

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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

796TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17TH, 1936,
AT 4.30 P.M.

DR. A. S. YAHUDA IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the Meeting of the 3rd February were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of Rabbi E. Munk, Ph.D., as an additional correspondent.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Mr. A. Cowper Field to read his paper entitled "The Evidence in the Pentateuch of the Sojourn in Egypt."

A hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Dr. A. S. Yahuda for presiding, on the motion of the Rev. C. W. Cooper, F.G.S.

THE EVIDENCE IN THE PENTATEUCH OF THE SOJOURN IN EGYPT.

By A. COWPER FIELD, Esq.

BEFORE analysing the relation of the Pentateuch to early Egyptian religious thought and symbolism, there are certain wide differences between Egyptian and Semitic mentality and its expression and that of our own familiar English usage that I ought to make clear. We possess a language more flexible in grammatical construction than any other—certainly far more so than any ancient tongue—also the most copious vocabulary ever known, nearly every word possessing a precise significance and a narrow range of accepted applications.

Compare this with Hebrew or Egyptian, vague in grammatical use, the very tenses of the verbs—even the use of the various moods or voices in Hebrew—far from precisely defined; a very limited vocabulary, many of the words used each to cover a wide range of different meanings, and many of these also vague. Egyptian is often even more vague as to exact meanings, especially in allegorical passages.

We, with our enormous vocabulary, can easily use one large series of words for actual objects; quite another range for their properties, qualities, characteristics—or our ideas about them; another wide series for figurative or symbolical expression; another for abstract ideas, philosophic terms, scientific concepts, etc.

Neither in Hebrew nor in Egyptian is there any attempt thus to categorise the use of different ranges of words; their vocabulary was not adequate for this—and the same word is often used for verb, adjective and noun; for an actual object, its character, or its use; as a symbol, a figurative expression, an allegorical significance; as an abstract term or ideologue, and even in a special spiritual signification. (*E.g.*, “Guide thee with mine eye,” “Under His feathers,” “Set me upon the rock that is higher than I.”)

With this brief preliminary introduction, let us now consider the influence of the sojourn and slavery in Egypt on what we find in the Pentateuch.

When first I commenced to make an analytical study of the Hebrew language as we find it in the Old Testament, I soon realised that it seemed to be taken for granted by almost all commentators and students, whether Jew or Gentile, that Hebrew was a homogeneous tongue: *i.e.*, that the language grew up, developed its grammatical uses, and expanded its vocabulary by forming fresh words and word-modifications almost totally from indigenous “roots” or primitive word-formatives, probably monosyllabic.

I soon saw that this was a primary mistake; at the root of many a wild assertion made by those who had studied Hebrew much as one would a modern Continental language.

The records of ancient Hebrew speech that have come down to us are almost entirely contained in the writings of the Old Testament. And, of course, these Old Testament books are themselves all of one type, both as to the subject-matter recorded and the point of view or mental outlook of the writers—alike predominantly religious, ethical, spiritual-minded. Add to this the evident fact that the phraseology, the very vocabulary, of the subsequent books is largely based on an habitual, even studied, practice of quotation from the older ones (*i.e.*, Job, the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges), very few really new “phrases” being met with—except in poetry—until the later

Prophets, and we shall realise how restricted is the scope—as a literature—of the writings actually extant of ancient Hebrew speech.

This evident effort on the part of the subsequent writers to express themselves (usually) with reasonable closeness of language to the phrases already used in the Pentateuch, appears to have early become a traditional practice; how early we cannot tell, except by noting the result in the books before us. Obviously, this fact quite destroys all possibility of any extensive “editing” of the Pentateuch by the aid of subsequent books, the writers of which used the Pentateuch as *their* model, never vice versa.

Nor can we tell how early or to what extent the colloquial Hebrew of everyday use—Aramaic—became divergent from the strictly literary or “classical” form and vocabulary permitted in writing the religious books based on, or in continuation of, the Pentateuch and immediately subsequent writings.

And what do we find *is* the language of the Pentateuch? As we might have expected, that it is *not* a homogeneous language at all! When we note, in English, that

handicap, handicraft, handily, handiness, handyman, handiwork, handle, handkerchief, handmaid, handscrew, handsome, handsturn, handspike, handwork, etc.,

all derive from one Saxon word “hand,” we recognise a closely kindred group, all from a true Saxon source; and when we come to “manicure” instead of “hand-care,” or “cheiropody” in place of “hand-and-foot,” we know we are astray from our Saxon fount, and dealing with borrowed distortions from Latin and Greek respectively.

Similarly, in Hebrew, we find many groups of words all denoting things of close association, all showing an evident relationship; but there are many words—some for very familiar ideas—which seem to have no near kindred elsewhere in the true Hebrew. Most of these seem clearly to show that they are borrowed from an external source in another tongue, and in most instances we can now identify this source with considerable confidence. An analysis of all the words in the Old Testament, taking the vocabulary of each book of the Pentateuch and onwards *separately*, and grouping the words in their natural series according to their *Hebrew* sense and Hebrew “roots,” leaves a very

considerable mass of words and a good many phrases which cannot be so classified. Studying these further, we find :—

1. These borrowed words nearly always occur, in their first instance, in passages where the narrative itself indicates pretty clearly some clue as to the probable reason or source.

2. Pursuing this further, we find frequent Egyptian words—not only appellations—and Egyptian forms of expression in the narrative of events in Egypt (Genesis and Exodus); in Numbers we find many words taken from the speech of the various races with whom the narrative tells us Israel were then from time to time in contact or conflict—we believe most of these had disappeared from Palestine or become merged before the death of David! We can trace Kretan (Philistine) words in Joshua and Judges; and a good many occasional words may be recognised here and there as borrowed from some other alien race then before us in the narrative, or in whose speech some previous account of the events may have been recorded and thence become known to the Hebrew writer.

3. But there are other “foreign” words—whole series of them—early used in connection with religious ordinances, dress, ritual, etc., specifically enjoined under the Mosaic code, where the narrative affords no hint of *contemporary* association with any other race or speech to explain their occurrence, nor is any reason given why *they* are thus employed. We recognise at once that nearly all the details as to ritual, tabernacle, and ornament, etc., are symbolical or figurative—and yet by no means Semitic!

But no explanation is offered *why* these particular symbols, etc., are employed nor—usually—of their significance, nor yet of their evident special relationship to each other. Why? The only possible explanation can be that to those to whom they were first promulgated, for whose guidance they were first enjoined, these very words and symbols, details of tabernacle furnishing, priests’ dress, breastplate, ark, table of shewbread, etc., would seem natural and appropriate, being already so well known as to call for no “explanation.”

And when we trace the close similarity of many of these words, and the closer correspondence in detail after detail of the things themselves, with those in use with similar significations in the Egypt of Moses’ early days, we realise how conclusively

this determines both the only possible (1) date of these ordinances and (2) of the record of them in such words : since *only* to those who, like Moses, had been long *familiar* with these very words and objects and their accepted significance in the land of Egypt *could* it thus be natural to use them more readily than true Hebrew words, Semitic symbolism, objects, etc., whilst to them alone—again—would it appear natural to make use of this symbolism, ornaments, etc., of *Egyptian* worship of the period *before* Khu-n-aton as appropriate to inculcate these more spiritual truths now set forth by Moses.

4. And all this furnishes a further clue (though not to the full spiritual significance implied) for many of the elaborate minor details so strictly enjoined in Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and elsewhere in the Pentateuch.

