

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

earth. We are furnished with a catalogue of his published works—it were no mean task to read them through. What Mr. Spurgeon himself read, the mental pabulum that enriched his own mind, we are left to surmise. Perhaps in the concluding portion of the work we may have light shed on this most interesting point. Towards

the close of this volume his son Charles contributes a loving tribute and appreciation of his father. For our part, we feel disposed to sum it all up in the words which he himself applied to another, 'He was a good man, full of faith and of the Holy Ghost.'

J. H. MARTIN.

Dundee.

## An Archaeological Commentary on Genesis.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., OXFORD.

XLVI. 16. Arodi is 'Arvadite,' from the name of the Phœnician town Arvad.

17. Isui seems to be 'Usite,' from Usu or Palætyrus.

34. The herdsmen (*sekheti*) in the marshes of the Delta were regarded by the Egyptians of the old empire as social pariahs, and the artists represent them as dirty and unshorn. After the conquest of the country by the Hyksos or 'Shepherd' kings, this feeling was intensified. The herdsmen, at all events in the eastern Delta, were Shasu or Bedawin, and were looked upon as the Bedawin are to-day by the modern Egyptians. They were the gypsies of society, and came under the general heading of 'impure foreigners.'

XLVII. 4. In an inscription of Hor-m-heb (Armais), at the close of the eighteenth dynasty, now at Berlin, a group of Mentiu or 'Shepherds' from the Sinaitic Peninsula and the Haurân, are represented as bowing before the Pharaoh, and asking him to grant them land in which to pasture their flocks, 'as was the custom of the father of their fathers from the beginning,' since 'their lands hunger,' and they had nothing to live on. So, too, in the eighth year of Meneptah II. the Bedawin of Edom are allotted land in the district of Succoth—*i.e.* in Goshen—'in order to feed themselves and to feed their herds on the possessions of Pharaoh, who is there a beneficent sun for all peoples.'

6. These would be the royal 'superintendents of the cattle.'

11. The use of the name Ramses is proleptic, as there was no land of Ramses until after the buildings and restorations of Ramses II. in the

districts of Zoan and Goshen. The first Pharaoh of the name was the founder of the nineteenth dynasty, and the grandfather of Ramses II. the Pharaoh of the Oppression. In a papyrus of that period mention is made of a Per-Ramses or 'temple of Ramses,' which Brugsch would identify with Zoan. See Ex. i. 11, xii. 37.

14, 15. The association of Canaan with Egypt is also proleptic, and carries us forward to the age of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, when Canaan was a province of Egypt. The subsequent verses show that only the Egyptians are referred to.

20–26. A great change came over Egypt during the Hyksos period. When the New Empire begins with the rise of the eighteenth dynasty, we find that the old feudal aristocracy have disappeared and have been replaced by royal officials, while their landed property has passed into the possession of the Crown and the priests. Instead of being held by private individuals, all land, with the exception of the fields attached to the temples, became the property of the Pharaoh, and was rented from him at a payment of twenty per cent. The Pharaoh thus became an autocrat, ruling over a nation of slaves, checked only by the power of the priesthood, and administering the country by means of a huge bureaucracy. It will be noticed that during the seven plenteous years it was the Pharaoh who had paid the twenty per cent. (xli. 34). In later times, after the age of the nineteenth dynasty, certain lands came to be assigned to the mercenary troops, who acquired great power, and founded or upset dynasties. When the story of Joseph was written, however, the possession of the land of Egypt was still divided between the Pharaoh and the priests (ver. 26). In Upper Egypt private pro-

perty survived the rise of the eighteenth dynasty for a short time, at all events during the reign of its founder. Baba, at El-Kab, in an inscription already quoted (xli. 54), states that he provided corn for the people during the famine, and 'Captain' Ahmes, who took an active part in the wars of liberation, not only tells us in the inscription in his tomb at El-Kab that he owned 'much land,' but also that he was presented by the Pharaoh Ahmes I. with '5 *arura* of land in' his 'city.' Consequently, 'all the land of Egypt' which Joseph 'bought for Pharaoh' could have been only that northern portion of it which was under the immediate authority of the Hyksos monarch. After the firm establishment, however, of the power of the eighteenth dynasty, and the foundation of their Asiatic empire, the agrarian system of the north must have been extended to the south, since long before the close of the dynasty all traces of private property in the country have disappeared. Perhaps civil and military appointments, or even allotments of land, in Syria were given in exchange for the old family estates in Egypt.

It will be convenient to sum up here the conclusions to which the archæological evidence points in the case of the story of Joseph. (1) It is based on an Egyptian original, and even possibly translated—or rather paraphrased—from some hieratic document like the account of the expulsion of the Hyksos in the Sallier papyrus. (2) In its present form it has been written in Palestine; it contains a strong Palestinian colouring, *e.g.* in making a famine caused by a failure of the Nile extend to Canaan, or in describing the financial operations of Joseph as affecting the south as well as the north of Egypt. (3) It is substantially historical, and even in details is correct as to the condition of Egypt in the age of the later Hyksos kings. (4) In its present form it is not earlier than the period of the nineteenth dynasty, and there is no reason for believing it to be later. (5) Certain words and phrases seem to indicate that they have been mistranslated from a document in some foreign language. That language was not Babylonian, and may have been Egyptian.

