

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 13.—JULY, 1890.

I. CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS.¹

You have called me to the discharge of most responsible duty and exalted service in this honored school of sacred learning. I sincerely pray that your call and my acceptance may unite in being an outward expression of the mind of the Spirit and of the will of God in regard to the way in which Christ's cause may be served and his name honored by means of this institution. Having hope that such is the case, it will be the earnest and undivided effort of my life, so long as I remain in your service, to perform the duties of this high office to the best of my ability, ever seeking the needed wisdom and promised grace which Christ's servants may claim.

You have also informed me that a short time prior to my election the scope of the chair whose work is committed to my trust was so enlarged as to include the entire field of Christian apologetics. This, in my judgment, is a very important change, and it makes exceedingly useful modifications of the work pertaining to this chair possible. Its incumbent will now be in a position to deal with several great topics not embraced in the field of the relations of science and revelation; and he will at the same time be able to construe many things which emerge in the discussion of these relations under the category of Christian apologetics. In this way the work of this professorship may be made wider in its scope and more systematic in the treatment of its materials than was possible under its former designation.

¹ Inaugural address by F. R. Beattie, on the occasion of his installation as Professor in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C., May, 1890.

VII. NOTES.

ON THE LENGTH OF THE SOJOURN IN EGYPT.

GEIKIE, in his *Hours with the Bible*, repeatedly asserts, without any show of proof, that the children of Israel dwelt for more than four hundred years on the banks of the Nile. The same view is maintained in the Revised Version of the English Bible, in Exodus xii. 40, where four hundred and thirty years is given as the precise number. Several references to the subject in *The Old Testament Student* imply that, in the belief of the writers, that point is so well settled that no reasons need either be asked or given. So far as I can see, however, this is not, as many appear to regard it, a question of textual translation merely, or of simple historical interest. To me it seems rather to touch upon the very vitals of Biblical certainties; so that, if we come to accept the "long term" of four hundred and thirty years as a matter of fact, and set aside the "short term" of two hundred and fifteen years as an antiquated notion, it cannot fail to react most unfavorably on the trustworthiness of the Mosaic records and of the other scriptures as well.

Take, in the first place, Paul's plain and unqualified statement (Gal. iii. 17), that the giving of the law was four hundred and thirty years after the covenant with Abraham. Now, who may be supposed to know most about the matter, Paul or ourselves? If the recently prevailing opinion be accepted for truth, then what shall we do with the apostolic witness and authority of Paul? Was Paul misled by Moses?

Moses says (Ex. ii. 1) that "a man of the house of Levi went and took to wife a *daughter of Levi*"; which man and woman were his own father and mother. Again (in Ch. vi. 16-30), he informs us that "Amram took him Jochebed, *his father's sister*, to wife, and she bare him Aaron and Moses"—that is, that Jochebed, Moses' mother, was his father Amram's aunt, and his grandfather Kohath's sister, and his great-grandfather Levi's daughter. And so again, as if to leave no room for doubt or cavillation, Moses asserts, in Num. xxvi. 59, that "the name of Amram's wife was Jochebed, *the daughter of Levi*, whom

(her mother) *bare to Levi in Egypt*; and she bare unto Amram Aaron, Moses, and Miriam their sister."

This view, likewise, is consistent with all the other facts of the case as stated in the Bible. For example, Levi was some six years older than Joseph. Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh, and, after seven years of abundance and two of famine, Jacob and his family removed into Egypt; so that Joseph was then thirty-nine and Levi about forty-five. In the passage cited (Ex. vi. 16) Moses informs us that Levi died at the age of one hundred and thirty-seven; so that he lived about ninety-three years in Egypt. Aaron was eighty-three and Moses eighty when they presented their divine credentials before Pharaoh. Adding, then, the eighty to the ninety-three, we have one hundred and seventy-three years; which, by the "short term," leaves but forty-two years from the death of Levi to the birth of Moses; and makes the statement that he was the third child of Levi's daughter every way credible, without recourse to the interposition of that divine power which made Sarah a mother at the age of ninety. But if we accept the "long term" for truth and certainty, then there is a gap of two hundred and fifty-seven years between the death of Levi and the birth of Moses; and then what becomes of the credibility of Moses, not now as to what passed between Jehovah and himself in the burning mount, but as to the simple facts of his own family history?

