribe of Levi."

Again, Elijah brings forward as a charge against the people, "They have thrown down thine altars" (1 Kings xix. 10), and he himself " repaired the altar of Yahveh " on Carmel "that was thrown down" (1 Kings xviii. 30). How reconcile all this with the existence of laws prescribing *one* sanctuary, *one* altar, *one* priesthood?

We may therefore conclude that the document which the priest brought with him from Assyria, if document there were at all, would consist only of the narrative of E (who on many independent grounds is supposed to have been a native of Northern Israel, in the tenth or ninth century B.c.), or perhaps of J E, already combined, which would contain the greater and lesser Books of the Covenant, and the early traditions of the nation; but not Deuteronomy, which was not " found" at Jerusalem until 100 years later; nor the Priestly Code, which was not written out until the loss of the temple services during the Exile made a code necessary, if former customs were to be remembered at all. This is distinctly stated to the discerning reader in the verse quoted, and the succeeding passage to the end of the chapter (2 Kings xvii. 34-41).

Thus we have every reason to believe that the ten tribes never had the written " Book of the Law," if by that is meant the completed Pentateuch as we now have it. The only written *law* they had was that contained in Exod. xx.-xxiii., and Exod. xxxiv., and by this

they could justify their worship at Dan and Bethel and other sanctuaries on the strength of the permission given in this code to a multiplicity of altars (Exod. xx. 22-26).

I hope I have now said enough to show that, on historical grounds 2 Kings xvii. has really nothing to do with the question of the origin and date of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

(p. 302) And now to come to Dr. Hayman's paper in the September number of THE THINKER. The Doctor writes with an ability and acuteness worthy of all praise, and brings an immense amount of ingenuity to bear upon the technical details which he advances in support of his view; but he appears to completely misunderstand the critical standpoint, and while he opens up the whole question debated between the advocates of tradition and the Higher Criticism, he discusses much that is really irrelevant to the subject in hand, viz., the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Nevertheless, his paper merits careful consideration, and such I will endeavour to give it.

I have already shown that we have no grounds for believing that the Samaritans knew anything of the completed Pentateuch before the Captivity. I have now to show that the facts recorded in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah are not inconsistent with the supposition that they first received the completed Pentateuch (in which they afterwards made alterations to suit their own schismatic worship) from Manasseh, the grandson of Eliashib, in 432 B.C.

The first thing we have to bear in mind in studying the facts recorded in Ezra and Nehemiah is that these two books originally formed only one book, and that this book was in close connection with, and intended to be a continuation of, Chronicles (see 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23; and Ezrai. 1, 2). This book, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, was intended to be a universal history, commencing with Adam, and continuing the annals of the Jewish State, and especially Jerusalem, down to the time of Nehemiah, from the priestly standpoint. It runs parallel with, and is sometimes dependent upon, the prophetic narrative in Samuel and Kings, but differs from it in the prominence it gives to the law, which it looks upon as having come down in its entirety from the days of Moses. The author, who certainly made use to a large extent of contemporary documents in the later stages of his history, and had the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, from which he made large extracts, lying before him, lived most probably at the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century before Christ, when the institutions he describes had long been in force, and when for nearly two centuries the Jewish Church had taken the place of the Jewish State (see 1 Chron. iii. 17-24, where the genealogy is carried down to the 6th—some say the 11th— generation after Zerubbabel; and Nehemiah xii. 22, where "Darius the Persian " is certainly Darius Codomannus, who was defeated by Alexander in 332 B.C., and ver. 26, where the "days of Nehemiah" are spoken of as long past).

This being so, let us now examine more particularly the points brought forward by Dr. Hayman in order; and here I must be as brief as perspicuity will allow, though the questions involved are almost too vast to be even touched on in the limits of a short paper.

