

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

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published an amazing variety of Calendars and Cards for 1922. And as amazing as the variety is the beauty of every card and calendar. It is quite impossible in a notice to give any idea of the wealth of artistic effort that has been spent upon them. An order should be sent for the Descriptive List, which is itself a work of art with its miniature illustrations. There are three series, one the Mildmay Series, one the Christian Series, and one the Paternoster Series: the List describes all three. The

address is 12 Paternoster Buildings, London, E.C.

Some practical and very timely temperance literature has been published by the Wesleyan Methodist Church. There are *Temperance Lessons for Sunday Schools* (2d.), *Temperance Lessons for Bands of Hope* (2d.), a *Study Circle Syllabus* (1d.), and other things. They may all be had from the Temperance and Social Welfare Department, 1 Central Buildings, Westminster.

'The Prodigiously Long Ages of the Patriarchs.'

BY E. E. KELLETT, M.A., LEYS SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE.

OF all the various genealogies, dates, and calculations with which the Priestly writer has enriched or encumbered the early books of the Bible, those of the fifth chapter of Genesis are perhaps the most puzzling. At one moment they assume an appearance of system or reason, only to cast it aside at the next; and if we think we have lit upon the principle on which part of them may be based, we speedily perceive that it will not suit another part.

What has increased the confusion is the fact that our three main authorities differ; and differ in a way which also shows a combination of order and chaos: the Septuagint altering the Massoretic numbers in one way and the Samaritan in another. It is therefore very difficult to know whether we have the slightest chance of unmasking the original P; for even if we solved the mystery of one of these versions, another, or perhaps none of them, may turn out to be the right one. A glance at such a commentary as that of Dr. Skinner is sufficient to show the embarrassment which these and other difficulties have caused to all readers except those to whom Archbishop Ussher's marginal 'B.C. 4004' has the sanctity of a revelation.

If, then, I venture to offer here my attempt at a solution of the problem, I shall not be surprised should it fail to meet with universal acceptance; for a problem which has baffled so many is certainly not an easy one; and in a set of numbers which might have been shaken out of Judas's bags and flung on to the floor, one may well—to mix one's metaphors—mistake a will-o'-the-wisp for a

lodestar. But such as my theory is, I here put it before my readers for acceptance or rejection.

Let it first be remarked that we are not in the least concerned, in the following argument, with the questions as to whether the Priestly codifier himself invented these numbers, or whether he derived them from an earlier authority: nor need we fret ourselves over the equally hard question as to which of the three great Versions has preserved the Priestly original with the greatest accuracy. For, even though the Hebrew list be corrupted from the Septuagint or from the Samaritan, it is a *deliberate* and *systematic* corruption, and the man who made it must have had his reasons for thus altering his author. It is those reasons that we are to try to find out.

Again, we must not be surprised if those reasons seem trivial to men of our generation. Before the invention of the Arabic notation, the simplest arithmetical sums were hard, and the results, when obtained, were inevitably regarded with superstitious awe. A Pythagoras, discovering a few easy properties of figures, goes at once to the extreme of founding the universe upon number; and even Plato was more than tinged with the same belief. We must therefore expect that P (to use that symbol for the man with whom we are here concerned) will show a quite childish delight in coincidences which to us may seem too obvious to require notice. Precisely as the Jews, and Shakespeare long after the Jews, appear to have been almost awestruck at the discovery that a word may have two meanings, so that we find

them punning with the mystic solemnity of a priest sacrificing to Pluto—so this old Jew, observing an arithmetical coincidence, seems beside himself with rapture.

All will agree that among P's numbers two were given to him by tradition, and could not be manipulated. These were the 365 of Enoch and the 600 that Noah lived before the Flood. All, again, agree that the number 365 proves a connection between Enoch and the year; he was either a Sun-god or some sort of Eniautos Daimon; and P knew this as well as we do. With this number, then, we may assume that P started. He was provided with Enoch's total years; what simpler than to take the 65 as what we shall call his initial years, thus leaving the round 300 for what we shall call his finals? But P looks at this 65, and the longer he looks at it the more he admires it. He divides it by 5 and gets 13, the number of lunar months in the year; 13, accordingly, is set aside for later use. Next, he takes his two lists of names, the Cainite and the Sethite, nearly the same but not quite, and combines them. To Adam, the first man, he gives for initials twice 65 or 130. He has an idea that the ideal age for an Antediluvian is the full 1000, and he would like to give that to Adam, but no: he remembers that by all orthodox doctrine Adam was created of mature age. Fix that age at 70, and this will enable us to make his final years a round 800 (besides doing other work of which we shall speak shortly), and thus Adam's total comes out at 930.

We now turn to Seth and Enos, who probably came to P by an entirely different tradition from that which gave him other names. As, however, Seth is marked as the son of Adam, he takes them in at this point. What is he to do with them? He can hardly give them as high a number as Adam; but he does the next best thing; he makes their 'initials' together come to just *three* times his mystic 65, namely 195, and of these he assigns 7 parts out of 13 to Seth and 6 to Enos, or 105 and 90 respectively.¹

When we arrive at Cainan, who of course is nothing but the Cain of J, and the eldest son of Adam, but who in the second list appears as the son of Enos, the procedure of P becomes most curious and suggestive. To obtain his *initials* he

¹ It may be worth noting that Seth's 'final' 807 = Enoch's final 300 + 3 × 13 × 13.

gives him just enough to increase Adam's *total* to the ideal 1000; *i.e.* 70; while for Cain's total he gives him just enough to increase the *initials* of his other father, Enos, to the same amount; not omitting, however, to notice that the same answer, namely 910, is reached by multiplying the 70 by the favourite factor 13.