Nor is that all. Moses again relates (Gen. xv. 13-16) that, in the covenant made with Abraham (which Paul asserts was four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law), Jehovah told him that his "seed should be a stranger in a land not theirs, . . . and they shall afflict them four hundred years"; adding, "And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age; but in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." Gesenius explains the "four generations" in the one passage as the equivalent of the "four hundred years" in the other; the Hebrew "DOR" (meaning a lifetime), like the Latin "*seculum*," standing for the round period of one hundred years. Now, since Joseph lived seventy-one years in Egypt after the whole family removed there, and as it was long after the death of Joseph before the "bondage and affliction" began, "four hundred years of bondage and affliction" cannot be made out by the long term any more than the short one; and furthermore, it is perfectly legitimate to understand verse 13 as a loose mode of stating that "they shall bring them into

bondage and afflict them till a period of four hundred years *from now*," the reason given in the passage itself for the delay being that "the iniquity of the Amorites is *not yet full*." As, therefore, four generations, or four life-times, means, in round numbers, four hundred years (which corresponds with the more specific number given by Paul), the promise to Abraham was that, after four revolving centuries had passed, his descendants should come out of bondage into the land of promise. But if now we agree to accept the long term, and make it *si. v.* revolving centuries instead of four, what becomes of the divine faithfulness, as well as of Mosaic trustworthiness?

It will probably be objected to this that two hundred and fifteen years was not sufficient time for the prodigious increase of the Israelitish people from seventy males into a nation of six hundred thousand fighting men. But the objector seems wholly to overlook the fact that Abraham, who had three hundred and eighteen young men, or servants, born in his house, must have had at least five hundred or six hundred males in his encampment; that Isaac's servants, or dependents, were so numerous that the king of the Philistines said to him, "Thou art much mightier than we"; that Jacob brought back with him from Padan-Aram men servants not a few, before he got this birthright share in his father's estate; so that with his seventy male descendants there went down with him into Egypt probably not less than one thousand five hundred males, circumcised Israelites every one of them; all of whose descendants were no doubt merged into the families to which they belonged; so that the one thousand five hundred males, rather than the seventy, was the stock out which the Israelitish nation was developed, in those days when masters and servants were alike reduced to the condition of Egyptian bondsmen.

Very strong confirmatory proof that the lineal descendants of Jacob formed but a very small part of the Israelites who came out of Egypt, is found in a passage which has perplexed commentators not a little, to-wit, Num. iii. 43. When Jehovah proposed to take the Levites, instead of the firstborn of all the tribes, there was found to be twenty-two thousand Levites from thirty days old and upwards; and by actual count there was found to be only twenty-two thousand three hundred and seventy-three firstborn of like age in the other eleven tribes; whereas the firstborn of a month old and upwards, corresponding to an army of six hundred thousand men, (allowing the incredible average of six or eight males and females to every family,) could not have been less than four hundred thousand to five hundred thousand.

one-half of whom may be supposed to have been males; ten or fifteen times as many. If, then, the twenty-two thousand three hundred and seventy-three be assumed to have been the lineal descendants of Jacob, and an average of even five all around for every family be allowed, the sons and daughters of Jacob would amount to only about eighty thousand or one hundred thousand: a number by no means difficult to be accounted for in the short term of two hundred and fifteen years, under the fostering hand of God. It deserves mention, likewise, that the zeal of the true-born sons of Jacob to keep the records of their lineal descent seems to point in the same direction.

But just here the advocates of the long term will no doubt aver that Exodus xii. 40, by the "only honest translation" that can be made of it, expressly declares that "the sojourning of the children of Israel, *which they sojourned in Egypt*, was four hundred and thirty years;" and that this is so certainly the only admissible rendering, that the revisers would not honor the old version with a place in the margin, as an alternative rendering. But we have Holy Writ for the assertion that "great men are not always wise"; and, I think, I can show it to be certainly so in the present instance, and prove, by a convincing demonstration, that of the two "the old is better."

Stephen says that Moses was born "when the time of the promise drew nigh which God had promised to Abraham" (Acts vii. 17-20): the fourth life-time, or the four hundred years expressly stipulated. Stephen certainly believed in the short term. Paul as certainly believed in the short term. The author of the First Book of Kings certainly believed in the short term. (See 1 Kings, vi. 1.) But what is more to our present purpose is that Moses himself just as certainly believed in the short term. To say that he believed and asserted the truth of the long term would, in addition to all other difficulties named, convict him of the absurdity of asserting that his mother gave birth to him when she was nearly three hundred years of age!