1. With regard to the genealogy in Ezra ii. which corresponds with that in Nehemiah vii. and is taken from the same official document, which Ewald (p. 303) and Kuenen admit to be "full and accurate." Let us see what the latter has to say as to the distinction so sharply drawn therein between the priests and the various orders of the lower clergy, upon which Dr. Hayman bases so much. The whole passage is worth attention, and I think disposes of the question from the critical standpoint. Professor Kuenen says :—

"Before we proceed farther, we will glance at the composition of the new colony. From the list of those who returned (Ezra ii. ; Neh. vii.) we find in the first place that irrespectively of the staff of the temple they belonged to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin; the towns and villages whose former inhabitants went back were all situated in the territory of these two tribes (Ezra ii. 21-35 ; Neh. vii. 26-38). The continued use of the sacred number, twelve (Ezra ii. 2, vi. 17), therefore proves, not that 'the children of the Exile belonged to all the twelve tribes, but that they considered themselves the lawful representatives of all Israel.' In the second place our attention is attracted by the returns concerning the staff of the temple. Separate mention is made of the priests (Ezra ii. 36-39 ; Neh. vii. 39-42), the Levites (Ezra ii. 40; Neh. vii. 43), the singers (Ezra ii. 41; Neh. vii. 44), the porters (Ezra ii. 42; Neh. vii. 45), the Netthinim, 'those given,' i.e., temple slaves (Ezra ii. 43-54; Neh. vii. 46-56), and the children of Solomon's servants (Ezra ii. 55-58 ; Neh. vii. 57-60), i.e., the Canaanites whom Solomon had made his slaves, and who had thus been incorporated into Israel (1 Kings ix. 20, 21). If we add the number of all these upper and lower temple servants together we obtain a total of more than 5,000 ; thus they formed nearly an eighth of the entire colony, perhaps even about a sixth, if the returns of the numerical strength of the single families be more worthy of credit than the figure which is given as the total amount (comp. Ezra ii. 64; Neh. vii. 66). Though this proportion is remarkable in itself, yet there is more that calls for our notice. The Levites, the singers, &c., are distinguished here from *the priests*, and this for the first time. Among the returning exiles, therefore, there were persons who were appointed to serve in the sanctuary, but were not considered fit for the actual priestly functions. If we remember, such under priests, as one might call them, had existed since Josiah's reformation (621 B.C.); it was very natural that the line of demarcation between them and the priests had not been gradually obliterated, but rather defined more sharply. Ezekiel had ordained in his description of the restored Israelitish state that for the future only 'the sons of Zadok,' i.e., the descendants of the priestly families of Jerusalem, should take charge of the service of the altar, and had excluded from the priesthood the rest of the sons of Levi, precisely because they had been foremost in worshipping Yahveh on the high places. It is now evident that the reality began to answer these requirements of the prophet. But at the same time another circumstance is now explained. The priests are more than 4,000 in number (Ezra ii. 36, 39 ;

Neh. vii. 39-42); the Levites only amount to a total of 74, or 341, if we include the singers and porters (Ezra ii. 40-42). This proportion remains an insolvable riddle to any one who, with the (younger) Mosaic laws, holds the priests or sons of Aaron to be a small subdivision of the tribe of Levi. On the other hand, it is extremely natural if the Levites be regarded as degraded priests; probably they were less numerous than their brethren at Jerusalem from the very first, but at any rate the desire to go up to Jerusalem must have been less strong in them than in the men who had the prospect of occupying the highest rank in the temple (Ezra viii. 15). And finally, it does not escape our notice that in the list already mentioned of those who returned, the singers and porters occur next to the Levites, and thus are distinguished from the latter. If this only happened here we might perhaps suspect a slight inaccuracy of expression, and, in agreement with the Chronicler (1 Chron. xxv., xxvi. 1-17) and tradition, assume that the whole of the servants of the temple belonged to the tribe of Levi. But the name distinction is made elsewhere (Ezra vii 7, 24, x. 23, 24 ; Neh. viii., x. 28, 29). The singers are included among the Levites for the first time in a document of considerably younger date (Neh. xi 15-18), and the porters also still more recently by the Chronicler. It appears, therefore, from the historical accounts themselves, that it was only by degrees that the whole temple service was assigned to the tribe of Levi . yet not by removing from their posts the non-Levitical families connected with it, but by including them in the tribe of Levi " (Kuenen's *Religion of Israel*, ii. 202-204).

(p. 304) From this we see that the distinction between priests and Levites which first prominently arose at the time of Josiah's reformation in 621 B.C. (the former being the priests of the central sanctuary, the latter those of the country high places) would naturally be well known in 536 B.C.