With Mahalalel his method is similar. Of him, whether identical with the Cainite Mehujael or not, P knew little; and he therefore does no more with his initial number than to repeat the 65; but as, in the Sethite genealogy, he probably appeared as the son of Seth, P gets his total by the same mode of operation he had used with Cain and Enos. He makes it 895, which, it will be observed, is precisely the number needed to raise Seth's 105 to the antediluvian maximum of 1000.

If we may be allowed to continue our inspection of P at his work, we shall notice that he begins his next series of jugglings towards the end of the list, with Lamech; who, in the Cainite genealogy, is seventh, and who, according to the chronicler, made a poem with sevens in it. Let us then make of Lamech's total a kind of numerical pun on the poem, and give him 777 years of life. This has the advantage of letting him die comfortably before the Flood; for a few years more will spoil all. But what of Lamech's initial number? That, of course, is easy: as he is tied up with sevens, all we have to do is to multiply our old friend 13 by twice 7 or 14; and the result is 182. This leaves his middle years as 595.

The essential point with Methuselah, as with Lamech, is that he shall not survive the Flood. Other numbers you may alter, but not the Six Hundred; we must be careful. We can, it is true, let him die in the very year of the inundation; and that gives him a total of 969 years, obtained in the following very ingenious fashion. From the birth of Lamech to the Flood is fixed at 782 years: these then are Methuselah's 'finals' or middle years. Subtract the corresponding number for Lamech, namely 595, from this 782, and we get 187, which accordingly appears as the age of Methuselah when Lamech was born.

One name alone remains, that of Jared, probably the same as the Irad of the Cainite list. By this time it might well be supposed that P had exhausted his manipulating powers; and indeed it is only his total, 962, that is divisible by 13; but his initial

is at once found by subtracting the 807 of Seth from the 969 of Methuselah; and the medial thus becomes the same round 800 that we have already seen in the case of Adam.

It appears, then, that in all the confused system of numbers with which P has crowded this chapter, there is not one which may not be traced with more or less confidence to the two given to him by tradition.

The following tables will help to make things clearer:

I.

GENEALOGY OF J.
(Genesis iv.)

GENEALOGY OF P.
(Genesis v.)

—	—
Adam	Adam ¹
Cain (Cainan)	Seth ¹
Enoch	Enos
Irak	Cainan (Cain)
Mehujael	Mahalalel (Mehujael?)
Methusael	Jared (Irak?)
Lamech	Enoch
	Methuselah
	Lamech

¹ These are probably extraneous, the original list beginning with a first man Enos, corresponding to the Adam of J.

II.

	Initial.	Final.	Total.
Adam	130 ²	800	930
Seth	105 ³	807	912
Enos	90 ³	815	905
Cainan	70 ⁴	840	910 ⁷
Mahalalel	65 ⁶	830	895 ⁷
Jared	162 ⁸	800 ⁹	962 ¹⁰
Enoch	65	300	365 ¹¹
Methuselah	187 ¹²	782	969 ¹³
Lamech	182 ¹⁴	595	777 ¹⁵
Noah (to Flood)	600
Total	1656		

² Obtained by doubling Enoch's 65.
³ Together = 3 × 65 : 105 = 7 × 5 × 3, 90 = 6 × 5 × 3.
⁴ 70 + Adam's 930 = 1000.
⁵ With the 90 of Enos = 1000.
⁶ Repetition of Enoch's 65.
⁷ With the 105 of Seth = 1000.
⁸ With the 807 of Seth = 969 of Methuselah.
⁹ Repetition of Adam's 800.
¹⁰ Multiple of 13.
¹¹ Days in year : a fixed quantity.
¹² Subtract Lamech's 595 from Methuselah's 782.
¹³ Just reaches Flood.
¹⁴ 7 × 2 × 13.
¹⁵ A kind of play on the sevens in Gn 4²⁴.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

How much did it cost?

'Neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God which cost me nothing.'—2 S 24²⁴.

DURING the last few weeks we have all been thinking and talking a great deal about Christmas presents. There were presents in the air, so to speak. We couldn't go down the street without seeing the shop windows filled with beautiful gifts; and some of us have spent hours with our noses glued to the panes of the windows that held life-like dolls and marvellous mechanical toys. Then at home there has been a lot of whispering and rustling of tissue-paper, and a quick hiding of certain articles when the people to whom they were going to be given came unexpectedly into the room. It has been a glorious time, and full of thrills—hasn't it?

Now I am going to ask you what sounds like a very rude question. How much did your Christmas presents cost? Wait a moment!—I don't want you to tell me how much you think the presents you got at Christmas cost—I want you to tell me the cost of the presents you gave. Now, before you answer that question, I'm sure you'll agree with me that the presents you gave were really much more important than the presents you got. The presents you got were fine. But, ah! the presents you gave!—what a lot of planning and thinking and doing without went to the giving of these presents! How many hours did you spend making them, when you might have been playing instead? How much did you deny yourself, young man, to buy the wood for that fretwork pipe-rack you gave to father? And how many needle pricks in your own fingers did you have,