

rections, but I have carefully suppressed all that appeared doubtful or trivial. Though many are in themselves unimportant when taken alone, yet viewed as a body they effect considerable changes in the history, add to its graphic force, give greater cohesion to its parts, and bring it into more exact harmony with known circumstances, and with other records and apostolic teaching.

F. RENDALL.

THE PENTATEUCH—EGYPTICITY AND
AUTHENTICITY.¹

THE lives of the saints are, in Egypt, called "maimers" (memoirs?), and I have read a number of them besides those of St. Joseph and St. Moses.

Between these and those I find this great difference—that, while the latter are definite, particular, and sharp-cut in their details, the former, for the most part, are indefinite, hazy, and when they condescend to particulars which can be checked by veritable history, often incorrect.

For instance, finding myself not long since wind-bound near a village on the Nile containing a Coptic church, I went up to it, and finding no audience to hear the gospel message except an impracticable priest, I spent a few hours rummaging among the old books, and especially in reading the memoirs of the saintess to whom the church was dedicated and the story of its erection by her husband, a Copt who was at the time chief secretary of the reigning sultan.

The style and internal evidences of the story all went to show that the document was written about 500 years ago, while the plot of the story was laid some 400 years further

¹ I have to acknowledge the kindness of Professor Sayce in revising this paper.—Ed. *Expositor*.

back, namely, at the epoch of the crusaders, and especially at the time of the taking of Damietta.

The story did not lack in striking and interesting incidents of a private and domestic nature (such as might take place anywhere and at any time); but when the events of actual history were mentioned, it was in an indefinite and hazy manner which showed that the author was not at home in this domain, and when tested by the touchstone of reliable history his facts turned out to be fictions. Thus all that a charitable critic could conclude from the narrative is that the church was probably founded about the time of the crusaders, that some loose and greatly exaggerated traditions of the event were hovering around for several centuries, until the days of Beni Assal (the golden age of Coptic ecclesiastical invention), when some unknown sat down and wove the web of the story, the warp consisting of the above-mentioned traditions, and the woof pure invention.

Not such are the stories of Joseph and Moses. I lately saw quoted a remark of Bunsen, "that reliable history commenced when Moses led the Israelites out of the land of Goshen." I think the most will agree with me in the remark that, to be reliable, especially in the sense required in our sacred books, it must be written at or near the time when the events narrated occurred.

That this was the case in reference to the Biblical narratives of the lives of Joseph and Moses I wish to contribute my mite to help to show, and that not by the many sidelights which may be focussed upon the subject, but by the one line of argument with which as an "old Egyptian" who has read the narrative pretty closely in the original, and on the spot, I ought to be somewhat conversant, *viz.* the line of local hints and linguistic usages,—in other words, the Egyptian cast and character of the narratives.

We will begin from the 39th of Genesis.

Without indorsing any of the fine-drawn theories which

have been built upon the "document hypothesis," no one who believes in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch should, I think, doubt that Moses possessed documents from which, as directed by the Holy Ghost, he compiled the history as we have it in the Book of Genesis *down to his own day*. On this supposition, which the sceptical critics would be the last to deny, may we not also build the presumption that, during the stay of Israel in Egypt, and before the nation had been reduced to the state of hopeless, abject slavery in which we find them when Moses was thrust forward by God as their deliverer,—may we not, I say, build the presumption that a memoir of Joseph would be written ?

This memoir would naturally embrace the stirring and romantic events so flattering to the national pride embraced in the story of the exaltation and rule of Joseph in Egypt, and its marvellous result in preserving alive, not only the holy seed, but many others ; and also sundry other matters of prime importance to the covenant people : such as the blessing of Jacob upon his sons contained in the 49th chapter of Genesis ; the history of that long funeral procession from Egypt to the cave of Machpelah in Hebron ; and the solemn charge and oath of Joseph narrated in the 50th chapter, when he said, " I die, and God will surely visit you and bring you out of this land unto the land which He sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob." " And Joseph took an oath of the children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence." These records, together with his embalmed and cofined body, were doubtless sacredly preserved for the expected time of deliverance so long foretold.