2. Dr. Hayman assumes that Hebrew was an " obsolete " tongue in the year 444 B.c., when the Pentateuch was promulgated by Ezra and Nehemiah, and the people bound themselves to its observance for the first time (Neh. viii.-x.). Was this the case? Here let me quote Professor Driver :—

"The idea that the Jews forgot their Hebrew in Babylonia, and spoke in 'Chaldec' when they returned to Palestine, is unfounded. Haggai and Zechariah and other post-Exilian writers use Hebrew; Aramaic is exceptional. Hebrew was still normally spoken in 430 B.C. in Jerusalem (Neh. xiii. 24). The Hebrews after the Captivity acquired gradually the use of Aramaic from their neighbours in and about Palestine. (See

Wright, *Comp. Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, 1890, p. 16.) 'Now do not for a moment suppose that the Jews lost the use of Hebrew in the Babylonian Captivity and brought back with them into Palestine this so-called Chaldaic. The Aramaic dialect, which gradually got the upper hand since 4-5 centuries B.C., did not come that long journey across the Syrian desert. It was *there*, on the spot; and it ended by taking possession of the field, side by side with the kindred dialect of the Samaritans "' (Driver, *Introd. to Lit. of O. T.*, p. 471, n. 3).

Hence, then, there is nothing wonderful in the fact that the priests compiled their code in Hebrew, the ancient language of their race, and that in that form it was amalgamated with the other component parts of the Pentateuch.

3. Dr. Hayman admits that it is "violently improbable" that the dues mentioned in Nehemiah x. 32 ff., and especially "the tithe of the tithes" to the priests, had been paid during the whole period of the monarchy, and so uniformly that they could be claimed even after the dislocation of the Captivity as a recognized custom; and yet he argues that it is still more "violently improbable" that they should be new imposts laid upon the people by Ezra and Nehemiah, on account of the opposition they would naturally evoke. The fact is that it was their very novelty which did evoke the unceasing opposition encountered by both these reformers, of which their memoirs are full, and which led to the complaints made by Malachi and the later prophets as to the remissness of the people in paying those dues.

4. With regard to the description given of the setting up of the altar and the holding of the Feast of Tabernacles in the seventh month of the first Return under Zerubbabel, 536 B.C. (Ezra iii. 2-6), and also with regard to the letter of Artaxerxes (Ezra vii.) it will be, I think, sufficient to say that in this part of the book of Ezra (iii.-vi. and vii.) the Chronicler is writing in his own person, and that consequently the language is coloured by the ideas and customs of his own age, 332 B.C, at earliest. This is consistent with his uniform practice throughout (Driver, *Introd. to O. T. Lit.*, p. 513).

And here a very striking fact must be noticed, which serves to answer many of the points raised by Dr. Hayman, and it is this: If the central portion of the Pentateuch, the Book of Leviticus, and great parts of Exodus and Numbers, which, with certain parts of Genesis, is considered to make (p. 305) up the Priestly Code as we now have it, was known to the prophets and the people on the return from the Exile, how comes it that Haggai, for instance, wishing to settle a question of ceremonial cleanness or uncleanness, bids the people "go to the priests for Torah," *instruction*, the universal meaning of the word in the pre-Exilian literature (comp. Deut. xxxiii. 10), instead of simply referring them to Numbers xix. 11, where the precept is fully laid down?

I will leave this part of the subject with a few words as to the last matter touched upon by Dr. Hayman, viz., the laws as to "vows." These are, no doubt, scattered in an apparently aimless way throughout the central portions of the Pentateuch, and this would be surely just as strange on the assumption of the Mosaic authorship as on that of Ezra and the priests of Jerusalem. On the latter assumption it may be the easier explained for two reasons: (1) the different subjects to which the vows relate; and (2) the fact that the priests were merely giving written expression to customs which had long had the force of law, and which were reduced to writing on different occasions, some in Babylonia, some in Jerusalem. "A separate law is devoted to the law of the Nazarite (Num. vi. 1-21); another law treats of vows in general (Lev. xxvii.), and is further amplified by regulations as to the vows of women and young girls (Num. xxx.). All these precepts are most remarkable. A vow from its nature is something voluntary, a natural product of religious belief in a certain stage of development. The Israelite can dedicate himself to Yahveh as a Nazir (1 Sam. i. 11-28; Judg. xiii. 3). He can give up to him a part of his means; banning

(*cherem*) can also take place in consequence of a previous vow to Yahveh (comp. Num. xxi. 2, 3). Now, what does the priestly lawgiver do with the natural product? *He prunes and regulates and assesses it, until it is in danger of losing all its significance and worth.*" So says Kuenen (*Bel. of Israel*, ii. 284), and after discussing the nature of these laws, he adds, " It cannot be denied that by laws of this kind the free utterance of the religious sentiment is fettered, and the real character of the religious action is in great part lost." This is characteristic of the priestly ordinances.

