

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

ment and wrath from the nature of God, we do not bring Him near. We put Him far away. He is no more the Living God. Dr. MOODY brings all this to a pointed conclusion when he says that, though mystery may remain in the death of Christ, yet the

mystery is abated if we recognize that by His own will, and by the Father's appointment, the innocent did, in some sense, take the place of the guilty. May God forbid that for us Jesus should cease to be a Saviour !

The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN E. MCFADYEN, D.D., GLASGOW.

PROFESSOR A. S. YAHUDA has just published an elaborate volume of 320 large and beautifully printed pages, bearing the title *Die Sprache des Pentateuch in ihren Beziehungen zum Aegyptischen* (Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, W.10 ; Mk.22). Only an accomplished Egyptologist could do justice to this impressive book ; but even Old Testament scholars who are not Egyptologists will recognize it at once as a contribution of first-rate importance to Old Testament science. As this volume is to be followed by another which will deal with the portions of the Pentateuch not here discussed, any criticism of the argument which it introduces must be premature and incomplete ; but the trend of the conclusion is already quite visible. Briefly it is this, that the Pentateuch originated about the time of the Exodus and before the conquest of Canaan. Hebrew, it is argued, was developed from a primitive Canaanite dialect, under the influence of Egyptian, into the literary language which we find in the Pentateuch : so pervasive is its Egyptian colouring, alike in language and style, that it could only have originated in an Egyptian environment. Thus the argument of the book, as its title suggests, is mainly, though not exclusively, linguistic. There are words and turns of expression, it is contended, which occur in no other Semitic language, but are to be found in the Pentateuch and in Egyptian ; and similarly, words which within the Bible appear only in the Pentateuch, but also in Egyptian. Of course Egyptian words in the Pentateuch, like אָהוּ, *reeds* (Gn 41^{2, 18}), have long been recognized as such, but Dr. Yahuda believes that other words, which have passed for Semitic, are really Egyptian : e.g. חַרְטָמִים, *magicians*, which the *Oxford Lexicon* connects with חָרָט, 'stylus,' is ex-

plained as derived from the Egyptian *hrj* and *dm* and meaning 'those who are over the books,' i.e. 'learned in the (magical) writings.' So הַתְּבִיחַ, *abomination*, for which the *Oxford Lexicon* assumes a root תֵּבַח, is held to be connected with the Egyptian *w'b* (ועב), 'pure, holy,' and it should in strictness be referred in Hebrew dictionaries to עֵב. (The transformation of the meaning would be explained by the simple fact that what was holy to the Egyptians would be an abomination to the Hebrews.) Similarly בַּיָּד, *post, place (office)* (Gn 40¹³ 41¹³), is believed to have nothing to do with the Hebrew בַּיָּד, but comes from the Egyptian *gnw*. 'a stand.' Again שֶׁבֶר, *corn, grain*, which looks so genuinely Hebrew, is the Eg. *šbw*, 'food' ; and the puzzling חַמְשִׁים (*Oxf. Lex.* 'in battle array,' Ex 13¹⁸, Jos 1¹⁴ 4¹², Jg 7¹¹) is connected with the Egyptian *hms* ('lance, harpoon') and explained to mean 'armed with lances.' It is certainly not without significance that no less than four Egyptian words appear in a single verse (Ex 2⁹)—תִּבְרָה (ark), נִפְתָּא (rushes), סוּף (reeds), and יָאֵר (river).

The first and shorter section of the book deals with the Joseph and Exodus narratives, which reflect most distinctly the Egyptian environment, and exhibit most clearly a linguistic relation with Egyptian. The second and in some ways the more important and interesting section deals with the Genesis stories in 1-11, in which the Babylonian element has long been recognized, and with the patriarchal stories. The first section offers a detailed examination of certain words and phrases which can only be explained, or at least can best be explained, on the basis of Egyptian analogies. Here are some illustrations. The difficult עַל-פִּיךָ יֵשֶׁן (Gn 41⁴⁰ : according to thy word 'shall they be