Beginning with the Egyptian life of Joseph, from the 39th chapter, we have, in the first verse, an evident repetition of verse 36 of the 37th chapter, and thus a splice of the narrative. Chapter xxxviii. is evidently a previously existing document thrown in. The events narrated in it

are of so discreditable a nature to the parties concerned, that we cannot suppose that the compiler would have inserted them had he not felt that it was his duty to do so.

That chapter xxxviii. is an inserted document from a previous time is evident from chapter xlvi. 12. In the enumeration there given of the sons of Israel which came into Egypt with him, we have the names of Hezron and Hamul, *sons of Pharez*.

Now taking the age of Joseph as seventeen when he was sold to Egypt, the time which he spent in the house of Potiphar and in prison as thirteen years, as he was thirty when he stood before Pharaoh (xli. 46), the seven years of plenty, and the two or three of famine before Jacob came down to Egypt, there is not, we see, time for Pharez to have had children at the date of the descent into Egypt; for from chap. xxxviii. we learn that Pharez was not born till after the marriage and death of Er and Onan, his elder brothers.

If it be asked, What then shall we do with the expression, *ויהי בעת ההיא* (xxxviii. 1), and it came to pass at that time, we answer that it must either refer back to some former paragraph in the history, or to some document which Moses (the only redactor of primitive documents whose hand we have yet been able to see in the history up to his death) was divinely directed to omit. That there are instances of this latter we think we shall see evidence as we proceed.

We have (xxxix. 1) two Egyptian proper names, Potiphar and Pharaoh. For their explanation we will refer, as we shall often have occasion with other Egyptian words, to the able essay of Canon Cook, at the end of the *Speaker's Commentary on Exodus*, "On Egyptian Words in the Pentateuch."

We have also, in this first verse, proof that the narrative from this 39th chapter down was written, or at least collated, *after the exodus*. We have it in the expression

הורדהו שמה (brought him down thither). But in our version *brought* and *thither* do not agree. We *bring* a thing *hither* and *take* it *thither*.

The use of שמה and not לזה is proof that this verse was written outside of Egypt, and after the exodus. In chapter xxxvii. 25, the writer was in Palestine, and so he says, הולכים להוריד מצרימה (going to carry it down to Egypt), and in xlii. 2, Jacob, speaking in Palestine also, says, רדו שמה; and a little after (verse 15) Joseph says מזה והנה (hence and *hither*). In chapter xlvi. 3, 4, we have the expressions רדה מצרימה and ארד עמך מצרימה (go down to Egypt); and then in verse 8, in sharp contrast, הבאים מצרימה (which came to Egypt).

A more important question, because at present a living, "burning" one, is whether, granted that the narrative was written after the exodus, it was written *soon* after, and by an author or authors acquainted with Egyptian affairs; or, several hundred years after, and by men trained among Syrian or Assyrian environments.

It is to answer this question, which has been forced upon us, as well as to contribute my mite towards the elucidation of the sacred narrative, that I have taken up my pen.

"Captain of the guard." Rather, we think, as we have it in the LXX., "head cook." The translators of the LXX. were more likely than we to know the Egyptian use of the phrase. Besides, we have evidence from other passages.

In chapter xliii. 16 we have טָבַח טָבַח (slay); but the expression as even yet used in Egypt in Arabic means more than simply to slay, *viz.* to slay and cook; that is, prepare a meal of butcher's meat. In Proverbs ix. 2 the phrase is used with the same meaning, טַבַּחַה טַבַּחַה, translated "she hath killed her beasts," which I would prefer rendering literally, "she hath cooked her cookery," *i.e.* "prepared her feast."

There are thousands of well-to-do people yet in Egypt

who only have "tabikh" when, like Joseph, they have guests; and it shows how frugally he lived, even in the height of his power, that he had to give special orders to his cook for a supper of butcher's meat when he would entertain his brethren.

Then we have the same use of the word in the days of Samuel. 1 Sam. ix. 22, 24, "And Samuel said unto the cook" (לִטְבַח). "And the cook took up the shoulder." And xxv. 11, "and my flesh that I have killed," אֲשֶׁר טַבַּחְתִּי טַבַּחְתִּי. This I would translate, "my food that I have cooked."