And it is the realization of this fact, through the patient investigation of the books, that has led, more than anything else, to the critical view of the origin and growth of the religion of Israel. In the early days religion was free, spontaneous, and unfettered. There was no distinction between Levite and priest; there was no central sanctuary; sacrifices were festal occasions, performed anywhere, especially at the shrines consecrated by memories of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (see Exod. xx., xxiii., and xxxiv.; and Judg. and Sam., *passim*, and the Books of Kings for the uniform practice in Northern Israel). Later on, with the building of Solomon's temple, and the consequent disfavour into which the high places fell, through the danger of the worship performed at them becoming assimilated to the heathen worship around, the Jerusalem priesthood gained more and more authority, until after a temporary reformation under Hezekiah, and a terrible reaction under Manasseh, the (p. 306) reformation of Josiah, under the influence and authority of Deuteronomy, then " found," was effected. Then the central sanctuary was established as the one lawful shrine, and the country priests were degraded to the position of Levites (see the Books of Kings, written under the influence of Deuteronomy, *passim*, and note especially 2 Kings xxii., xxiii.; contrast also the influence of Deuteronomy on Jeremiah and the subsequent prophets, and the entire absence of its influence on Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah i.). Upon Josiah's reformation followed the awful purification of the Exile, and then it was that codes like that contained in the Law of Holiness (Lev. xvii.-xxvi.), and that contained in Ezekiel xl.-xlviii., and others, were constructed as memorials and improvements upon former temple practice. This law, not yet fully arranged, nor combined with the earlier writings, and Deuteronomy, Ezra brought with him from Babylon in 458 B.C.; and after fourteen years, during which he was, no doubt, perfecting and completing it with the help of the Jerusalem priests, the finished Pentateuch was read in the ears of the people in 444 B.C. (Neh. viii. 1).

This was the publication of the Torah, or written law, and twelve years afterwards, in 432 B.C., Manasseh, the grandson of Eliashib, on being expelled from Jerusalem by Nehemiah, and taking refuge with his father-in-law, Sanballat the Horonite, in Samaria, would carry with him this finished Pentateuch. His quarrel was with Nehemiah, not with the law; and, seeing that the Samaritans were becoming more and more eager to prove themselves of the seed of Israel, he would have no difficulty in gaining their adhesion to this law. It was to his interest to do so, especially as he was about to inaugurate a schismatic temple on Mount Gerizim with himself and his successors as chief priests. Thus, by a somewhat long digression, we are brought back to the point from which we started—the question of the date and acceptance of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The Torah or Pentateuch was the only canon of the Jewish Church at the time of the secession, and the growing and finally dominant hostility between Jews and Samaritans prevented these latter from ever accepting the books subsequently canonized by the Jews as Scripture.

Two facts let me notice with regard to the Samaritan Pentateuch itself.



1. Its archaic characters, of which so much is made in some quarters, but which are not referred to by Canon Garratt or Dr. Hayman, are most important to the question at issue, for it has been proved that they are those in use in Judah at the time of the schism, and would therefore be those that Manasseh took with him to Samaria. They afterwards fell into gradual disuse in Judah, and were replaced by the "square" letters of our Hebrew Bible, just as Hebrew fell into disuse as the spoken language, and was replaced by Aramean (see Professor Kirkpatrick's *Divine Library of the Old Testament*, pp. 60-62).

2. The various readings, which Canon Garratt sweeps aside as in no way affecting the argument, are again most important, for they are mostly (p. 307) inserted to favour the Samaritan worship, and must therefore have been introduced into the original document at the time of the secession; e.g., the substitution of *Gerizim* for *Ebal* in Deut. xxvii. 5, and many others.

One word I must say in conclusion, with all due respect to Canon Garratt and Dr. Hayman. In common with so many writers of the conservative school, they asseverate that the Higher Criticism virtually charges the composers or compilers of the Scriptures with "forgery" or "concoction." So much does the Canon allow his righteous indignation to run away with him, that it lands him in the anachronism of speaking of "Jeremiah" forging the law in the early part of the reign of Hezekiah, a century before the prophet's birth!

Against this attitude I must ask leave to protest. No good purpose is secured in controversy by the use of strong language or by accusing your opponent of being less honest than you lay claim to be yourself.