The genealogies also furnish us another very strong line of proof. The only genealogies of Moses and his contemporaries found in the Bible are the following, and they all, without a single exception, agree in making out the short term:

1. *Levi*, Kohath, Amram, *Moses* and *Aaron* (eighty and eighty-three years old respectively at the time of the exodus). (Exod. vi. 16-30; Num. xxvi. 57-59; 1 Chron. vi. 1-3.)

2. *Judah*, Pharez, Hezron, Ram, Amminidab, *Nahshon*. (Ruth iv. 18-20; 1 Chron. ii. 3-10; Matt. i. 3, 4.)

3. *Levi*, Kohath, Izhar, *Korah*. (Exod. vi. 16–21; Num. vi. 1.)

4. *Ruben*, Pallu, Eliab, *Dathan* and *Abiram*. (Num. xxvi. 5–10.)

Singular as it may seem, the genealogies of 1 Chron., chaps. i. to ix., are constructed on some such principle that, besides the two already given, the only other that can be made out with a tolerable degree of certainty, is the following:

5. *Judah*, Pharez, Hezron, Chelubai, Hur, *Uri* and *Bezaleel*. (1 Chron. ii. 3–20.) As Bezaleel seems to have been a young man, his father, and probably his grandfather, were contemporaries of the aged prophet, as well as himself. Hur was perhaps the same individual who, together with Aaron, sustained Moses' wearied hands while Joshua fought against Amalec.¹

Now, if there be omitted links in the line of Moses, in spite of the repeated and explicit statements he makes of the names and ages of his ancestors, both paternal and maternal, pray why should the same thing be done in the case of all the rest? We know that single names are sometimes omitted in the genealogical lists, but the supposition is quite inadmissible that any such wholesale omissions can be sanctioned or allowed as the long term would imperiously demand. A writer in the *Old Testament Student* for November, 1887, (who assumes the long term to be unquestionably true,) estimates that "the Israelites *numbered thirteen generations* during their sojourn in Egypt." (P. 79, note.) Very differently reads the venerable Septuagint Version, which was a recognized authority in the days of Christ and his apostles. This old version distinctly states that "in the *fifth generation* the children of Israel went up out of Egypt." (Exod. xiii. 18.) Now, whether the seventy interpreters had a different Hebrew text from our own, or whether they mistranslated (if it be wholly a mistranslation; compare Exod. xx. 5, 6, and xxxiv. 7, unpointed Hebrew,) the difficult text we have, it may be reasonably supposed that they knew more about the matter in dispute than all of us put together: if they knew anything of their national history, they might be expected to know how long their fathers were in Egypt.

There are not wanting those who affirm that Moses had nothing to do, except in name, with the one set of statements relative to his personal history, any more than the other; but believing as I do, in the

¹ Since the above was written, I have found one more, the only other, I think, in the Bible; and, like the rest, it attests the truth and certainty of the "short term." 6. *Manasseh*, Machir, Gilead, Hopher, *Zelophehad* and his daughters. (Num. xxvi. 29, 32, 33; xxvii. 3.)

Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch (with unquestionable additions here and there by a later hand), as certainly as I do in the fact that the four Gospels were written by the men whose names they bear, I am shut up to the conclusion, that either the numbers in Exod. xii. 40 have become altered in the transcription throughout so many ages, or else that *Moses did not intend the verse to be taken in the sense given in the Revised English Version*, which definitely states (what without egregious absurdity he could never have meant to say), that the sojourn in Egypt was of four hundred and thirty years' duration.

Is there, then, any mistake about the numbers? There can be none; because, *1st*, All MSS. and all versions agree in the exact number; and, *2nd*, Paul gives that precise number of years as marking the interval between the covenant with Abraham and the giving of the law; and there can be no doubt that he got the figures from this very text.

The only alternative, then, is to allow that the passage is susceptible of, and was meant to have, a different meaning from that now claimed by some to be the "only admissible" rendering. This, I think, is implied in the very next verse, which goes on to say, "And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from Egypt." As, therefore, the "selfsame day," or more generally, the "exact time," must have reference to God's faithful performance of some promise or engagement, it can only refer to the promise to Abraham, that in four centuries, or life-times, or after four hundred years, his seed, delivered from bondage, should return to the land of promise. To this period Stephen refers as the "drawing nigh of the time of the promise which God had sworn unto Abraham;" at the approach of which auspicious season Moses was born. Moses, then, was BORN WITHIN THE PERIOD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED YEARS; and there is the best of all reasons to believe that it is to the same period, more definitely stated as four hundred and thirty years, that Moses himself refers as the exact time at which God brought the people out of bondage, and put them *en route* for the land he had sworn unto their fathers to give them. If so, then it is doubly impossible that in the immediately preceding verse he could mean to assert that the whole period of four hundred and thirty years was spent in Egypt.

