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PREFACE

For more than half a century modern Higher Criticism as expounded by the Graf-Wellhausen School has everywhere dominated the field of Biblical research, considering the whole of the Pentateuch as a late product and representing the Joseph and Exodus narratives, which deal with the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, as the work of authors who had very little knowledge of Egypt and matters Egyptian. The Assyro-Babylonian school has undoubtedly been very successful in shedding new light on many parts of the Bible and also on some chapters of Genesis. But far from solving the problems of composition and antiquity of the Pentateuch, it rather complicated them. Egyptology, too, failed to furnish a solution only because of the rise of the Graf-Wellhausen School some of the leading Egyptologists accepted its theories without having sufficient knowledge of Hebrew and the Bible to enable them to take any initiative in these questions. As they could not find more than occasional connexions between Hebrew and Egyptian, they simply took it for granted that Egyptology had very little to yield for the study of the Bible, and as to the Bible itself, Professor Adolf Erman went so far as to affirm that all "that the Old Testament had to say about Egypt could not be regarded with enough suspicion." Such a statement and others of like purport, coming as they did from Egyptologists of established authority, brought it about that students who might have perhaps undertaken to penetrate more deeply into a study of Hebrew-Egyptian relationships, were intimidated and deterred from approaching the matter; and on the other hand, Biblical critics could always refer to such statements as highly authoritative in support of their views on the late origin of the Pentateuch and the unreliable character of those parts which deal with Egypt. The endeavours of those few scholars who dared to go beyond the limits prescribed by the "official" view of representative Egyptologists were either ignored altogether or only condescendingly considered, the results of their research being contemptuously rejected as unscientific and even fantastic.

1. "Ägypten und äthisches Leben im Altertum," 1889, p. 5, and reaffirmed in the revised edition, by H. Rass, 1903, p. 5. Similarly Dr. Alan H. Gardiner said about the Exodus that "all the story of the Exodus ought to be regarded as no less mythological than the details of creation as recorded in Genesis", and that "at all events our first task must be to attempt to interpret these details on the supposition that they are a legend." *Études Champollion*, 1903, p. 205.
Now the whole problem of the Pentateuch is approached from the linguistic side. After having studied all the languages with which Hebrew had any relation, I came to the conclusion that Egyptian exerted considerable influence on the formation and development of Hebrew as a literary language.

The present book is only the first volume of a comprehensive work in which the results of my investigations are to be set forth. A great portion of the material was already available as early as 1913 when I was still in Berlin, but the continuation of the work had to suffer delay, chiefly owing to my call to Madrid in that year and to my appointment to a Chair of 
Medieval Hebrew Literature in Spain at that University. I thus had to devote myself for many years to quite a different field of research, and it was only when I retired from my Chair that I was able to devote myself exclusively to these studies and proceed with the publication of my materials.

My first attempt to make known the preliminary results of my work was in a lecture given in March 1921 to the British Academy, London, and subsequently in a series of three lectures at King's College, London, and at Christ Church, Oxford, in April and May of the same year.

In 1929 I was able to offer to the public the first volume of my work in German under the title Die Sprache des Pentateuch in ihren Beziehungen zum Ägyptischen, which contained, however, only a very small part of my material extending over the whole of the Pentateuch. Whilst I was engaged on the second volume, a number of scholars and Bible students in England and America repeatedly expressed a desire to have the German book translated into English. I therefore decided to postpone the publication of the second German volume and to put the first volume into English. But instead of giving a mere translation, I preferred to rewrite the whole book in order to adjust it in spirit and language to the taste and requirements of English readers. Some few errors have been eliminated, minor alterations suggested by reviewers and readers made, and the interpretation of a few additional passages from the Joseph and Exodus narratives included.

The volume contains two sections: the first deals with the Joseph and Exodus narratives, the second with the Genesis stories and a portion of the Patriarchal narratives. The examination of other parts of the Pentateuch, including the poetical portions, will follow in the second volume. From among the numerous subjects to be treated there, the following may be particularly mentioned: The Egyptian loan-words, metaphorical expressions, modes of speech and phrases of Egyptian colouring in the remaining parts of the Pentateuch; the ritual and judicial phraseology of the Pentateuch; the sacerdotal and sacrificial institutions and the terminology created for them; the names and attributes of God; the architectural work of the tabernacle and the craftsmanship of the holy vessels, with special regard to the technical terms used; finally also the grammatical, syntactical, and stylistic relations to Egyptian.

I refrain from furnishing an exhaustive introduction, as this would have to be extended over questions and subjects not contained in this volume, and many results would have to be anticipated. I therefore confine myself by way of introduction to a short outline of the main points regarding the origin and development of Hebrew as a literary language and to an exposition of the principles by which I have been guided in my investigations. But as each section is provided with prefatory and concluding remarks, and in most cases every chapter is furnished with a short introduction, adequate provision is made for the orientation of the reader.