When we collate the passages under the verb טַבַּח and its derivatives, we see that some of them refer to the slaughtering of *men* as well as animals; but the former is evidently the secondary meaning, and the transition is easy. The butcher acquires a hardness of heart which prepares him for the office of executioner; and the butchers are always foremost in an oriental massacre of Christians by Muslims. We have had two since my residence in the East, that of Damascus, and in Egypt in the days of Arabi, besides many panics. During these the poor Christian sheep have often told me, with a shudder, how the Muslim butchers would sit in their open shops and in the streets sharpening their knives and brandishing them in their faces as they passed.

Eunuchs are not the men to be made either "chiefs of the executioners" or "commanders of the body-guard." In voice, heart, and body they are usually very effeminate. At least we must say that "captain of the guard" is not a translation of שַׂר הַטַּבָּחִים or רֶב טַבָּחִים of 2 Kings xxv. 8, and parallel passages in Jeremiah. Had Nebuzaradan been either "captain of the body-guard" or "chief of the executioners" of Nebuchadnezzar, we think it very unlikely that he would have been sent to Jerusalem on such a mission. He would have been always needed near his master; and we think it best to take the description of him as "servant

of the king of Babylon" to mean his trusted man whom he could send on a special confidential mission. Canon Cook's derivation of the name Potiphar, "devoted to the house" (*i.e.* of the king), falls in admirably with this idea.

Verse 5. The promotion of Joseph, a slave, to the post of honour and responsibility in his master's house is quite in accordance with the custom still in Egypt, **בית עבדים**. Potiphar, his master, was probably a slave and eunuch, as his name, **סריס**, implies. Khalul Aga, a black man, eunuch of the ex-khedive's mother, was, a few years ago, perhaps the most influential man in Egypt, next to the khedive. He amassed immense wealth; and I was told that, on entering a room in which the pashas, the ruling officials of the land, were, they would all rise and kiss his hand.

How light the yoke of slavery is in such cases may be shown by an illustrative example, of which I could give many. A friend of mine freed and sent away his slave, who had been acting as his major-domo. The slave begged me to intercede with his master to take him back into slavery.

One great reason of this advancement is that, being foreigners, they have no outside family connexions and ties, and so are more likely to be true to their masters. When the master dies the slave often takes his place; and thus it came to pass that Egypt for generations, up to the end of the last century, was ruled by Mamlukes, that is, slaves.

"In the house and in the field." The field, or farm, is generally distant from the house, and under separate management. It shows how implicit was the confidence of Potiphar in Joseph that he made him overseer of both house and field.

Ver. 11. **כדוים הוה**. "About this time" is not a translation of this phrase. It necessarily refers to some special day, which however is not specified in the context.

In the book at present existing among the Jews as the

Book of Jasher, the gap is most naturally filled up by a description of the annual festival still observed in Egypt in August at the rising of the Nile, when nearly the whole population go down to the river, leaving their houses; and it represents Potiphar's wife as seizing this opportunity to accomplish her purpose. Without ascribing undue authority to this so-called "Book of Jasher," might we not say that it is possible that, in this and other cases that might be pointed out, it has preserved parts of the original story, which, being irrelevant to the history of God's people, Moses was not directed to preserve?

The "tale of the two brothers," translated from the D'Orbiney papyrus of the age of Seti II. of the 19th dynasty, has been quoted as illustrating, by the similarity of expressions used, the temptation of Joseph. (*Records of the Past*, vol. ii. p. 137. 22.) The keeper of the prison turning over everything into Joseph's hand is quite Egyptian. In a land of slavery no one does anything that he can turn over into the hands of a slave.

Ver. 5. פתרון. Does not this word here and in ver. 8, and in the other places in which it is used, mean "revelation," rather than "interpretation"? And has it not thus its Arabic equivalent in *فطر* rather than *فسر*? The latter means "to explain"; the former (cf. Lane's Dictionary), "to cleave, split, rend," and then "to create, cause to exist," that is, to bring something into being out of nothing; and therefore the participle is one of the names of Deity as Creator; and have we not here the meaning of 2 Peter i. 20, "No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private *interpretation* (*revelation*). For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"?

Ver. 11. כוס (cup). Tattam, *Coptic Lexicon*, p. 146, gives "kagi." The usual Arabic word is *كاس*, "kas"; but *كوز* "kooz," is used in Egypt.

The expressions על כף and ביד are still true to Egyptian life. The cup is a shallow one, like a saucer, and when the servant brings it *in* his hand, the master takes it *upon* his, or *vice versâ*. כף is also an old Egyptian word, "keb." Pierret, p. 615.