That the Septuagint fathers so understood it is seen in their translation of the passage. As they had no way of putting in italics the words they regarded as necessary to complete the sense, they cannot

be regarded in fairness as corrupting the text, any more than the Targum (or "translation") of Onkelos, in passages not a few. They render, "Now the dwelling of the children of Israel, which they dwelt in Egypt, AND IN THE LAND OF CANAAN, was four hundred and thirty years." They surely knew how long their fathers were in Egypt, and there can be no doubt of the fact that they inserted the words indicated in order to make the passage accord with *the known facts of the case*. Another expedient was adopted by King James' translators to accomplish the identical purpose; to-wit, that of rendering the passage thus, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, *who dwelt in Egypt*, was four hundred and thirty years." The revisers, *assuming that the known facts of the case were just the other way*, rendered, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, WHICH THEY SOJOURNED IN EGYPT, was four hundred and thirty years." This is what the advocates of the long term would call "the natural and proper rendering of the words." I propose to show that it is neither the one nor the other. Gesenius says that the word in question means "seat, dwelling"; and in this particular passage he makes it mean "time of abode." It can be proved, in spite of the authority of the great master, that this is not the natural and proper sense of the words either.

The word MOSHAV, rendered by the former "sojourning," and by the latter "dwelling," in the sense of "time of abode," occurs forty-four times in the Hebrew Bible, and in each case, except the one under consideration, it is rendered in the Old Version (and I believe in the Revised as well), as follows: "Dwelling," "dwelling-place," and "habitation," twenty-six times. Once, "a city to dwell in," but this is simply an English variation for "a city of habitation." Eight times it is rendered "seat" and "situation." Once, "assembly," or "consistory." Once it occurs in a passage rendered "for common use," "for the city, *for dwelling*, and for suburbs," where it can only mean "for dwellings." (Ezek. xlvi. 25.) Twice, "the sitting of his (Solomon's) servants"; of extremely difficult interpretation. It may mean their *seats*, or their *dwellings*, but it can hardly mean the act of sitting, about which there could be nothing extraordinary. Lange says it means "the civil officers who sat at Solomon's table," that is *sitters*. Once, "dwellers"; "all that dwelt in the house of Ziba." With the exception, then, of the last three cases, where the word is used in the concrete sense of "sitters," or "dwellers," it appears to have a purely local signification, to-wit, a "*sitting-place*," or "*dwelling-place*." To

assume, therefore, that the rendering "the dwelling which they dwelt," or "the sojourning which they sojourned," is the only natural and proper signification of the words, or the proper signification of them in any sense, is a wholly groundless assumption, without the shadow of a foundation, except in the accidental and misleading circumstance that "dwelling" may, in English, be either a noun or a participle, while MOSHAV is a noun only, and not a participle.

This passage, therefore, is a clear exception to all ordinary usage. The ordinary and proper sense of the word has no possible application here. "The dwelling-place of the children of Israel, which they dwelt," makes simple nonsense, and completely explodes the allegation that the rendering of the Revised Version, or that proposed by Gesenius, are the natural and ordinary sense of the words, and the only admissible rendering. The case is wholly an exceptional one, and we have to seek a meaning which MOSHAV never has in any other passage. What, then, shall it be?

MOSHAV is a verbal noun that means ordinarily "a dwelling-place," and not the act of dwelling; "a place of sojourn," and not the act of sojourning. Now it happens, curiously enough, that in verse 45, eight lines further down, Moses uses another verbal noun, a cognate of the word in question, to-wit, TOSHAV, as meaning a "foreigner," or "temporary resident," who, as such, was forbidden to eat of the passover. This word Gesenius defines, "an inhabitant," "a dweller, usually a sojourner, a stranger, living in another country, without the rights of citizenship."

Since, then, in this particular case we have to seek a wholly exceptional meaning to the word, what more natural than to suppose that Moses used the word MOSHAV to express the character and condition of a TOSHAV, whom he proceeds so soon to mention? As the word never means the act of dwelling, it seems quite as improbable that it should mean *the time of abode*; the more so as that would make Moses contradict himself and all the other teachings of Scripture in relation to this matter. The word by all its analogies seems to express a state or condition rather than an act; and if Moses had wanted to express the character and condition of a TOSHAV, it is very doubtful whether he could have found in Hebrew a fitter word to set forth that conception than MOSHAV.