ruled,' R.V.) whose text the *Oxford Lexicon* suspects as corrupt—for נשק regularly means 'to kiss'—is explained, in accordance with Egyptian metaphorical usage, as meaning 'shall feed,' the reference being to Joseph's measures for the regulation of Egypt's food supply. The infinitive in an imperative sense (נָתַח, Gn 41⁴³; cf. 43¹⁶) is an Egyptian construction familiar in official proclamations and laws; cf. the inf. in both versions of the fourth commandment (זָכוֹר, Ex 20⁸; שָׁמֹר, Dt 5¹²). Those who 'stood by' Joseph (Gn 45¹) are not casual bystanders, but officers of the court—a regular Egyptian phrase. In Ex 9¹⁶ the curious word 'for this cause have I made thee to stand' (תַּעֲמִדְתִּיךָ) is explained from Egyptian as equivalent to 'I have spared thee.' The description of Joseph's installation as Vizier in Gn 41⁴¹⁻⁴⁴ is brief but accurate in every detail: note v. 42 'the gold chain' (not *a*, A.V., R.V.), *i.e.* the chain which such an official habitually received at his investiture. 'Father' (45⁸) is a common Egyptian priestly title (cf. 41⁴⁵). The word מִצְרַיִם, which, regarded as a dual, has usually—and Yahuda believes rightly—been taken to refer to Upper and Lower Egypt, is explained by him, for the first time, as a Hebrew adaptation of the Egyptian word *t3.wj* 'the two lands,' dual of *t3*, 'land.'

Particularly interesting is his discussion of הָאִישׁ, a word which occurs with curious frequency (42^{30, 33} 43^{3, 5}) in reference to Joseph, and which turns out to be an Egyptian official title. This throws fresh light on Ex 2¹⁴. The translation in A.V. and R.V.: 'Who made thee a prince and a judge over us?'—ignores the word אִישׁ, which in the original precedes שָׂר וְשֹׁפֵט. Dr. Yahuda regards the three words as a gradation and takes the meaning to be, 'Who made thee Lord Chief Justice (Vizier), or one of the higher judges, or even an ordinary judge?' שָׂר is often quite clearly not 'prince,' but an official of some kind; cf. 40², the שָׂר of the butlers and the bakers. There has been much dispute over the meaning of Joseph's Egyptian name Ḥaph'nath-pa'neah (41⁴⁵): it has been commonly interpreted as 'The God speaks; may he live,' and as theophorous names are particularly common in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., this has been taken to confirm the current critical view of the date of the Hebrew document in which the name occurs. But Dr. Yahuda points out that in such cases the name of the god—Ptach, Horus, Thoth, etc.—under whose protection the person named is to come, is always added; besides, such a name, however applicable to a new-born child,

would be totally inapplicable to a vizier: he therefore interprets the name as meaning, 'This living one is the nourishment (*i.e.* nourisher) of the land'—an allusion to Joseph's official position as controller of the grain supply (42⁸). For Moses he also suggests a new interpretation, 'child of the Nile,' deriving it from *mw* ('water,' *i.e.* seed, child) and *z* (the Nile). The prison, בֵּית הַפֶּהַר, in which Joseph was shut up, is not an ordinary prison, but the massive fortress *T3r* on the border of Egypt and Palestine in which great criminals and particularly political offenders were confined (Gn 39²⁰). In Ex 4¹⁶ Aaron is described as the 'mouth' of Moses, this being the title of a very high court official, while Moses is as אֱלֹהִים, whose Egyptian equivalent *ntj* is one of the highest attributes of Pharaoh.

In Ex 10⁵ it is said that the locusts will cover אֶת־עֵין הָאָרֶץ, which our versions render by 'the face of the earth,' but the literal translation 'the eye of the land' is correct, and by it *the sun* is meant, as clear from v. 15, where, as a consequence, 'the land was darkened.' In Gn 42²³ שָׁמַע ('hear') is used in the sense of 'understand'—'they knew not that Joseph understood them' (שָׁמַע). But this should hardly be pressed as due to Egyptian influence: it is a good Hebrew usage (cf. Gn 11⁷, Jer 5¹⁵), and the same idiom is found in a language so remote from Egyptian as Efik. Similarly it hardly seems necessary to refer to Egyptian so obvious a phrase for multitude as 'the sand of the sea.' A really important point, however, is scored by Dr. Yahuda, when he suggests that such a phrase as 'it came to pass in (the course of) those many days' (Ex 2²³) does not necessarily imply a long interval of time: in Egyptian popular narrative it merely indicates a transition from one phase of the story to another. So Egyptian usage, he argues, throws light upon Hebrew narrative style.