It is shown in the *Speaker's Commentary*, in opposition to the testimony of Herodotus, that the vine and wine were known in Egypt in ancient times. Not only so, but I have known this very act in Egypt, *viz.* the servant pressing the juice of the fresh grapes into a cup, and immediately giving it to his master to drink. Communion wine is also often made by soaking raisins in water over night and then expressing and straining the juice. The most esteemed Araki is also made from this juice fermented and distilled.

Ver. 16. סלי חרי. "White baskets" is an incorrect translation of the phrase. We have no *white* baskets in Egypt; and those on the head of the chief baker were really *red* baskets, *i.e.* baskets covered with red leather. The commentators, following the lead of Gesenius, have said they were called white because they contained "white bread made of fine flour." But the adjective is a description of the *baskets*, and not of their contents, which are described in the next verse as "all manner of baked meats for Pharaoh."

The word חרי has not only been incorporated into the Hebrew, but also into the Arabic; and so in the Arabic translation of the Scriptures we have سلال حراي, "selal houari." But as our Syrian translators knew nothing of our חרי baskets, they simply inserted the word, and in the margin gave the explanation of Gesenius. Betaking ourselves, as we often must, to the *Arabic* lexicon to find the true meaning of the Hebrew word, under حروي "houari," after a great variety of meanings, we find "selal houari" (both noun and adjective being broken plurals), with the meaning "baskets covered with red leather." This exactly

meets the case; and for confirmation I immediately rushed out to the kitchen of one of our Egyptian Pharaohs (the khedive's brother-in-law), and saw these same baskets covered with red leather (tanned sheepskins dyed red), in which the dinners were carried to the adjoining palace of the pasha, lying in one corner, and the chief of the bakers sitting in the opposite one; and when I asked him what those baskets were called, he at once answered "selal houri." I now returned to my lexicons (more ancient ones than either Hebrew or Arabic), and found in Tattam, p. 579, the Coptic *shar*, "a skin." Then going back to the *old* Egyptian, Pierret, p. 433, we have "xenru" and "xenl." The determinative and the definition "peau cuir" leave no doubt of the identity of the words.

Ver. 17. The vision which the chief baker saw in his dream is one which we often see in actual fact, even in the busy streets of Cairo, *viz.* the עוף, the vultures, swooping down upon the baskets upon the heads of the chief bakers or their servants, and snatching away and eating their contents. In my youth I used to picture to myself small birds, like sparrows, alighting upon the baskets and picking at their contents.

xli. 1. יַאֲר (river) is an Egyptian word, *aur*, in Coptic *eioor*. It is used only once (Dan. xii. 5, 6) for any river beside the Nile. Daniel took many words from the Assyrians among whom he lived. He took this *one* from the copy of the books of Moses which he read.

Ver. 2. פְּרוֹת. Gesenius' derivation of פֶּר from פֶּרֶה is not satisfactory, as פֶּרֶה means "to bear fruit," not a yoke; nor is his suggestion of פָּרַר better, "to be borne swiftly, to run," which does not describe a characteristic of the ox. The word is probably Egyptian, though I know nothing nearer it than *mert*, "a cow." The buffalo is doubtless meant, which may be called the Egyptian kine. They are more hardy than the cow, endure the climate better, and

are not so liable to the murrain, which still makes its periodical visits to Egypt; and though their milk is not so rich as that of the cow, they give a large quantity. A peculiarity of the animal is its delight in wallowing in the water. When driven down to the river or canals to drink, it immediately plunges into the water; and in hot weather droves of them may be seen lying in the water by the hour, with only their eyes and nostrils above the surface, and these they often also plunge under to rid themselves of the plague of flies. These are doubtless the kine which Pharaoh saw, and hence the naturalness of the expression "came up out of the river."

אָהוּ (meadow). This is an acknowledged Egyptian word (cf. Pierret, pp. 45, 79). In Job viii. 11 it is used, together with two other Egyptian words, גִּמְלָה (rush) and גִּמְלָה (to grow up). Cf. Canon Cook's Commentary *in loco*. The use of גִּמְלָה, Isaiah xxxv. 7, is one of many internal indications that the "evangelical prophet" must have visited Egypt. This is the plant of which the ark of *bulrushes* was made in which Moses was entrusted to the Nile by his mother. The Egyptian words and allusions in the Book of Job are a strong presumption in favour of the opinion of many that Moses wrote or edited it while in Midian. The word is used not only as a noun, in Job viii. 11, but also as a verb, xxxix. 24, "he swalloweth the ground"; and Gesenius rightly says the bulrush is so called from its porous nature, as absorbing or drinking in moisture. Our ladies find that none of their house-plants drink in so much water.