5. It is to be noted that in many instances we *are* given some explanation as to the spiritual significance or underlying meaning of an ordinance or even of a detail of ritual, ornament, or dress ; but we are usually *not* told why that particular symbol or detail assigned was selected as appropriate—often so very different from any usual Semitic idea of what would be so. Again, the parallel to the ideas and practices of Egypt—Egypt *before* the Exodus—will usually furnish the clue. While outwardly enjoining the use of articles and practices closely similar to those with which centuries of sojourn in Egypt would have made them familiar, Moses' teaching is directed to emphasising a deeper underlying spiritual conception of the nature and attributes of God. It is instructive to note exactly *what* of outward form and symbol he adopts, what he adapts or modifies, and what he rejects. For example, on a strikingly critical occasion, the power of faith in the Divine Wisdom is emphasised by the use of exactly the same symbol—a bronze snake's head—long familiar in Egypt as an ideograph to represent this very concept. An *exact* adoption.

(I here use the term ideograph to denote a pictorial figure, emblem, or hieroglyph used to indicate an *idea*—a mental concept—not necessarily conceived of as having any actual material form. Some Egyptologists have formerly assumed that, from the snake's head (termed uræus) being so usually pictorially represented on the forehead of the living Pharaoh, of the deceased, of deities, and other pictographs of concepts as showing that, as one eminent scholar wrote me : “ such objects

were commonly worn." Of this, however, there does not appear to be really any sound indication. The halo, often shown in our own pictures of apostles and saints, is not usually understood as meaning that such was a normal part of their apparel! This will also apply to many other symbolic objects often depicted in association with deities, divine principles (conceived of as living entities), *e.g.*, in the "Judgment of the dead," etc.).

The table of shewbread (literally "bread of faces") is a considerable modification of the "tables of offerings," depicted in the wall-paintings of Egypt, whereon are shown various types of gifts symbolising *things* offered to God; the Pentateuch enjoins instead the use of "presence-bread," symbolising the offering to God of *ourselves*, as "being always before Him"—a continuous self-dedication. An *adapted* adoption.

In the case of the golden calf, however, Moses definitely rejects the use of the familiar Egyptian symbolism in any such material form (he uses the very idea it signified!), although his own brother Aaron had evidently deemed it quite an appropriate symbolic object to reassure the dejected Israelites of the continual providence of God (Elohim, the Infinite Powers) being exercised as Shaddai—the Ever-sustaining One—on their behalf.

As to this part of the narrative, nearly all the commentaries that I have studied, Christian or Jewish (Rabbinical), are so woefully wide of the mark that a simple and correct analysis may be useful.

Moses, their great leader, the visible human centre of their hopes and enterprise, had gone away—had been absent some time. With the sudden despondency—the rapid excitement to exaltation or discouragement of an Eastern race—they began to murmur their disaffection; Aaron decides on a spectacular celebration with a visible emblem to remind them of the ever-continuing Providence of God: in Hebrew, Shaddai; in Egyptian, Hathor, which symbolises exactly the same idea. *This* aspect of God's provident care which Aaron now wished to emphasise was but at the *outset*, so to speak, of its exercise on their behalf; the fulfilment of the great promises to Israel lay still ahead—so he fashions, not a full-grown cow, but a calf (termed 'geh-gel, apparently from an Egyptian word), gold typifying the deity and sovereignty of God. Why did Moses reject this symbol with such aversion? "Thou shalt not make to thyself . . ." etc. We can now see all the more reason for

that prohibition to Israel, just released from a land where birds and animals, men and women, statues, rivers and rocks were alike often regarded as in some loose sense divine, enshrining an indwelling God or gods, or as themselves actual individual gods or goddesses. So Aaron's well-meant expedient had to be banned.

Modern archæology now enables us with considerable precision to follow this sifting process of Moses' in those far-off years in detail after detail. Of course, there are many words in Egyptian and Hebrew obviously, from both sound and sense, either derived alike from a common older source or borrowed by one language from the other, and we cannot always say which; we can only form our opinion which view the linguistic evidence and other data indicate as the more likely, *e.g.*, is Ptah, the (Egyptian) divine Opener or Unfolder = the revealing Source of All, from the Hebrew pathah, to open, reveal, or *vice versa* ?

I have found over seven hundred Egyptian words, ideas and details in Genesis and Exodus alone !

Sometimes the very forms of the hieroglyphs used in writing an Egyptian word, or a comparison of those used for related words, will afford illumination as to the original symbolism implied; more often, the wall-paintings or other pictorial representations in temples or tombs give a clearer clue to the symbolic uses and meanings. It is also important to note that many of the hieroglyph signs used in the recorded narratives are constantly introduced as pictorial details into the "scenes" in these wall-paintings but, since these paintings are not intended to portray an event or narrative in any *literal* way (they are not meant as depicting actual sights as a photograph would), the hieroglyphs are here used in a purely *symbolic* sense, not in a literary use at all. The two systems, using identical figures or symbols, existed side by side for many centuries; it is surely irrational to suppose that such dual uses could have been continuously independent! Many of those associated with the figures of "deities," aspects of God, of divine "principles," or of deceased human beings must be understood in this way; *e.g.*, the bronze snake's head, so often represented on the forehead of a deity—even of a living Pharaoh—merely *symbolises* the Divine Wisdom; the circle shown on the head of a deity emphasises eternity or self-completeness; a pair of horns indicates power—often sustaining power, etc.

And so with the actual forms or characters symbolic of the deities or "divine qualities" themselves. Hathor (= the Hebrew Shaddai), depicted as a cow, typifies perpetual sustenance; sometimes bearing a circle to typify Eternal Deity, often with the hieroglyph for utchat (provision) marked under the eye to emphasise the Divine Providence. Thus, too, Heru (the hawk or eagle) typifies the Supreme Being (heri, chief, president, master), the Over-all One; in Hebrew Elyon, Most High. Was the hawk or eagle symbol originally chosen to indicate the far-seeing or wide-ranging activity of God, much in the sense of our word "overseer"? It seems probable.

There are many ideas associated with particular Egyptian conceptions of God, with which the Israelites must have been long familiar in Egypt, which we meet—some repeatedly—in the Pentateuch; although of the Egyptian names for these deities or of their *general* character as conceived in Egypt there is no trace. We can usually see why; we have but to compare that *general* character, as obtainable from Egyptian records, with these special "phrases" in the Pentateuch to realise that Moses is retaining and incorporating every familiar word, every phrase and idea of divine things helpful to the fuller revelation that he safely can; and rejecting very far more than he retains.

Let us now consider a few more of these Egyptian ideas of God or gods, and the use Moses makes of them. For brevity, I omit the many he rejects.

Amon, the worker; the secret or hidden One, *i.e.*, the Invisible God. Often, as Kheper-Ra, denotes creative power. He rejects the names but adapts the teaching.

Bast, represented with a cat's head, doubtless originally typified the "god of the home" (*cf.* Lares and Penates), of whom the home-loving cat was a familiar symbol. In Christian homes, one still sees sometimes a wall-card: "Christ is the Head of this house, the Unseen Guest at every meal, the Listener to every conversation," etc. It seems a tremendous jump to *that*, but the underlying conviction is in essence much the same.

Ra, power, the source of all life, etc., is typified by the sun, the great vivifier in Egypt as elsewhere. Without the sun, there could be no life, as we know it, on the earth at all. (Ra: regal, royal, rule, reign, roi, rex, ré, ras, raj, rajah, realm—

the languages of Europe, Asia and Africa still witness to the widespread power of this primitive formative element, in the same sense—the putting-forth of *active* power.)

Ra, in another aspect, represented with a hawk's head, is the All-seeing One. Horus, as an alternative aspect of Ra, the Life-giving Sun. Both concepts rejected as unsuitable.