XLVIII. 22. The embalmed body of Joseph was carried to Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 32). The fact that Hamor is here called 'the Amorite' suggests the question whether Hamor, 'ass,' was not a contemptuous play upon the ethnic name

Amor (but see Judg. ix. 28). It is difficult to reconcile the statement that Jacob had acquired the piece of ground at Shechem by means of his 'sword' and his 'bow,' with the fact that, according to Gen. xxxiii. 19, he had peaceably bought it. The patriarch Israel is here identified with the Israel of later days which conquered Palestine. The translation should be 'a Shechem more than thy brethren.'

XLIX. 5. The sense requires us to adopt the rendering: 'instruments of cruelty are their swords,' *mekhêrâh* being the Greek μάχαιρα, 'a sword.' Other Greek words occur in early Hebrew, like *lappîd*, 'a lamp,' Gk. λαμπάς, or *pîlgesh*, Gk. παλλακίς, which have an etymology in Greek but not in Semitic, and indicate intercourse between the Greeks and Canaan. For this we now have archæological testimony, apart from the mention of Achæans (Aqaiush) and Danaans (Daanau), among the northern invaders who assailed Egypt in the reigns of Meneptah II. and Ramses III., since one of the Tel el-Amarna tablets states that an 'Ionian' (Yivana) was 'on a mission to Tyre.'

10. If Shiloh is not the name of a place ('until he come to Shiloh'), it may be the same as the Assyrian *sêlû*, 'a ruler.'

11. This seems to be a quotation from some older poem, since *oseri* ('binding') has no grammatical construction.

14. In the Song of Deborah (Judg. v. 16) the Hebrew words are translated 'among the sheepfolds' (instead of 'between two burdens'), which is probably more correct. The repetition of the expression in the two poems seems to show that it has been quoted from a common source. The ass or 'Khamôr' is a reference to Hamor of Shechem (see note on xlvi. 22).

15. Perhaps there is a reference here to the reign of Abimelech over Shechem (Judg. ix.).

20. The reference is probably to the 'kings' of Tyre and Sidon.

22. *Ben porâth*, 'son of fruitfulness,' refers to Ephraim, the 'fruitful.'

24. With *eben Israël*, 'the stone of Israel,' compare the Assyrian *aban Samsi*, 'the stone of the sun-god.'

L. 2, 3. The art of medicine was highly appreciated in ancient Egypt, and there were special-

ists who devoted themselves to the study and cure of each single disease. But the physicians were not 'slaves,' nor did they embalm mummies. This was the business of the *paraskeuites*, Egyptian *khatfu*, Gk. *παρασκευστάι*, a special class of persons who were despised and shunned by their fellow-Egyptians. The leading *paraskeuites*, however, were what we should term surgeons, and they commenced the work of embalment by extracting the brains of the corpse. In the time of Herodotos, the mummy, in the case of a 'first-class' burial, was kept in natron for seventy days after the removal of the intestines, but the process of embalment had by that time doubtless become very elaborate, since we find a marked progress in this respect in the age of the New Empire as compared with the Old. Diodoros gives thirty days as the period over which the principal part of the operation extended, and seventy-two days as the period of mourning. We must note the statement that it was the 'Egyptians,' and not the Israelites, who mourned for Jacob seventy days.

4. Mr. Tomkins notices that Joseph spoke to Pharaoh's household, not to Pharaoh himself, because, in accordance with Syrian custom, he had allowed his hair and beard to grow in sign of mourning, and was therefore, by the rules of the Egyptian court, excluded from the Pharaoh's presence.

7. The 'elders' are the *uru*, or 'great ones,' of the Egyptian texts.

10, 11. These two verses interrupt the context, and seem to be an interpolation intended to explain the name Abel-Mizraim. The name, however, had nothing to do with the 'mourning of the Egyptians,' but signified 'the meadow of Egypt,' and was a reminiscence of Egyptian rule in Palestine in the time of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. *Abel* was a common term in Canaanite geography, and is accordingly found several times in the (Palestine) geographical lists of Thothmes III. and his successors. Thus Thothmes III. mentions the Abel of Carmel and the Abel of Irtu (perhaps Jordan), and Ramses II. the Abel of Karzak. The eastern side of the Jordan would have been far out of the road from Egypt to Hebron, which ran either along the edge of the Mediterranean Sea ('the way of the Philistines,' Ex. xiii. 17) or past the modern Kantara to Beer-sheba (Gen. xlvi. 1). There must have been a local legend at Abel-Mizraim

based on a 'popular etymology' of the name which connected it with the mourning for Jacob.

22. A hundred and ten years is the number of years which, when a long life is desired, is invariably asked of the gods in the Egyptian inscriptions. So in 'the oldest book in the world,' the Proverbs of Ptah-hotep, written in the time of the fifth dynasty, the author says at the end of his work: '(To be a good son) has caused me on earth to obtain one hundred and ten years of life.'