Striking, however, as are the analogies between Egyptian and Hebrew in the stories of Joseph and Moses, the second and longer part of the volume, dealing with Egyptian influence upon the tales of the early world (Gn 1-11) and of the patriarchs, is more interesting and arresting still. Dr. Yahuda acknowledges the presence of Assyrio-Babylonian elements in Gn 1-11 as frankly as any Assyriologist could wish, but he insists that Egyptian elements are present even more abundantly, and that their influence is palpably felt both in the language and in the substance of the tales. Indeed, traces of Accadian in the language are nothing like so prominent as one might expect, considering the Accadian origin of these tales. For example, none

of the Accadian words for ship is used to designate Noah's ark, but תִּבְיָה, which is just the Egyptian *dp.t*. Again, he does not accept the common belief that תְּהוֹם points back to the mythological Tīamat: it is simply the Hebrew equivalent for *tāmtu* or *tāmdu*, the primeval ocean (cf. Gn 7¹¹ 8²). The 'hovering' or 'fluttering' (רָהַר) of the spirit of God, like a bird, over the face of the waters, is ascribed to Egyptian influence and supported by the Egyptian analogy of the sun-god Re, who flew over the primeval waters in the form of a goose, scattering light with his wings. (But this view would be invalidated by Professor J. M. P. Smith's translation, 'a mighty wind was beating upon the surface of the waters.' *Old Testament Essays* [Griffin & Co.], p. 169.) שָׁמַיִם, which is treated as a dual, is traced to the Egyptian conception of two heavens, through one of which—that in the underworld, the world of the dead—the sun was believed to travel by night. Hebrew, of course, does not share this conception. Indeed, Dr. Yahuda sees in the statement that the purpose of the heavenly bodies was 'to give light upon the earth' (Gn 1⁵. 17), a subtle but deliberate protest against the Egyptian belief: so that while the (?) dual word embodies an Egyptian reminiscence, the passage itself is anti-Egyptian. It is also curious that in the Creation story, the birds seem to be associated with the fish as originating in the waters (Gn 1^{20f.}). Here also Dr. Yahuda detects Egyptian influence. The birds in which the Egyptians were chiefly interested had their nests in the swamps and thickets of the Nile meadows. The phrase 'God saw that it was good' recalls, we are told, an expression common upon the lips of Egyptian workers in art, though it hardly seems necessary to account for the phrase in this way.

אֲדָמָה is connected with אֶרֶץ, the red earth. Why the red? Because, it appears, in Egyptian, the Red, as distinguished from the Black, which was a designation for Egypt, is a term used to describe unfruitful land, or the nomad-inhabited wilderness. Contrasted with this is Eden, which is conceived as an oasis, near the western horizon. The doom which follows the sin of אָדָם is that he is driven from the oasis, in which is the garden of God, to the inhospitable אֶרֶץ from which he was taken (3²³). The statement that 'man was formed from the dust of the ground' (Gn 2⁷) is, according to Dr. Yahuda, a later correction or at least modification of 1^{26f.}, which, representing man as made in the image of God, might too readily suggest the physical similarity of God and man. The verse 2⁷, by suggesting the lowly origin of man,

and by placing him in this respect—as formed from the אֶרֶץ—on a level with the beasts (2¹⁰), not only rules out any interpretation of 1^{26f.} which would lift man to a place of equality with God, but also, by accentuating thus his distance from God, prepares the way for the story of the Fall. It is easy to see how such a view as this, which regards Gn 1 as older than Gn 2, overturns the whole current conception of Pentateuchal criticism. Most critics would rather regard the sublimity and reticence of the Creation story in Gn 1 as an implicit criticism of the facile and primitive anthropomorphism of Gn 2.

The four streams, Pison, Gihon, Tigris, and Euphrates, which were in some way connected with the stream which flowed through Paradise (2¹⁰⁻¹⁴), are the four great rivers of the world; the two last water the eastern world and the two former presumably the western. Dr. Yahuda argues powerfully for the view that Pison and Gihon stand for two divisions of the Nile, Pison being the Egyptian Nile as far as Assouan, and Gihon the Nubian Nile. In the *four* streams he detects the monotheistic and universalistic tendency of the Hebrew writer: to the Egyptians the Nile was the only 'heavenly' stream, and so did the other peoples regard their river. There is no space to pursue the detail further. Suffice it to say that nearly a hundred pages are devoted to the stories of the Creation and the Fall, and every feature of these stories—the creation of woman, the two trees, the serpent, etc.—assumes a fresh interest and often a clearer meaning in the light of the numerous Egyptian analogies. The serpent-motif, e.g. in the Hebrew story, is held to be better illustrated by the numerous parallels in Egyptian fable than by the 'single and very dubious parallel,' to which Delitzsch appeals, of the Babylonian cylinder-seal, with its man and woman sitting on either side of a fruit tree and a serpent erecting itself behind the woman.