It is to be observed, too, that the revisers have, in this one passage, given to the root form YASHAV a rendering never given to it elsewhere. The word occurs one thousand and fifty times in the Hebrew Bible,

and it is never rendered "sojourn" in the A. V. at all; nor is it ever so rendered, that I can find, by the revisers, in any other but this passage; and here it is evidently used to create a Hebraism for which Moses is not responsible, to-wit: "The sojourning which they sojourned." But if, on the other hand, MOSHAV is understood to indicate the character and condition of a TOSHAV, the passage would naturally read: "Now the sojourning life of the children of Israel who had dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years; and it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." This not only renders Moses consistent with himself (the first of all claims which a writer has on his translator) and with all other Scripture writers, but it obviates all necessity for the interpolation adopted by the seventy to solve the supposed difficulty, and brings the passage into harmony with the known facts of the case. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews may have had an eye to this very passage, understood in this very sense, when he speaks of Abraham and his children, Isaac and Jacob, as "dwelling as sojourners [the state and condition of TOSHAVIM] in the land of promise, as in a strange country." (Heb. xi. 9.)

Thus understood, Moses, instead of meaning to determine definitely the length of the Egyptian sojourn, as is claimed by the advocates of the long term, intended rather to cover the whole period during which Abraham and his seed had led the life of TOSHAVIM—the life of sojourners—without the rights and privileges of citizenship (whether as strangers in the land of promise, or as strangers in the land of Egypt), from the time of Abraham's vocation till they became a nation with a home and a citizenship of their own.

In the summer of 1887 I had the privilege of hearing Dr. William R. Harper make a grand exposition of the Ninetieth Psalm, which he contended that none but Moses himself could have written, in which he gave prominence to this very thought. "Lord, thou hast been our DWELLING-PLACE in all generations," he understood to be a pathetic reference which "the man of God" makes, in his old age, to the wandering, homeless life of himself, his people and all his fathers, from Abraham down to his own day. They had all alike led the life of TOSHAVIM; and in all that long period which Moses here asserts, if I understand him properly, to have been of four hundred and thirty years' duration, Jehovah had been their only and their safe abode.

The Spanish language, in virtue of its affinity with the Hebrew,

through the influence of the Arabic of the long Moorish domination, sheds light in a good many difficult passages of the Hebrew Bible, and, if I mistake not, this is one of them. In both, the relative ("que" in the one and "asher" in the other) refers indifferently to persons or things; while, as in all other languages, it must naturally refer to the nearest antecedent, unless special pains be taken to prevent it. The nearest antecedent in this case is "the children of Israel," rather than "the sojourning of the children of Israel." Why then should it not have this reference in Hebrew, when it can have no other in Spanish, if the words be translated just as they stand?

In English the case is not so apparent at first sight, owing to the fact that the same is not true of the relatives in common use, "who" and "which." But let us illustrate the point by the use of the less frequent relative "that," of which the same thing is true. A literal rendering of the passage would then read: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel *that had dwelt in Egypt*, was four hundred and thirty years;" which, with the substitution of "that" for "who," is just the common version of the passage; and I should like to be informed what there is to hinder it from being called a good, honest, faithful, and accurate version? In order to prove that it is not, and to displace it unceremoniously as unworthy even of a place in the margin, the revisers separate the relative from its nearer antecedent, and compel it to seek alliance with the more remote, by treating it as an objective case, and gratuitously supplying another nominative for the verb, thus: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, which [they] lived in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years." But as the English of this would be intolerable, they had to go yet a step further, and give to the verb a rendering it has in no other of the one thousand and fifty passages of the Bible in which it occurs—"the sojourning of the children of Israel which [they] sojourned in Egypt"—and then this is called the natural and proper rendering of the words! And all that is gained thereby, so far as I can see, is to make the passage contradict the uniform teaching of the Bible, in the Old and New Testaments alike, and force Moses to teach for historic truth and inspired verity that he was born of a woman nearly three hundred years old!

In conclusion, I would like, with becoming modesty, to inquire, if the sacred writer had intended to express just the sense of the Authorized Version, so ignominiously discarded by the Revised, how else could he have better done so than in the very terms of the Hebrew text?

H. B. PRATT.

Tlalpam, Fed. Dist., Mexico.