Thoth, truth; represented with the head and long beak of the ibis, to typify the "searcher-out of secrets." Again, Moses rejects the *name* but merges the teaching in Elohim. Cf. "the God of truth," "he trieth the very secrets of the heart" (in Hebrew, lehb, Egyptian, ab).

Maat, law, righteousness, right judgment. Cf. "just and right is he," "shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Name not used.

Anubis, death; represented with the head of a dog or jackal (a "dog runs everywhere"); regarded as divine because inescapable and therefore eternal and infinite. No such conception in the Pentateuch.

In the earliest Egyptian civilisation of which we can trace any clear records, we find several great temples in different districts, each with its own college of priests, its own local code of religious teaching, emphasising varying series of doctrines concerning different gods—or different aspects of the same God. The attributes associated with one Divine Being are often ascribed to another. Thus the Egyptians, as a whole nation, seem never to have decided whether to believe in a number of separate deities or in one Supreme God, manifesting his powers, his activities and himself in many different aspects—each separably distinct and alike divine; perhaps they regarded such positivism as an impious presumption. Moses has no such uncertainty.

Khu-n-Aton, soon after the Exodus, seems to have sought to unify the Egyptian religious beliefs in the worship of One Supreme Illimitable God, whose visible symbol is the sun—the source of all vital phenomena on the earth. Execrated as a heretic by the numerous long-established priesthoods, each upholding a different conception of Deity—or deities—and by their followers, Khu-n-Aton was slain, his teaching proscribed, and a rigid sectarian worship speedily established, with "local" gods and doctrines, differing in each temple district throughout Egypt down to the days of the Cæsars. Did they regard his "heresy" as an

impious seeking to define the Indefinable, to "formulate" the Incomprehensible? I wonder!

The Egyptians had another concept of Deity: the Ennead (or Godhead), even more vague. Sometimes the Ennead seems to be a Supreme Divine Essence or Being—undefined because illimitable, infinite, transcending all—of which (we should say, of Whom) all the distinctively *named* conceptions of deity are but separate presentations (or Persons), sometimes it seems merely an assemblage of different gods, like the Olympos of the Greeks. Most Egyptologists, having usually absorbed a good deal of Roman and Hellenic mythology while still at school, *i.e.*, numerous separate deities with a home or family meeting-place on Olympos, naturally fall into the latter reading of the references in the Egyptian texts; but that there *was* a monotheistic conception of the Ennead or Godhead as One Supreme Deity, at all times before Khu-n-Aton widely held by many thoughtful believers, there is abundant evidence in many of the oldest Egyptian texts and hymns.

Here, then, lies the explanation of what had long seemed to me so unexplained. Why did Moses, supremely concerned to teach Israel the true belief in One God—and only One—in place of all the vague, confused ideas they had known in Egypt of many deities or separate divine manifestations, yet himself make use of so many diverse words to denote the different activities or relations of God: Elohim, Ehl, Eloah, Olam, Paghad, Elyon, Tzoor, Ruach, Adonai, JHVH, etc.? All this is now clear; Moses is now endeavouring to present his faith and religious conceptions in such a way, and using such terms and details, as Israel, just released from Egypt, could most readily understand, and, for the most part, in the very Egypto-Hebraic words so long used there by them.

With this key, it becomes easy to identify each of these Hebrew terms employed in the Pentateuch, each denoting one special aspect or activity of God's Being—and invariably used of that *one* activity only—with the particular Egyptian concept which had served to prepare the minds of Israel for the fuller, clearer truth. We can also now explain the reason for a *plural* word for God in exercise of Supreme Power, Elohim with a verb in the singular; and even perceive why, in three Early passages, the word is specially treated as a true plural; we can also see why, to Adam *unfallen*, alone is God represented

as communing in both the Personal and Transcendant aspects on every occasion—JHVH Elohim, Lord God. Of no one else in the entire Pentateuch is this ever said. Moses is building on what the downtrodden, enslaved Israelites, now at last freed, already understood, so far as he can safely use it. Our Lord did very much the same many centuries later.

Nearly all the words relating to divine things or worship are Egyptian in origin, more or less thinly veiled with a Semitic pronunciation or clad in a loose-fitting Hebrew garb. Let us take the words used for God in the Pentateuch; they are all to be found in Genesis :—

Ehl (in our versions, God): the One, the Infinite Being; corresponding to the undefined (because Infinite) God of so many Egyptian hymns. A Semitic word.

Eloah (in our versions, God): God in the exercise of *one* of His infinite aspects or powers, like the powerful Amon or Amon-Ra. A Semitic word.

Shaddai, the Nourisher, the All-sustaining One (wrongly rendered Almighty in our versions); corresponds to Hathor, already explained. It is really the same word expressed in the respective pronunciations.

Elyon (Most High): the Being over-all; Heru, the All-seeing, already explained.

Tzoor (the Rock): Tcheseru in Egyptian; mass as an "abstract," the foundation, the basis or source of all; the First Cause. Cf. "the Rock that begat thee."

Ruach: the Spirit, the breath of God-giving Life. Egyptian: ruh, ruha, rest after effort, evening; akin to Ra, source of Life.

Adonai, adon (in our versions, Lord): a Syrian word for master. (Cf. Egypt: aton.) Olam, the Eternal, an attribute of God. (Cf. Egyptian ankh, eternal Life, as an attribute of Deity.)

JHVH, the LORD in our versions. Built up from the far older Semitic Jah, Jeho or Jahu, plus vayeh, abiding (*i.e.*, a continuous Personal Presence in blessing).

We can now see why Elohim, *all* the powers and aspects of God, united in some great purpose—the fullness of the Godhead (Col. ii, 9.)—is a true plural; but the verb is in the singular,

since He Who wields these "powers" is One. And the context in each of the three passages referred to as exceptions explains itself. When man is to come into being, "created in image of God"—not a material or physical resemblance, of course, since man's material body is stated to be "formed of the dust of the ground," *i.e.*, of earthy matter—but endowed with a *nepheesh* (another Egyptian word), a life-force, suitable and capable of imaging, reflecting or responding to every aspect or "power" of the Godhead revealed to him, *all* the relations of God to man: to the Israel of Moses' day, with the conception of the Ennead—the fullness of the Godhead so long established in their minds, Moses builds on this to emphasise the tremendous greatness of man's relation to God, if he respond aright to every form and aspect by and through which, material, natural, and spiritual—physical, mental, and moral—God renders Himself *evident*, revealing Himself and His inexhaustible, universal activities. Thus, too, "the man would become as one of us," aspiring to ape *one* of the Divine powers—Omniscience. And similarly in the Babel-building incident, where another of the "powers" (omnipotence) is indicated as being imitated.

Let us look at some further examples:—

1. The breastplate or pectoral of the High Priest. The chief priest, or "celebrant," of an Egyptian temple frequently wore a pectoral, of which several types or forms are known. Sometimes these were very beautiful in design and of most elaborate workmanship, often also embellished with enamel or precious stones. Their ritual import or symbolic significance does not yet seem clearly ascertained; the Egyptian term, *usex* (perhaps connected with *usr*, power), rendered into Hebrew as *goh-shem* (probably from Egyptian *xu*, glory, and *shem*, priest), may well have had a ready significance for Israel, like the names, and perhaps also the colours, of the various stones which, being known *at that time* to all concerned, is nowhere explained by Moses, and is now apparently lost. We also note that no hint is given *why* a breastplate (not a customary Semitic ornament) is to be used, nor why it is to be set with special stones; this also being presumably already understood. What *is* explained, very fully, is the special religious significance now to be symbolised thereby, since this is new for Israel. Similarly of the table of shewbread, the table is not explained; the new symbolism of the loaves is.