The spirit of the age in which we live is a critical one. "Criticism," says M. Anatole France (a modern French writer), "is the most recent of all the manifestations of literature, and perhaps it will end by absorbing all the other forms. It is admirably suited to a very civilized society, whose souvenirs are rich, and whose traditions are already of long date. It proceeds at once from philosophy, and from history. Its development demands an epoch of absolute intellectual liberty." Against this spirit it is hopeless to fight; our aim must be to lead it into right and safe channels.

On behalf, then, of the Higher Criticism I would earnestly disclaim the charge that it makes the writers guilty of "forging" or "concocting" the Books of the Old Testament. The Higher Criticism, it appears to me, is based on the recognition of two facts. Having observed, from a study of science and philosophy, the unity of God's methods of working in the world of nature, and in the moral sphere, it realizes that His dealings with His ancient people Israel in His method of giving them His revelation, and in His education of them by means of it, were agreeable to His dealings with all other nations of mankind, and to His works in nature.

1. It recognizes *the progressive character of revelation*. Just as no river bursts full-born from the mountain side, but issues in a tiny rill, which, as it descends, gathers to itself other rills, which swell and swell its volume till it forms the majestic river rolling placidly to the sea; so Revelation and the Old Testament, its record, ran the same course. Beginning with the first small law-book and the records of the early traditions of the race, swollen as it descended the hills of time by new codes and new laws, by prophecy and psalm, and history and drama, it becomes at last the majestic "River of God," rolling placidly onwards, till it is merged in the ocean of God's love, as it is revealed in Jesus Christ.

And 2, It recognizes and endeavours to explain *the composite character of the Old Testament generally, and of the Pentateuch in particular*. Just as the geologist, if he

would learn the history of the formation of the earth's crust, must examine and break up the rocks, and in so doing finds evidence that (p. 308) they were originally deposited in strata of varying depths and in a definite order of succession at different ages, though now commingled in apparently hopeless confusion, till the wand of science makes them tell their tale; so is it with the Pentateuch as we have it to-day. The eye of the critical student discerns the strata deposited at different periods of the nation's history, and beneath all the apparently inextricable confusion of the Pentateuch, as it came from the hands of its last editor, can read the story of a uniform and consistent progress and development. The outlines of a merely local and national worship, given by Moses, develop in due course into the magnificent ceremonialism of Ezra and the priesthood of the second temple; and this, in God's providence, takes its right place as a preparation for the time when the germ of true religion, planted in the heart of the Chaldean Patriarch, after growing and spreading down the centuries put forth its full flower in Christ; and in Him Abraham became in truth the "father of many nations," and the religion of Israel became the religion of the world. To the reverent student of the Old Testament this unravelling of the documents by which the historic development of Israel and her religion may be traced is deeply interesting, and as it proceeds he feels that, amid all the perplexity of the problems evoked, among which the origin and date of the Samaritan Pentateuch is not the least, he may fearlessly "assert eternal Providence, and justify the ways of God to men."

NOTE.—On the questions involved in this paper I would refer the reader to Wellhausen's *Prolegomena of the History of Israel*, p. 498; Kuenens *Religion of Israel*, vol. ii., pp. 206-8, 236, 249, 250; vol. iii., pp. 47 ff., in addition to those quoted. See also the same author's *Hibbert Lectures*, 1882, p. 80 ff.

Professor Robertson Smith's *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, ed. 1892, p. 61, and Lectures viii., ix., x., *passim*; Ewald's *History of Israel*, vol. i., pp. 173-78, 188-96; vol. v., p. 216 ff., 279, 281; vol. viii., pp. 322-24; Professor Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, pp. 77, 135, 146, 471, 507 ff.

That the views expressed in this paper are not inconsistent either with loyalty to the teaching of our blessed Lord or the teaching of the Church as to Inspiration, is well brought out by Mr. Gore in his celebrated essay in *Lux Mundi*, pp. 351-61; by Professor Kirkpatrick in the book already cited, pp. 8, 9; and by the Bishop of Manchester, *Teaching of Christ*, pp. 37-43.

### **Comments on this section from the Editor of theSamaritanUpdate.com**

This reference is #202 located in *A Bibliography of the Samaritans, Third Edition, Revised, Expanded, and Annotated*, by Alan David Crown and Reinhard Pummer, ATLA Bibliography, No. 51, **The Scarecrow Press, Inc.** Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford. 2005