-I have now reached the end of this archæological commentary on the Book of Genesis, and must briefly gather up the general results. In the first place, the archæological evidence is wholly against the so-called literary analysis. The author of the book has indeed made use of older documents, but these documents are Babylonian and Egyptian, possibly also Canaanite and Edomite, and we can establish their existence only by means of the archæological evidence. A comparison of the Biblical and Chaldæan accounts of the Deluge shows that the 'literary analysis' of the account in Genesis is merely a philological mirage. The same conclusion may be drawn from the archæological testimony to the 'two accounts' of the Creation, the history of Joseph, etc., while the use of different terms like 'Amorite' and 'Canaanite,' 'Padan-aram' and 'Aram-naharaim,' which has been assumed to characterise different Hebrew writers, turns out to do nothing of the kind. Secondly, narratives which the 'Higher Criticism' had pronounced to be legendary are proved to be historical, and the accurate agreement of other narratives with the circumstances and conditions of the periods to which they profess to belong favours the presumption that they are historical also. Thirdly, a good deal of the history must have come over with comparatively little change from the patriarchal age. A considerable amount of it must be dated at least as early as the epoch of the Egyptian nineteenth dynasty, that is to say, the Mosaic period, and there is no reason for believing that the main part of the Book of Genesis is of later date. Fourthly, in many cases it has been shown that the history rests upon written sources, not on oral tradition, and the presumption is that it will be also found to do so in cases for which at present no archæological evidence has been obtained. Fifthly, while there

are portions of the book which can be ascribed to the Mosaic age, there are passages and statements which belong to a much later date. In ch. x., for example, the mention of the Medes and Kimmerians cannot be earlier than the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. We must admit, therefore, that interpolations and re-editing were allowed down to the time of the Exile, if not later. Sixthly, there are narratives which interrupt the context, and do not harmonize with its statements. This is the case with the account of Jacob's theft of his father's blessing (ch. xxvii.), and the anticipatory blessing of Joseph and his two sons by Jacob (xlvi. 2-7), which breaks off in the middle of a sentence. Such narratives, it will be noticed, are written from the point of view of a Bedawi rather than from that of a member of a settled society. Consequently they do not admit of archæological treatment. Seventhly, whatever may be the source

of the older narratives employed, they have all received a Palestinian colouring.

To sum up the general impression left upon me by the archæological evidence: Genesis is substantially a work of the Mosaic age, and has been compiled out of older written documents, the majority of which were in the Babylonian language and script. Its narratives are substantially historical, and in their earliest form were coeval with the events they record. But other and later elements have been mixed up with them, and in its present form the book contains passages, partly interpolations, partly modifications of the original text, which bring us down to the age of the Exile. Throughout it is intensely Hebraic, and written from a Palestinian point of view. Finally, the archæological facts seem to me diametrically opposed to the results and theories of the so-called critical analysis.

## Some Exegetical Studies.

BY THE REV. JAMES WELLS, D.D., GLASGOW.

### The Sacred Art of Contemplation.

THIS is my third paper on this great subject. In the first I examined the four most interesting of the New Testament words for 'beholding.' These are: *κατοπτρίζεσθαι*, to behold in a mirror (2 Co 3<sup>18</sup>); *ἐποπτεύειν*, to be like the initiated when they behold their chief religious mysteries (2 P 1<sup>16</sup>); *θεᾶσθαι* and *θεωρεῖν*, to behold as men do in the theatres or at the public games (John's Gospel, 1<sup>14</sup> and 17<sup>24</sup>). In the second paper I postilized upon two of the four elements in Christian contemplation—Clearness and Admiration. I am now to examine two other secrets of success in spiritual study. These are Steadiness and Assimilation.

*Steadiness.*—In the Greek churches they have the curious practice of suspending ostrich eggs from the ceiling. The idea is, we are told, that the mother bird hatches her eggs by steadfastly gazing upon them. Southey has embodied this myth in his 'Thalaba.' The suspended eggs are a symbol of the power of continuous contemplation.

He who had been initiated into the mysteries

was supposed to be a delighted and lifelong beholder of them; the spectators at the games could not see them too often or too long; life for them had lost its best charm when these were over. Beholding is quite different from a hurried glance. It is no *πάρεργον*, no *nebensache*, no by-job. Continuity is one of the secrets of what has been called 'the lost art of meditation,' or what the mystics call recollection: 'Meditate on these things,' Paul says to Timothy. 'Meditate is *in medio esse*. The butterfly flits over a thousand flowers, while the bee lights on one, buries itself in the middle of it with a hum of satisfaction, and remains there till it has emptied the honey-bag at the bottom. Literally the bee is *totus in illo*. To be interested (*inter esse*) has the same meaning as to meditate. As with the three who beheld Christ's glory on the Holy Mount, meditation wishes to pitch its tent near the loved object, so that it may gaze without let or hindrance. For the full appreciation of the truth, as in many chemical processes, time and the right