2. The ark of the covenant. It is when we come to consider the "ark of the covenant" that we obtain the most complete and elaborate example of what we are observing: the unexplained adoption of a familiar accessory of worship, also (by implication) of part of its accustomed significance and symbolism, but with a considerable modification in form and detail, all fully explained—and with a new signification, use, and purport also very fully set forth—an object-lesson to enforce a higher, purer conception of the continual Presence of God, vouchsafed in a special manner to Israel alone. It is surprising that the resemblances and differences between the ark of the Mosaic ordinances and the ark (or shrine) used in Egyptian religious ceremonies have not long since been worked out in detail; but I cannot trace any previous account of this being even attempted.

At the outset, we may note that the word used in the Pentateuch for the Ark (ah-rohn) of the Covenant is first used for the "coffin" (or sarcophagus) to contain the embalmed body of Joseph (Gen. 1, 26); and from its first use (in Exod. xxv, 10) for the Ark of the Covenant is thereafter restricted throughout the Old Testament to that one application alone, until we come to 2 Chron. xxiv, where alone it is used for a chest made, we are told, for a special religious purpose, and probably therefore fashioned with some resemblance to the Ark then in the Temple.

In Egyptian temples it was quite usual to have a movable box-like shrine, with a door which concealed from view the symbolic figure of the deity within; which, when the shrine was opened, was disclosed to view. The precise symbols and attributes appear to have been those proper to the particular deity or conception of God chiefly worshipped at the temple specially dedicated to him. The shrine, *kara* in Egyptian (and written with a special "determinative" symbol, conventionally depicting it), is the original of the "Ark" ordained by Moses in its rough outline, but in little else. Instead of a contained symbolic representation of a deity, the Ark of the Covenant was designed (1) to contain the Divine commandments; and (2) to typify the ever-abiding "Presence," not to be revealed or concealed at the will of man, for the Ark had no movable door; and (3) to be borne among Israel in their journeyings as the visible emblem of the Divine guidance—the "focus," as it were, of the Divine Presence as JHVH; when they halted, to be placed in the tabernacle in their midst until they should settle in the

Promised Land, when it was to come to rest "in the place the Lord thy God shall choose, to place His Name there," *i.e.*, in the locality chosen as a centre for the teaching associated with "His Name"—that is, His nature as revealed and indicated to Israel as JHVH.

Instead of the occasional or periodical processions of the Egyptians, in which the "shrines" were borne along on festival occasions on special boat-shaped carriages; we have now the journeyings of the ark, carried only on staves, without festival or ritual ceremonial, save only the enjoined prayers: "Rise up, O Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered," "And let them that hate Thee flee before Thee" (quoted by David, Ps. lviii, 1), when the Ark set forward; and "Return, O Lord, unto the thousands of the thousands of Israel" when it rested and Israel halted in their journeyings.

The "shrine" of the Egyptians, with a door at the side or in front, had a canopied top; the Ark of JHVH, without a door, being closed in all round, had a cover which, with the two cherub-figures over it at either end, was called the mercy-seat, a conception we cannot trace in Egyptian worship; although an Egyptian concept (Kheper, create, cause to be, come into being) seems to have profoundly influenced the words (kah-phar, kip-poo-reem, kap-poh-reth) used in relation thereto and somewhat the ideas signified. As regards this verb-root kheper, it is very suggestive that this seems to be originally conceived as a *mental* activity, and not in any sense a physical process or manual act.

In considering the mercy-seat of the Ark and all that it typified, we approach the heart—the very arcana—of the spiritual teaching and significance of the ancient faith and worship of Israel. There was an ancient formative element, chaph (innocent, guiltless), which we can trace in Job xxxiii, 9; in the verb chah-phah (to cover, in a material sense); in a symbolic meaning, *e.g.*, Deut. xxxiii, 12; in chah-phas (to search out); in choph-shee (to go free), be released; and elsewhere. The mercy-seat (kap-pohreth) typified the release from sin, the making guiltless or innocent, the "covering" of sins committed (Ps. lxxxv, 2, etc.), on the penitence and atonement of the sinner (kahphar)—when the ritual atonement (kippooreem) called kippoor was celebrated. The sincere penitent, desirous of leading a "*new life*" was given a fresh start (*cf.* Ps. li, 10: "*create in me a*

clean heart, O God"). In all this it is impossible not to see the influence of the Egyptian conception of Khepera, He who created all; and when we are further told that the Divine Presence would abide between the cherubim (= Egyptian gherui, Assyrian kiribi), with outstretched wings over the mercy-seat, and thence converse with Moses, we can see how these symbolic figures would remind Israel of the long-familiar "orb with outspread wings" so often used in Egypt over the doorways of temples, tombs, shrines, etc., to symbolise the very same conception.

We must also realise that Israel, in Egypt, would have learned much as to the shrine in the inner sanctuary of the temple (as well as when borne in procession) being regarded as hallowed by a divine presence, represented by the symbolic figure contained therein. Though the Ark in the inner sanctuary of the tabernacle contains no "graven image," yet the Divine Presence, "abiding between the cherubim" (Exod. xxv, 22), is worshipped in a unique ceremony at the "Atonement," when He frees, renews and "re-creates" penitent Israel. Compare the following, from an early Egyptian hymn, "Worship to Thee, RA (Omnipotent), Lord of Right, secret (hidden) is his shrine. Lord of the gods, Khepera (creator) on his way."

And if the first part of the word expressed the idea of the Creator (Khepera) to those Egyptianised Israelites less familiar, as yet, with the more Hebraicised words (and meanings) used by Moses and others more acquainted with Semitic speech, what would the latter part of the word convey to them? Probably het (or heth), house or sanctuary, *i.e.*, Kheperheth, house of God the Creator; orāat (zone or standard), *i.e.*, Kheper-āat, place (or standard) of the Creator. We must note that the hieroglyph used to denote āat as "place of" or "zone of" was also used in representing the "shrine" of the deity in Egyptian temples. Further, that the promise that the Presence of the Creator would *thence* commune with Moses ("from between the Cherubim") "of all the things which I give thee in commandment to Israel"—a spiritual "creation" in the deepest sense—is made and promulgated to the people, *before* the Day of Atonement had been made an annual observance (xxx, 10), which, after the frequent "communing" had ceased, would more and more come to dominate the conceptions associated with the "dwelling between the cherubim," Ps. lxxx.

It has often been pointed out that Gen. xli (Pharaoh's dream, Joseph's promotion, etc.) is full of details recorded in precise agreement with Egyptian customs, formalities, court etiquette, etc., as we now know them to have been; but this by no means exhausts the matter. The remaining chapters are also full of Egyptian details, Egyptian forms of expression and turns of speech and phrase, and even many actual Egyptian words thinly veiled in a Semitic dress or rendered in a Hebraicised pronunciation. As a few examples:—

1. It is Joseph's steward who, on their arrival in Egypt (Gen. xliii), releases Simeon, and *before* the other brothers enter Joseph's house—in accord with Egyptian etiquette. 2. Joseph's command, "Set on bread" accords with Egyptian custom, and reminds us of the great variety of "bread," cakes, etc., for which Egypt was renowned and which often formed the chief part of a meal; though the phrase "eat bread" (with anyone) does not always denote that other "baked foods" were not included (*see* Gen. xl, 17; xlvii, 12, etc.).

3. Note (v. 32) another strict observance of Egyptian etiquette: there is no common table or eating together. Joseph, because of his rank, eats "by himself"; the Egyptians, of another race and inferior social status, "by themselves"; and his "brethren," though his guests, also "by themselves."