In general I do not attach so much importance to the formulation of problems as to the actual treatment of the materials themselves. Readers will do well to keep this in mind, and they will realize that in most cases the results attained dispose of many a problem, rendering a discussion altogether superfluous.

I intentionally avoid entering into questions of Biblical criticism, as the chief object of my work is the solution of the linguistic problem of the Pentateuch and the establishment of the Hebrew-Egyptian relationship. Undoubtedly some hypotheses of Higher Criticism and textual emendations will of themselves have to disappear in face of the linguistic facts here propounded. For the rest, it must be left to Biblical critics to reconsider their position and to determine whether other hypotheses and views can still be upheld, and if so, how far. My own views regarding the composition of the Pentateuch and the problems of antiquity and unity I shall fully define after the whole material that I have in hand has been presented.

As the main object of this book is to deal with Hebrew-Egyptian relations from the linguistic aspect, many passages and allusions in the Joseph and Exodus narratives of a distinctively Egyptian colouring have been here excluded and reserved for later consideration. Any one who is more or less acquainted with all that has been published either as original research by Egyptologists or by way of compilation by Biblical scholars will realize that as a whole my book contains new material, and that words or phrases of Egyptian origin or colouring which have been previously dealt with by others, are not repeated here, unless they have to be shown to be derived from a different Egyptian origin or explained from another point of view. It
will also be seen that I did not follow the method generally adopted by Egyptologists, to construe Hebrew-Egyptian comparisons without having sufficient knowledge of Hebrew. As a matter of fact they succeeded in hitting the mark only in palatable and unmistakable cases, but in others, they conjectured relationships between words of similar sound which in reality have nothing in common, either in meaning or in origin. At the same time, words which are actually akin in both languages were overlooked, because their common etymological origin was not recognized. To this category, belong a great part of all Hebrew-Egyptian comparisons, and also those of a more recent date, contributed by A. Ember; though many of his suggestions are based on a sounder knowledge of Hebrew and evolved with a finer linguistic feeling than is revealed by the others.

The present volume being new to most English readers, I think it opportune to say a word about the reception accorded to the German edition, and the kind of criticism which it encountered.

The appearance of the German book caused a stir in scientific circles and also among Bible readers in general. Of the numerous articles and reviews which appeared in scientific periodicals and leading daily papers in many countries, mainly in Germany, by far the greater number were appreciative; others critical, but keeping within legitimate bounds of impartial criticism. Many scholars, among whom are prominent representatives of Old Testament science, Assyriology and Egyptology, commented, though with some reservations, very favourably on the scope, method, and results of the book. Some of them went even farther, and enthusiastically hailed it as a new orientation, opening new vistas of far-reaching consequence.

In acknowledging my indebtedness to them for many instructive suggestions and observations, it is somewhat painful to me to have to mention that a few reviewers, misled by narrow dogmatism, directed their attacks against the book in an abusive spirit, employing tactics not too commendable in scientific discussions. I do not propose to deal with these critics, nor with those who, while ignoring the main problems, indulged in long disquisitions on points of minor importance, and who in suggesting new interpretations and etymologies instead of those proposed by me, only revealed a positive, though perhaps unconscious ignorance of the origin and semanticological development of the words under discussion. Still less am I inclined to pay any attention to certain attacks which were not calculated
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to serve a scientific purpose, but designed either to support accepted, but now untenable, theories, or to uphold statements merely based on self-assumed infallibility, but which in view of the evidence brought forward in my book prove to be utterly without substance.

There are however, a few cases of criticism which make it incumbent upon me to expose them here. Some of my critics, for lack of better arguments, endeavoured to minimize the scientific standard of my work by representing it as being ‘apologetic’. This is indeed a misrepresentation of the true character and aim of the book, and simply amounts to a negation of scientific objectivity altogether. Unbiased readers and students will very soon find out for themselves that my book has nothing in it of what is called ‘apologetics’.

Another method of criticism which cannot be passed over in silence is the following: As every reader will realize at a glance, this volume deals only with a portion, hardly exceeding a sixth part, of the Pentateuch. I always emphasized, therefore, that the first volume only contains a small part of my materials which embrace the whole of the Pentateuch, and that consequently it can by no means be regarded as exhaustive. I further affirmed on several occasions that the ultimate exposition of my views on questions affecting the composition and antiquity of the whole of the Pentateuch should not be expected before the complete publication of my whole work. In spite of all this, a number of reviewers, disregarding these declarations, anticipated many conclusions and refuted them as if they were mine!