The Flood story has usually been held to be peculiarly Babylonian. Dr. Yahuda has argued, however, we think successfully, that here also Egyptian elements are present. Apart from the fact, already alluded to, that the word for 'ark' is Egyptian, one of the explanations of the origin of the Flood is, he thinks, demonstrably Egyptian. According to 7¹¹ the world was submerged, because 'the fountains of the great deep were broken up,' and 'the windows of heaven were opened.' The latter phrase, which points to a terrific rainstorm, represents the Babylonian version of the Flood: the former, which regards the Flood as due to an overflow, is the Egyptian version, by which the

original Babylonian conception has been expanded. The 'overflow' is the form in which the Divine visitation overtakes 'rainless' Egypt. Here, as in the case of the four rivers, the Hebrew story has a definitely universal outlook; and the chronology of the Flood and its various periods are shown to correspond exactly with the periods of the rise and fall of the Nile.

Again, while the Babylonian origin of the story of the Tower of Babel is frankly admitted, it is contended that here also the presence of Egyptian elements is undeniable. The statement, *e.g.*, in Gn 11³ that the builders 'had brick for stone and bitumen for mortar,' has, it is claimed, Egyptian conditions in view. 'Such an explanation can only have been designed for circles where the use of brick for monumental buildings was a thing unheard of, but this is in high degree applicable to Egypt; for here brick was used for houses, corn-stores, and similar buildings, but not for gigantic monuments of the rank of the tower of Babel, for which the Egyptians used great blocks of stone or well-hewn squared stones of granite or basalt. Only in view of this did it seem to the writer appropriate to call attention to the fact that in Babylon brick was substituted for stones in buildings of great public significance and height.'

The rest of the book is taken up with the discussion of the fanciful etymologies of Hebrew proper names in Genesis, illustrated by Egyptian analogies, and with Hebrew words or phrases either borrowed from or influenced by Egyptian. *E.g.*, in the phrase *רֵיחַ הַנְּחִיחַ* (Gn 8²¹), which E.V. renders by 'sweet savour,' and the *Oxford Lexicon*, connecting it with *נָחַ*, 'to rest,' renders by 'odour of soothing (to God),' 'tranquillizing odour (of ascending sacrifices),' Dr. Yahuda derives *נִחַח* from the Egyptian *nḥḥ*, 'eternity,' and renders by 'eternal savour.' The broad thesis of the book—that the Pentateuch has been profoundly influenced by Egyptian—is supported by an amplitude of detail, of which this brief sketch can furnish but the remotest idea, and the conclusion of the whole matter is that the linguistic phenomena exhibited by the Pentateuch, or at any rate by Genesis and the sections of Exodus dealt with in this volume, are only possible and intelligible within an environment in which Hebrews and Egyptians lived together. Dr. Yahuda's contention, if it be held to be proved, would carry fateful consequences in other than linguistic directions. It would involve a radical revision, and indeed overthrow, of current critical conceptions of early Hebrew literature. It would,

as he hints in his Preface, necessitate the complete transformation of the prevailing view of the origin and development of the religion of Israel. If the Pentateuch is only explicable in an Egyptian *milieu*, then the critics will have to begin their work all over again.

It would be unfair to Dr. Yahuda to reject the conclusion towards which his first volume points until the appearance of the second volume, which will continue and substantiate his argument. He seems to have proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the influence of Egyptian upon the Hebrew literature which he has examined so closely is far more profound and pervasive than has hitherto been suspected. But the explanation which he offers is far from being the only possible one. Archæology, history, and literature unite in assuring us that for centuries Egypt was in intimate contact with Canaan. In the tenth century B.C., Solomon married an Egyptian princess, and Jeroboam fled to Egypt; in the seventh century the prophet Uriah took refuge from the wrath of Jehoiakim in Egypt, from which he was extradited; probably in that century and certainly in the following there were Jewish mercenaries in the service of Pharaoh; in the later days of Jeremiah there was a Jewish settlement in Egypt; and in the fifth century there was a Jewish military colony at Elephantine. This is the period—from the tenth to the fifth centuries—within which the critics place the constituent documents of the Pentateuch for a multitude of reasons which seem to them conclusive. Further, there is practically no doubt of the intimate connexion of Pr 22¹⁷⁻²⁴ or ³⁴ with the Teaching of Amen-em-ope. In view of all this, the strong Egyptian colouring of the Pentateuch can hardly be said to tell infallibly in favour of a date as early as Israel's sojourn in Egypt, or to outweigh the varied and abundant evidence which points to different literary strata and a later date or dates.