4. Joseph's knowledge of his brethren's respective seniority, and his observance of it, also in accord with due etiquette, causes them to "marvel." (This I take as the meaning of v. 33.)

5. Another touch, characteristically Egyptian; after the meal "they drank and were merry with him"—abundant wine, leading to "merriment" (if nothing more!) was a feature of Egyptian hospitality. 6. So also, the "divining," after drinking wine, alluded to in xlv, 5, 15, is an Egyptian practice. 7. Judah's phrase, "thou art even as Pharaoh" (v. 18), is no mere fulsome adulation but an exact acknowledgment of Joseph's titular status. 8. Also when (xlv, 1) Joseph says God has made him "a *father* to Pharaoh, and lord of all his house (*i.e.*, executive administration), and ruler over all the land of Egypt" (but *not* "King of the two Lands," or "King of the North and South," the exclusive titles of the Pharaoh himself).

9. Again, the peculiar construction of v. 12: "Behold, your eyes see that it is my mouth (Hebrew, *peh*; Egypt, *rea*) that speaketh unto you"; a solemn declaration in strict Egyptian

form. 10. The very word rendered, "wagons" (probably ox-wagons), seems a compound of the Egyptian for "going" or transport, and "ox" (agolta, Erman.). 11. "Joseph shall put his hand upon thine eyes" (Gen. xlvii, 4), *i.e.*, shall close thine eyelids after death (*cf.* v. 30), reminds us of the custom of Egypt, nowhere else indicated in the Bible.

12. In chapter xlix, Jacob's dying blessing, it is notable that the "Egyptianisms" of Joseph are absent; Joseph had gone into Egypt when a lad, and had long been accustomed to the use of Egyptian speech, ways, and habits, with little occasion for Semitic idioms or uses. Jacob had come comparatively recently, as an old man, and had continued to be surrounded by his family—Hebrews. From the very different verbiage of this chapter, it seems reasonably probable that the exact words spoken by Jacob were carefully committed to memory and handed down—most likely actually recorded in written form. "Embalm," gahnat (an Egyptianism), is *only* used of Jacob and Joseph (Gen. l).

In Genesis, we find a few words of such ancient lineage that we can trace them back through the Egyptian to an older Babylonian (or even Accadian) source, *e.g.*, ehd, mist or dew, from the primitive edu—a word-formative we meet again in Eden and elsewhere. There are about forty others, but they lie outside our present purpose.

I have already indicated more than once the virtual certainty of the existence of records in several different languages, dealing with much that we find recounted in the Pentateuch, extant before the time of Moses. Indeed, some few have come down to us, often probably much distorted from their original accuracy; but many more would have been extant in the Egypt of Moses' day. Many of these, in Egyptian, Babylonian and Hebrew—for the Pentateuch itself affords ample proof that its writer understood these three tongues—must have been known to Moses. The wider his knowledge of such older records, the greater the evidence of Divine guidance enabling him to select what *was* reliable, worthy of preservation, and necessary to his purpose from so much that was not.

Studying the Pentateuch in the light of Egyptian archæology and linguistics, we are enabled to understand many ideas and details therein far more clearly. For example, we can form some fairly clear view as to the religious beliefs of Israel while still

in Egypt, *i.e.*, before the Exodus; *e.g.*, we see that the several "names" for God (*i.e.*, for distinctive concepts of Deity, in Egyptian often used for different "gods," in Israel for distinctive aspects or "relations" of the *same* God) were already so familiar as to call for no further explanation. Especially should we carefully observe the great distinction almost invariably drawn between Elohim, the Powers (of God); Ehl, the Being (*i.e.*, God Himself); and Jah, Jeho or JHVH—this last used to denote successive perceptions or revelations of the Divine Presence in Blessing, the *full* expression, JHVH, being (after Exod. vi, 3) closely restricted to Israel.

Exod. xix, 4: "How I bore you on eagles' wings," here the word rendered eagle's (*nehsher*) reminds us of the Egyptian *nehui* (*nehu*) used in the same meaning, often with a definitely religious allusion to the oft-depicted symbol mentioned earlier (the cherubim).

Of close kin to the Egyptian, we may note especially the following:—

Tzelem, image. Egypt: *senem*, to fashion; *senen*, image (Pepi I).

N'shamah, breath (soul, spirit). *Cf.* Egypt: *axem*, *asem*, *ashem*, sacred form or image (also symbolical).

D'mooth, likeness. Egypt: *tema*, *tem*, *temu*, to make perfect, *i.e.*, like.

Nahsheem, wives (*fem.*, pl.), Gen. iv, 19, etc. Egypt: *na em hemt*, wives.

Nehtz, blossom, Gen., etc. Egypt: *nexeb*, a shoot.

Nehtz, hawk or eagle (Job, Levit.), Egypt: *neh*, hawk.

Nehsher, eagle (Exod.). Egypt: *ner*. *Cf.* eagle-sign for *netter*, divine.

Chah'y, living creature, living, life. Egypt: *ankh*, similar sense and range of uses.

Chahyah (verb), live.

Rahah, to see (? *yahrah*, teach). Egypt: *hru*, face, look, *see* (symbolic).

Yahrehsh, thigh. Egypt: *xeres*, thigh, haunch.

Shehm, name. Egypt: *shems*, *shem*, to follow, follower, successor. In the Egyptian sense, Shem is the "follower on" of Noah; in the Hebrew sense, "in his name" sustaining his character, *i.e.*, he continues it.

Thus Israel (Gen. xviii, 16): "Let my name be called upon them and the names of my fathers Abraham and Isaac," means not so much "Let them be called Israel after me" (*all* his descendants were thus "named") or after Abraham or Isaac, as "let them show the same *character*."

As names, Shem is the Egyptian shem, priest; Ham is the Egyptian hem, slave.

I had completed almost the whole of my comparative analysis of the ancient Hebrew and Egyptian languages, ritual, worship, divine law, and many other details before I became aware of Dr. Yahuda's *Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian*, covering part of the same ground; and I have been confirmed in my views by finding that, wherever he has investigated the same actual details as I have, in nearly every case he has formed much the same conclusion. His book deals with many points to which I had not specially addressed my own studies; in the case of many others, which have alike engaged his investigations and my own, he has elucidated them with such force and clarity that any further exposition of mine would be superfluous. I have therefore confined this brief essay mainly to specific subjects other than those so fully dealt with by him; and, in the case of some subjects of major importance, to aspects of these less completely set out by him.

It remains now to summarise the conclusions at which I have arrived chiefly as a result of categorising the entire vocabulary used in the respective books of the Pentateuch; and comparing each word analytically with its Egyptian counterpart or equivalent. I had hoped to append a short list of about 250 Egyptian and Hebrew analogues, which could very probably be doubled—or even trebled—by further analytical study, but space forbids.

1. It seems quite clear that early Semitic races, from whose history, traditions, or records most of the earlier narrative is derived, had *already* adopted the use of distinctive or descriptive terms by which to designate different aspects or activities of Divine Power. Since it is evident, from the linguistic material of the text itself, that Genesis was written *before* the subsequent books and by the same writer (or his scribes), we see that—whatever may have been the original form of these differing "Divine appellatives"—we find them from the very commence-

ment of Genesis throughout the Pentateuch expressed by (1) Semitic words to denote the Powers (of God), the Being (of God), and the Presence of God (Elohim, Ehl, and JHVH respectively); and (2) for the other conceptions of the Deity or Divine Power we find the monotheistic Semitic conceptions each rendered by the Egyptian word most nearly expressing the same idea transliterated as closely as it could be rendered in the Palestinian (or "Moabite") alphabet on a Hebraic pronunciation.