Special mention must be made also of the attitude taken up by some Egyptologists towards the German book. I particularly desire to point out that I owe a great part of my knowledge of Egyptian matters to the works of those Egyptologists who have most persistently adopted a sceptical standpoint with regard to a Hebrew-Egyptian relationship. Whilst I unreservedly acknowledge my indebtedness to them, I cannot refrain from expressing some disappointment at the quite incongruous fact, that strong opposition was forthcoming precisely from these Egyptologists, as they ought to have been the first to hail the important results derived from their works. That such an attitude should have been taken up by these scholars, can, I regret to say, only be explained by the fact that the abundant evidence brought forward in my book thoroughly and definitely disproved views which they had maintained with an almost ‘Pharaonic’ stubbornness during the past forty years, affirming again and again that there was very little to be obtained from Egypt and Egyptian for the elucidation of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, none of them went
so far in his criticism as did W. Spiegelberg in his article, Ägyptologische Be merkungen, in the Zeitschrift für Semitistik, vol. vii, pp. 115–21. In my rejoinder [Erwiderung] to his comments on my book, I have shown the true nature of his challenge, and I recommend the perusal of his article together with my reply to every student who may be interested to know what that spokesman of Egyptology had to say in the field which he considered as his own scientific reserve. But all that I said there about Spiegelberg applies also to some criticism directed by a few other Egyptologists who were either admittedly inspired by his article, or by a miraculous coincidence, not uncommon among critics of minor originality, only ‘accidentally’ repeated his arguments and almost the identical examples selected by him from my work.

I would have preferred not to make any allusion to his article, but feel compelled to do so, because his judgement on the merits of the Egyptian part of my book is still quoted by some Old Testament scholars and Egyptologists as valid and authoritative in spite of the most devastating refutations of his arguments and ‘proofs’ in my rejoinder. One might have thought indeed that anyone who has a sufficient training in philological methods and a fair understanding for cultural and linguistic relations would easily realize the striking similarity between Hebrew and Egyptian in the parallels adduced from both languages.

Now a few remarks about some details of a more technical nature. For the transcription of the Egyptian texts, the customary transliteration has been adopted (see p. xxvi), only substituting $y$ for $j$ as is usual among English Egyptologists. The reproduction of Egyptian words and texts in hieroglyphics, originally contemplated, had to be abandoned owing to the considerable expense involved. But in order to spare Egyptologists the arduous examination of the texts some of which are not everywhere available, and to facilitate checking the comparisons suggested and the interpretation propounded, a hieroglyphic appendix is attached, containing a selection of the most important Egyptian references (pp. 1–14*), followed by a list of the Hebrew words borrowed from Egyptian (p. 14* f) and of proper names discussed and explained by a play on words of similar sound (pp. 15* f). This appears all the more desirable inasmuch as in many cases the significance of an Egyptian word cannot be rightly inferred from the transcription, but only from the hieroglyphic sign itself.

As some of my critics endeavoured to lay too much stress on minute questions of Egyptian spelling and transcription, attributing to them an importance which they could never have, it is necessary to point out against these spelling-hunters, that such questions are purely a concern of Egyptian grammar, and have no bearing whatever on Hebrew-Egyptian relationship. Besides, it is very well known among Egyptologists themselves that the usual manner of transcription is only conventional, and as I have shown in my Erwiderung, Egyptologists themselves do not agree, in more than one case, as to the mode of transcribing certain words. Readers should therefore not be misled into believing that the methods or the results of my investigations are in any way affected by objections of this kind which are only bound to divert attention from much more important questions.

In order to facilitate the use of the book, I deemed it useful to supply this volume itself with indexes of all the Bible passages, of the Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and Akkadian words, phrases, and proper names, and not to wait until the completion of the whole work. In addition, a table of phonetic equivalents in Egyptian and Hebrew, a short survey of the periods of the Egyptian language and Egyptian history, and also a list of most of the books used, are given.

Only with regard to the Egyptian and Coptic words, it seemed to me more convenient to reserve the indexes to be appended to the complete work. I contemplate giving then a more elaborate index of the Egyptian words and phrases by which the Hebrew is explained and also of expressions which themselves gain in clarity through their comparison with the Hebrew. This will be followed by a list of those Coptic words which show more or less the same pronunciation as preserved in the Hebrew words borrowed from Egyptian (see pp. 50 n. 1, 98 n. 1, 185, 260 n. 2). The study of Coptic words from this point of view is not only of very great importance for Hebrew, but also for estimating the value of the Coptic vocalization as indication for the pronunciation of Egyptian, especially from the New Kingdom onwards.