Ver. 3. שֵׁפֶת (lip or brink). Coptic *sphotou*. Tatt., p. 487. Hieroglyphic *sept*. Pierret, p. 481.

Ver. 5. שְׁבִלִים does not mean *ears*, but *stalks*. We see this from such passages as Isa. xvii. 5 and Zech. iv. 12. Gesenius rightly renders "twig" or "branch." The Egyptian wheat often produces not only fourteen but even more twigs or stalks from one seed, which spring up from the

root at the surface of the ground, and each bears an ear. I recently pulled up from the edge of a wheat-field four plants, the smallest of which contained twenty-four and the largest forty-three stalks, each with its ear, and each of the four plants growing from a single seed. The branching root from which they spring is still called by the Arabs "kan," and the spreading of the root in the ground is called "takannen," though neither the noun nor the verb are found in the Arabic lexicons with this meaning. We must look for them in the Old Egyptian. Thus the pictures which we see in our Bible dictionaries of Egyptian wheat as containing several ears clustering around the head of one stalk are a mistake. The Arabic word still in use preserves the letter נ (nun), which in Hebrew is assimilated with the ג and represented by its Daghesch thus, שבלים, Arabic "sanbel."

Ver. 6. "Blasted." The Khamasin, or hot wind, comes in the latter part of March and April, when the wheat is in ear. It comes from the east, קדים, and usually lasts three days at a time; and when it comes a little earlier and hotter than usual it greatly damages the wheat crop, blasting and scorching the ears, as indicated by the word שדף. As Pharaoh saw in his vision, it is the ears which came up last, and are yet green and tender, which are scorched.

צבר (lay up) is in verse 49 translated "gathered." The word is used in only five other passages in the Old Testament, and is always translated "to heap up," except in Exod. viii. 14, where, when we reach the passage, we shall show that its meaning is the same.

The Arabic word صبر (sabr), singular صبرة (sabret), exactly answering to צבר, is still the word used by the Arabs in Egypt to describe the heaps of corn in the Egyptian granaries. Lane, in his Arabic Lexicon, defines it "a quantity collected together of wheat, and without being

measured or weighed, heaped up." This meaning is quite foreign to all the other meanings of *صبر*, and we have little doubt that the word is Egyptian.

G. LANSING.

THOUGHTS.

ONE of the thoughts which continually forced themselves upon me in a too brief visit to Palestine was the unwisdom of looking for too much light to the land apart from the book of revelation. Without a vivid sense of the Scriptures as an Eastern literature, it is vain to hope for more than a certain picturesque illustration of the letter of the narratives which does not really open up any fresh depths of meaning. Conington excused himself for reading the book of nature in the light of the poets; Italy to him meant the Italy of the Latin poets, not Italy as she is in her native splendour. Whether this needed as much excuse as the prevalent externalism of literary illustrators of the Bible, may be doubted. A patient and loving study of the Hebrew Bible, from a point of view at once philological, literary, and religious, is one of the best preparations for a fruitful visit to the Holy Land. The student cannot, of course, return the same manner of man that he was; but the work of reconstituting the real physiognomy of the times of revelation must have been begun in the study. It is no recreation (in the ordinary sense of the word) to travel in the lands of the past; it is a continuation of delightful studies. Unsolved problems rise up again before us; and if they are not solved, they at least gain in distinctness and become less overpowering. "Les grandes lignes reprement leur juste valeur, les détails se coordonnent, les figures s'humanisent, tout ce qui semblait impossible, incroyable, ou merveilleux apparaît naturel, véridique, et accessible" (E. M. de Vogüé). We forget the theological antitheses of the West, and read the Scriptures more as an Oriental would.

Return indeed we must to the theology in which we were bred, and whose forms of thought and speech have become our natural dialect, but we cease to be theological partisans, whether as Churchmen or as exegetes. Travel has carried on and confirmed the work