2. Not only are the vocabulary, phrase-forms, grammatical constructions, verb-uses, even when scarcely suitable, strictly adhered to, as a rule, by the writers of the subsequent books, with little relaxation until we come to the later Prophets, but throughout the Old Testament the various words denoting God (or Divine activity conceived of in different aspects or relations) are used in exactly the same distinctive significances and with the same discrimination in their use as in Genesis, Exodus, etc.

3. There are about forty words in Genesis and in Job (which I regard as still preserving in the text an older language or earlier form of Semitic speech than even Genesis) which seem closely related to Assyrian words (or even Accadian), though not directly taken from them; from their differences in meaning, they are in such cases probably derived severally from common "roots" in a still earlier tongue.

4. It is evident that we must enlarge our conception, not only of Semitic but also of Egyptian mentality. Many of the symbols and other things we see so constantly represented on the wall-paintings and elsewhere are conventional ideographs, representing attributes, qualities, functions, ideas, powers, etc.; they usually are not meant as depicting actual objects at all, and the sooner we realise that the better.

(Joseph's interpretations of "dreams" (in Gen. xl, xli) should, surely, have long ago afforded a sufficient clue to any person of average intelligence who, having read *that* narrative, subsequently considered such "pictures" as the Judgment of the Dead, and other ideographic designs!)

5. From a study of Egyptian religious texts, hymns, etc., it has become quite clear to me that there were, even from very early times, both the monotheistic conception of One God, manifesting Himself (*i.e.*, evidencing His activity or power)

in many ways or forms, and also the polytheistic idea of many distinct divine beings or "gods."

Moses, even during the period of his Egyptian education, may well have been reared in the monotheistic belief, which would render his use of so many different Divine "names" the more natural.

6. The whole Pentateuch is permeated with Egyptian mentality, with Egyptian words, Egyptian phrases, Egyptian symbolism, imagery and allegorical or allusive ideology; naturally resulting from the long period of Israel's stay in Egypt and continuous familiarity with every detail of Egyptian life and thought.

7. In my judgment, it is clear that Job, Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers are the work of the same writer (or scribes); and probably written or compiled in that order. Leviticus may have been compiled—at intervals—during the period covered by Exodus and Numbers; and Deuteronomy a few years later: many repetitions in Leviticus itself and the close parallels to several passages in the other two books somewhat suggest this. I see no reason to doubt—but, on the contrary, much *detailed* evidence to support—the view that Moses himself is the actual author, either inditing in person or employing a scribe to do so at his dictation, in accordance with the common practice of Egypt.

As to the general results given above, further research and comparative analysis will doubtless amplify much that I have only been able to outline, and will probably modify some of the details as to which I have expressed merely tentative views; it cannot alter the ascertained facts.

This paper has had to be so drastically curtailed—the original draft was more than twice as long—that it has been found necessary to omit my lists of several hundred words, details of symbolism, etc., all illustrative of the above conclusions.

Only at the very period indicated by the internal evidence of the Pentateuch; only in the circumstances therein recorded, could its words, its ideas, conceptions of religious and spiritual teaching, its very words for the Divine activities, have been familiarly understood by any Semitic or "Hebrew" race. Only by one long steeped in Egyptian etiquette, Egyptian life and thought, Egyptian advanced ideas of divine things—not the

crude notions of the vulgar—could its contents have been *thus* written, and only at just that period.

Whilst only to those recently come out of Egypt after a long sojourn therein would *all* these things seem natural, appropriate and calling for no explanation. The evidence, now abundant, corroborates almost every detail, every idea, every word—most of them minutely and precisely; and it is all inescapably focussed at one brief period of time, and only then.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN, Dr. A. S. YAHUDA, referring in appreciative terms to the wide scope of the paper and the industry and laborious investigation it evinced, proposed a vote of thanks to the Lecturer, which was carried with acclamation. To the discussion, in which several took part, the Chairman himself added a criticism of considerable length.*

Dr. BARCROFT ANDERSON asked the lecturer if it were his belief that the Book of The Law was of Mosaic origin, expressing his own belief of its being of Divine origin, and citing in support Ezra vii, 6, where the Law is stated to have been given by Jehovah, God of Israel. He added a further conviction that Hebrew was the original language, from which all others were derived at Babel, where speech was subjected of God to confused pronunciation; and also that each Hebrew letter represented an idea, words being built up of combinations of ideas.

The Rev. HAROLD C. MORTON, B.A., Ph.D., said: I want personally to join with special cordiality in the vote of thanks to Mr. Cowper Field for his very striking paper. I have known for years that he has been unweariedly pursuing this line of investigation. Just as no one knows enough about Hebrew to criticise the Hebrew of the Old Testament, so no one knows enough about Egyptian to be very dogmatic about it. The almost endless variety of translations,

* Owing to prolonged absence abroad, the Chairman's written remarks were only received late in the year. They are accordingly shown as a communication.—[ED.]

and even of transliterations, among those who have devoted their lives to the study of Egyptian, shows that we are only beginning to understand that ancient tongue. In its interpretation there is inevitably no small measure of personal opinion and hypothesis, and therefore much liability to fall into subjectivity and error.

We have a great scholar in the Chair to-night, and for lecturer a keen and unbiased student, as free from the fetters of any school as it is possible for mortal man to be, giving to us what appears to me to be a valuable but a daring paper. For, if I understand him aright, Mr. Cowper Field goes much farther than Dr. Yahuda, and claims not only that the Israelites took up many Egyptian words into their vocabulary, but that Hebrew, as we know it to-day, was literally in the making during those 430 Egyptian years, and that Hebrew religious ritual was very largely Egyptian religious ritual modified and purified.

Dr. Yahuda has been warning us that the same root consonants in Egyptian and Hebrew do not necessarily argue identity of words, and that we must carefully study the usage of the two languages. But must we not also bear in mind how many different meanings the same root bears in different connections ?

Gesenius will reveal to anyone who spends half an hour with his pages that a Hebrew root in different connections passes through a most bewildering variety of meanings. The same root, for example, which in Ps. ix, 11, is translated "dwelleth," in Ps. xvii, 12, has taken on the meaning of "lurketh," and in Ezra x, 2, has reached the sense "take a wife, marry." Yet it is the same word.

I should like to express the hope that Mr. Cowper Field will find opportunity to publish in much more extended form the results arrived at by these long years of study in this important realm.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Dr. E. CECIL CURWEN wrote questioning the connection between RA, the Sun-God, and such words as rex, etc.

Dr. A. S. YAHUDA wrote :—Although a chairman is not expected to utter but words of praise and is allowed to make some criticism, I feel somehow reluctant to use the Chair for such a purpose especially

as my own work, to which the lecturer has alluded, is involved. I feel sure, however, that in fairness to the lecturer and to my work, as well as out of consideration for the audience, I am bound to make some remarks.

Mr. Cowper-Field said that he arrived to the same conclusions as I have, before he became aware of my book *The Language of the Pentateuch in its relation to Egyptian* (Oxford, 1932), and that the results of my studies have only confirmed him in his own views. I should not like to discuss this point as it is not so much a question of priority rights as it is a matter of methodical procedure and of the correctness and exactitude of the linguistic and archaeological parallels adduced from Egyptian, which can only be based on genuine and first-hand knowledge of Hebrew and Egyptian and other languages concerned. I do not belong to those who, to use the expression of Job xii, 2, think of themselves that "wisdom dies with them." Now if I venture to say a few words of criticism I hope that they will be regarded as a contribution towards the efforts made to find the right path to the right end.