But, however that may be, it cannot and will not be denied that Dr. Yahuda has given an immense impetus to a fresh study of Israel's tales of the early world and the patriarchs. The facts which he adduces, with all the authority of a wide and intimate knowledge of Egyptian literature, compel a re-examination of the whole problem. Not so long ago it used to be said that the influence of Egypt upon the Old Testament was negligible. Dr. Yahuda has dissipated this misconception once for all. He very justly claims that by the investigation of Hebrew in the light of Egyptian, new horizons are opened up, and the student of

the Old Testament will henceforth have to reckon with Egyptian no less seriously than with Babylonian. This is the indefeasible merit of Dr. Yahuda's very erudite book, and no difference of opinion on other matters can rob him of it. Whether the book will inaugurate a new era in Pentateuchal criticism remains to be seen, but in any case it must be recognized as a weighty and even momentous contribution to Old Testament science, opening up, as it does, if not exactly an undis-

covered field, at any rate a field of unsuspected fertility and promise. The book has already attracted the attention of scholars in Germany, Italy, and Spain, and an English translation of it is being projected. It is much to be hoped that its appearance may not be long delayed, as it furnishes a fresh approach to a study which is in danger of moving along conventional lines, and it cannot fail to be gratefully welcomed by every real student of the Old Testament.

The Blessing of the Peacemakers.

BY PROFESSOR B. W. BACON, D.D., YALE.

ONE of the most poetically beautiful sermons ever addressed to a Jewish synagogue, and one of the most deeply religious, is preserved to us in outline in the Talmudic treatise, *Genesis Rabba*, 66. 2, where, in speaking of the Reconciliation of Israel, the rabbi quotes Is 66¹², 'I will extend peace to her like a river,' and in his comment dwells upon Ca 6¹³ (Heb. 7¹), translated in our English versions, 'Return, return, O Shulammitte; return, return!'

The Hebrew word for 'return' (*shubi*) is identical with that elsewhere translated 'repent.' It is repeated four times in succession in the entreaty to the Shulammitte, who, in rabbinic interpretation of the Song of Songs, is always taken to represent Israel, Jehovah's erring bride. Repentance, a favourite theme of rabbinic exhortation, is therefore the general subject of the sermon; but, as both selected passages show, the tone of the appeal is much nearer to the winning accents of the Servant of God who neither strives nor cries aloud, nor causes his voice to be heard in the streets, who will neither break the crushed reed, nor quench the smoking lampwick, till he has sent forth true religion to its victory, than to the austere voice of the prophet of doom crying like Jonah to the Ninevites, 'Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed.'

As all students of the post-Isaian literature of Israel know, there is an immense contrast in tone between the prophets of denunciation, who, like a Malachi or a John the Baptist, seek to drive Israel to repentance by threats of fire unquenchable, and those who, like Hosea, or more especially the Wisdom writers of the period nearest to Jesus' own

time, seek to win her by the entreaties of Jehovah's love. It is the tone of the Wisdom writers which characterizes the appeal of our rabbi. Wisdom is the gentle, pleading spirit of Jehovah's redeeming love, yearning over His wayward sons. She stands at the head of the streets entreating men to turn from their folly and accept her easy yoke. But to all save the remnant of the 'children' by whom she is justified, she pleads in vain. Men reject her and turn after folly. The Complaints of rejected Wisdom form the classic theme of such Wisdom lyrics as Pr 1-10, Eccles 24, and Bar 3^{9-4¹}. One such seems to be quoted in Lk 11^{49f.} 13^{34f.}.

Unquestionably the contrast between these two types of appeal is depicted in the great Q discourse of Jesus uttered to the multitude after the departure of the messengers of John (Mt 11^{16ff.} = Lk 7^{31ff.}). The warnings of the Baptist are compared to the harsh notes of funeral wailing, to which the evil generation gives no more heed than to the wedding music of Jesus' glad tidings of forgiveness to the penitent. John's message had come like the terror-awakening cry of Jonah which the Ninevites had accepted without a miracle. The wisdom of Solomon had drawn the Queen of the South from the ends of the earth. But this evil and adulterous generation demands a sign from heaven, and turns a deaf ear both to the warnings which are 'a greater matter (*πλείον*) than Jonah' and to the winning entreaty of Jesus supported though it is by gracious tokens of Divine healing and forgiveness, a work of the Wisdom of God which is 'a greater matter (*πλείον*) than Solomon.'

In every respect save its typically rabbinic style