First of all I must observe that almost all the parallels from Egyptian mentioned by the lecturer have been suggested many years ago by other scholars, and are to be found on a much larger scale and with a greater amount of illustrative details in the works of Brugsch, Ebers, Heyes, Kyle, Knight-Smith, Mallon and others quoted in my book *The Language of the Pentateuch*. Some comparison of words and phrases have been known long ago from Biblical commentaries, dictionaries and encyclopedias. The same is the case with the identifications of Hebrew words as being Egyptian loan-words; they are also taken over from other books mostly of a speculative character without proper preparation for the purpose.

Unfortunately, a great part of the material utilised by the lecturer for the formulation of his conclusions is not sufficiently substantiated and some of his linguistic identifications are utterly untenable. His assertion that he "found over seven hundred Egyptian words, ideas and details in Genesis and Exodus alone" (p. 98) goes far beyond the limit. Also from a list sent to me by the lecturer some time before the lecture for my full information, containing hundreds of alleged Egyptian loan-words in Hebrew which he accepted as such,

I saw that a great number is taken from Budge's *Hieroglyphic Dictionary*. Now, as Sir Wallis Budge had always too many irons in the fire, it was physically impossible for him to control and collate all the references from the Hieroglyphic tests quoted by him and still less to establish the correctness of the reading of each word. Some words were for a long time wrongly read and many others were only vaguely understood. Thus, his dictionary contains the most extraordinary mistakes and blunders and sometimes causes despair to the student, especially when not one of four references is correct. In some cases words registered in his dictionary as Egyptian have never existed in Egypt. In some other cases he has divided one Egyptian word into two and thus figuring in his dictionary as two different words. He also confused many words belonging to different roots and put them together deriving them from one and the same root and ascribed to them meanings which can actually be found nowhere. Similar criticism must be applied to his identification of Egyptian words with roots and words from other languages, especially from Hebrew. Hence a great number, if not all, of the Hebrew words accepted by the lecturer as being akin to Egyptian words, must be rejected either because the supposed Egyptian words only exist in Budge's dictionary, like the supposed Egyptian word *ruh, ruha*—rest after effort, evening—associated with the Hebrew *ruach*—breath of life—(p. 102), or because they are of different roots which have nothing to do with each other, for which dozens of instances could be adduced.

Many other "loan-words" or roots "akin" to Hebrew are taken over by the lecturer from the antiquated dictionary of Brugsch and from works of other Egyptologists, who either did not know enough Hebrew or have done only dilettante work with their Hebrew-Egyptian investigations; all these words are no less doubtful than those collected from Budge's dictionary. Of course, many loan-words are undoubtedly correct; but they are mixed with all the others and thus making it evident that the lecturer was not able to distinguish between the right and the wrong and to separate the grain from the straw.

Furthermore, all the Egyptian words quoted by the lecturer are, without exception, transliterated in the antiquated fashion, and in

many cases they are not even correctly written and reveal little knowledge, if any, of their origin and their Hieroglyphic form. The same is the case even with common Hebrew words mentioned by the lecturer. He seems to have had the sound, but not the actual lettering and forms in mind; otherwise it would be inexplicable how he could identify (p. 105) the Hebrew *kap-poreth*, "the cover of the ark," or the "mercy-seat" as it is interpreted, with the Egyptian *kheper*, "create" and with Hebrew *chapha*, "to cover," each of which belongs to a different root, and have nothing in common either in their morphological or etymological origin. Such and other associations suggested by the lecturer are utterly misleading, particularly for readers who do not know Hebrew or Egyptian. The combinations based on such identifications can best be illustrated by supposing that someone, who is little or not at all acquainted with the origin of English words, would construe a whole theory based on the association and even identification of the words bud, bead, bid, bad, bed, bath, both, booth, boat, boots, bet, bit, bat, etc. Of the twelve Hebrew words taken by him as "kin to Egyptian" words (p. 109 *seq.*) not one is tenable, and many of the Egyptian words are here too so wrongly transliterated that it is difficult to verify them.

There are other points in the lecture which are open to challenge. For instance, the tendency of the lecturer to identify divine attributes in the Pentateuch to the Egyptian gods or to introduce typically Egyptian conceptions in the Hebrew attributes of God. One of the most misleading and unfortunately widely accepted ideas is that Akhenaton, the reformer of the Egyptian religion, had distinctly monotheistic tendencies. But the discussion of this question would make it necessary for me to dig much deeper into the foundations of this view and to analyse the Hieroglyphic texts on which it is based; an undertaking which would take me too far away, as would also the discussion of some other points connected with this problem and referred to by the lecturer.

In conclusion, I should like to stress again the necessity of first-hand knowledge of Hebrew as well as of Egyptian. A mere study of dictionaries and books dealing with these questions, or of translations of Egyptian texts will never serve the purpose of

establishing a better understanding of the Biblical Egyptian relations.

· AUTHOR'S REPLY.

TO DR. ANDERSON :—I would just remark that we cannot regard “Hebrew,” as we find it in the Bible, as being in *any* sense “the original language of humanity.” Many early Hebrew and Babylonian words and word-forming elements (or “roots”) clearly evidence a common original source, though descending through subsequent divergent streams ; even Accadian or Sumerian “roots” can be traced ; and the wholesale adoption of Egyptian words, symbolism, etc., is clearly shown in the long lists of words and symbols which were only omitted from my Paper for considerations of time—and space. I agree that alphabet-signs were, earlier, syllabic and originally represented actual objects, animate or inanimate.

As to the primary source of The Law, I regard it as, in essence, given by Divine revelation and mediated for human guidance and observance by Moses. The use of familiar Egyptian “forms” to convey it would not alter its true Source. How far its every detail is of Divine revelation and how far modified or adapted by human inadequacy to express its full meaning—or by other human limitations of mind, etc.—I cannot presume to say. Our Lord accepted it, fully and simply, as the Law of God given through Moses ; and that for me is final.

TO DR. CURWEN :—I had tried in my Paper definitely *not* to imply any necessarily direct borrowing ; but rather the persistent recurrence, in many languages long widely separated, of this “primitive formative element” or root, as still active in our languages of today.

It may be helpful here, and I have been asked to explain something of the difference in method between “comparative” and “analytical” philology. Usually the former primarily takes note of general resemblances and relationships between two (or more) contemporary languages ; and elaborates from this. Analytical philology seeks to trace out—and back through the earlier stages—the formative elements (often called “roots”) used to express

simple ideas, and their combination into words for more complex ones. The "comparative" school, like Sayce, Budge, Erman, and others, finding a similarity in word or phrase in two different languages, then see if there be any common idea linking them or other traceable connection. This is often fairly productive; but it can rarely take us very far.

The "analytical" student, like Max Muller, Skete, Morris, Swete, first takes the *ideas*, and then notes the correspondence—where traceable—of the respective words used to express these in the two languages; this, owing (often) to considerable phonetic change or "decay," is not always obvious (*e.g.*, orange, from the Portuguese naranja, calico from the Hindi kalkut). Hence my comparing Semitic words and symbolism, where these had no evident near kindred in Semitic speech and thought, led easily to my finding over 900 correspondences in Egyptian; whereas Dr. Yahuda told us he had found "only 50 or so" by the other method.

As an example of roots combined into words, take the Semitic BA-RA and BA-NA, which will prove helpful in understanding early narratives in Genesis. BA, as an element, means beget, bear, bring forth, cause to be; RA, the putting-forth of power (already explained); hence BARA means to beget or cause to be by *power* (not a *material* operation; Gen. i, 1, John i, 1, etc.), *i.e.*, create. NA is the primitive element for knowledge, skill, craftsmanship; it is still heard in (Greek) nous, (Latin) nosco, (Semitic) nahash, (Gothic) konnan, (English) ken and know, etc. Hence BANA means to make, form, fashion—by skill—from some material *already* existent: a most important difference.

Accordingly RA, the Egyptian term for the God of Power, or the Power of God (to their mentality much the same concept); whose visible emblem—or manifestation, if you like—is the Sun, the cause of all vital phenomena in Egypt, as elsewhere. Let us take this, from an ancient hymn:—"O thou called Harakhti (ariser, arouser, or stimulator) when thou arisest"; RA (the Power—another variant gives Aten, the Disc "shining in his strength") when thou shinest; Atum (closer, or putter to rest) "when thou settest," etc., etc. Here the full power is denoted by RA; like our use of sunrise, sunshine, sunset. Even in this latitude, where the power of the sun (see how we still use the old ideas!) is so feeble,

we yet use different terms for these stages of the sun's daily journey. One would not say "Look, what a glorious sunshine" for either sunrise or sunset. Or, "Come into the sunrise or sunset" for "Come into the sunshine." So the influence of RA still rules our phrases.

To the CHAIRMAN :—Dr. Yahuda belittles and discredits the work of many able scholars, especially one from whom I formerly received much kindly help, Sir Wallace Budge, and (on Feb. 17th) yet another great student, Dr. E. Naville. The works of all of these he dismisses as "mostly of a speculative character," "without proper preparation," asserting that Dr. Budge's great *Hieroglyphic Dictionary* "contains the most extraordinary mistakes and blunders," and that "not one of four references is correct."

I am well content he should rate me in the same category as these others.

As to my own work, Dr. Yahuda makes numerous misquotations, and several specific accusations—all false; some few of these it may be worth while to refute.

1. He first suggests that, in my Paper, some work of his own is involved; this charge I sufficiently refuted in February, before it was subsequently made in December. He then proceeds to misquote what I said in reference to his book.

2. He next accuses me of having "taken over" "almost all the parallels" I adduced from "the works of other scholars." This is totally untrue, as any careful perusal of my Paper (wherein I sufficiently explain the method adopted) will make evident.

And most of the books he accuses me of "cribbing" from I have never even seen, Brugsch's dictionary, for example.

3. I had sent to Dr. Yahuda (as to other students) some considerable time before my lecture a few of my lists of words, inviting his comments thereon; but without receiving any reply, though he now asserts—nine months after he had returned them—that they contained "hundreds of Egyptian loan-words in Hebrew which I accepted as such." Now I was at some pains to emphasise, both in that abbreviated list and when reading my Paper, that the "borrowing" appeared to have been sometimes in one direction, sometimes in the reverse, that often similar words in both languages

for analogous ideas were more likely to be alike derived from a common older source, and that in many other instances the existence of a similar-sounding word in Egyptian to a Semitic one already in use for a somewhat similar idea *must*, in time, have led to an approximation in sound and use of one or both. This fact is so familiar to philologists that one need hardly stress it.

4. He then asserts as a fact that, in my lists, he saw "that a great number is taken from Budge's *Hieroglyphic Dictionary*." In sober truth, not one is so "taken." The only use I made of Dr. Budge's Dictionary was, *after* I had got out all my Pentateuch vocabularies sorted into categories, to check my renderings of Egyptian words (*i.e.*, sounds) by the well-established standards of that work. I took no "list of words" from either the Egyptian-English or the English-Egyptian section. Dr. Yahuda is good enough to admit that many of these loan-words are undoubtedly correct; but he at once goes on to assert—again without a scintilla of evidence—that I was not able to distinguish between the right and the wrong.

5. He is quite right in believing that I paid more attention to the *sound* of words—and their *meanings*—than to precision of spelling, which is so often variable, as he has himself shown in his book. In any race, at any time, there are always far more persons able to pronounce their language correctly (or they would not be understood) than are able invariably to spell or write *all* the words with precise accuracy. This is true, even in England to-day, and of course was far more so in earlier ages.

6. As to the transliteration from Egyptian, it is usually in accord with the great standard dictionary of Dr. Budge; which I observe, though he calls it "antiquated," has been adopted almost in its entirety by Dr. Yahuda himself in the tables of equivalents he gives in his book. So I do not know why he blames me on this score.

7. His allusion to what I had to say as to *kap-poreth* (mercy-seat), Egyptian *kheper* (create) and the ancient Semitic formative element *chaph* totally mis-states what I *did* say. Evidently, he has failed to grasp its meaning; though I had hoped it was quite clear. He seems so often to confuse quite obvious "relationships" of sound

and/or sense with "identity"; they must be carefully distinguished; so perhaps this explains *his* words on "the association and even identification of bud, bead, bad, bid, bed, etc.," of which, otherwise, I quite fail to see the point.

As to "actual lettering" (or spelling), I purposely did *not* strain any distinction based on the words *chaph*, *chah-phah*, *choph-shee*, etc., beginning with a *ch*, and *kap-pohreth*, *kah-phar*, *kipoor*, etc., with a *k*; though this might have seemed a strong argument for the "influence" of the *Khepera* conception. As is well known—indeed, it has often been stressed to me by learned Jews, *really* versed in these matters—we cannot be quite certain that, in turning over the Pentateuch, word by word, from the older (Phœnician or Palestinian) alphabet into that from which the present one was developed, no changes of such consonants were made to accord with the pronunciations then current. Indeed, some such seem very probable; so it is utterly unsafe to dogmatise as to *chapha*, *kah phar* originally "having nothing in common" as to origin; and therefore I did not do so.

With Dr. Yahuda's concluding paragraph I am in entire agreement; and I can only regret that, after ten months to consider my Paper, and such ample opportunity to consult the long list of authorities he cites, he did not make a more helpful "contribution towards the efforts made to find the right path to the right end" announced by him as his objective.

It remains to add a few words of reply to the late DR. MORTON'S observations, though such cannot reach him now. He has correctly summed up the broad general conclusion of much of my work in a few clear, simple phrases. Not only Hebrew, but very much else, embedded in the Old Testament, was "in the making" during the long Sojourn in Egypt; and I hope, ere long, all this will become available to Bible students in a book, phrased in as simple language as the subject will permit me.

And if, after much patient investigation by really painstaking philologists, it shall be found that the speech of Israel on leaving Egypt consists of but a small proportion of pure, untainted Semitic words; of many Semitic words modified and more or less Egyptianised during the centuries of the Sojourn; of very many

borrowed and much modified while there ; and a considerable number of those last borrowed only slightly altered ; need that very greatly surprise us ? I am not, yet, asserting that it is so ; but it is certainly at least probable ; Dr. E. Naville realised this, when he discussed it many years ago. Israel entered Egypt as a mere handful of seventy (Gen. xlvi, 27) and left—430 years later—a vast multitude (Num. xxii, 5, 41, xxiii, 13), by no means wholly Semitic in race (Ex. xii, 38). Our own English speech contains large contributions still remaining from *all* the waves of race that have come hither ; Goidels, Ivernians, Brythons (often all grouped, vaguely, as “ ancient Britons,” but probably each “ wave ” of a different speech)—possibly even earlier immigrants—Romans, Saxons, Danes, Normans and others.* Is it reasonable to suppose that Israel, increasing from “ seventy souls ” to a “ vast multitude ” would preserve their original local Semitic dialect unchanged throughout all those centuries ? Was there the least reason why they should ?

* See Earle's *Philology of the English Tongue*.