Although the meaning of almost every Egyptian word or phrase is substantiated by one or more examples from Egyptian texts, reference is made to Erman-Grapow’s Ägyptisches Handwörterbuch, 1921, in some instances also to the larger Wörterbuch der Ägyptischen Sprache, 1926–28, in so far as it was already available during the publication of this book. As for the Coptic words, Spiegelberg’s Koptisches Handwörterbuch, 1921, has been used because it is the only one handy and comprehensive, though not always reliable. In many cases mention is made also of the different forms of Coptic words in various dialects (see p. xxv), especially in cases where the one or the other form more or less agrees with the vocalization of the Hebrew words borrowed from the Egyptian.
The hieroglyphic appendix is the same as that used in the German book after it had been slightly altered and adjusted to the English edition.

One word more as to the elaboration and substantiation of statements or suggestions made in connexion with Hebrew or Egyptian matters. The many-sided nature and diversity of my research work made it necessary to enter at some length into considerations which might appear superfluous to experts in the various fields. Thus to an Egyptologist the explanation and substantiation of the Egyptian may in some cases appear unnecessarily elaborate; and similarly to the Biblical scholars in the case of the Hebrew. Nevertheless, I had to pay regard to various classes of students and readers, and thus many examples that would be redundant for Egyptologists will be welcomed by non-Egyptologists, and vice versa, the somewhat elaborate treatment of Biblical passages and subjects will be found useful by all those who are less familiar with Old Testament research.

Here I should like to acknowledge my indebtedness to Frau H. von Halle, collaborator in the Berlin Wörterbuch der Ägyptischen Sprache, for having assisted me in revising and checking the Egyptian references; to Mr. Maurice Myers, London, whose advice and suggestions have been very helpful to me whilst preparing and revising the English version, and to Professor John E. MacFadyen, Glasgow, for his kindness in reading the proofs.

In presenting this book to the English-speaking world, I hope that my readers will be guided in their judgement by that spirit of truth-seekings which I have endeavoured to follow in my Biblical investigations since I began, in my earliest youth, to study the Bible in the Land of the Bible.

A. S. YAHUDA

HAMPSTEAD, LONDON.

November, 1932.
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HIEROGLYPHIC APPENDIX 1*–10*

ABBREVIATIONS

The following index does not contain a general Bibliography of the works mentioned in the book, but only abbreviations of the most frequently quoted book titles, Periodicals, or text editions. As the quotations from Egyptian or Akkadian are mostly rendered by the Author independently of existing translations, the references to such translations are merely intended to enable also those who are neither Egyptologists nor Assyriologists to consult the texts quoted.

A. E. cf. Müller, A. E.

AJSL. = American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Chicago.


Amenemope = Das Weisheitsbuch des Amenemope aus dem Papyrus 10474 des British Museum hrsg. und erklärt von H. O. Lange, Kopenhagen 1925.

Amonhymnus Cairo = A. Mariette, P. de Boulaq, II, pl. 11–13.


Ani, or Papyrus Ani = Facsimile of the Papyrus of Ani in the British Museum (ed. P. Le Page Renouf), London 1890.

Annales = Annales du Service des Antiquités de l’Égypte.


AZ = Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde, 1853 ff.


BD = The Book of the Dead, Facsimiles of the Papyri of Hunefet, Anhai, Kerashar, and Netchenem, with supplementary text from the papyri. N. 1899, English translation by E. A. W. Budge, 2nd edition.)
ABBREVIATIONS


Brugsch, Oase = Reise nach der großen Oase El Kharga in der Libyschen Wüste, Leipzig 1878.


Burch, Altkn. = Max Burchardt, Die altköniglichen Fremdwörter und Eigen-

namen im Ägyptischen, Parts I-VI, Leipzig 1900-11.

Capart, Θῆβαι = J. Capart, Θῆβαι, la Gloire d’un grand passé, Brussels 1904.

Chabas, Maximes d’Ani = L’Égyptologie 1874-76.


Delitzsch, Wb. or HwB. = Fried. Delitzsch, Assyrisches Handwörterbuch, Leipzig 1886.


Edfu = J. Dümichen, Ägyptische Tempelschriften, vol. 1, Leipzig 1867.


Erman, Gramm., 3rd edition, 1911.

Erman, Gesch. d. Schiffbrüchigen = A. Erman, Die Geschichte der Schiffbrüchigen, in AJZ. 48 (1906) 1-26. See also Schiffb.


Erman, Wortforschung = A. Erman, Zur ägypt. Wortforschung, I-III, Sitzungs-


Gardiner, Mes = The inscription of Mes (Sethe’s Untersuchungen IV, 2), Leipzig 1925.


Götze, Ges. d. Wiss. 1859, pp. 173 ff., or: V. März, Textes relatifs au Mythe d’Horus, etc. pl. 12-19.


GGG = Göttingische geleherte Anzeigen.

Gilg(ame)h = W. Winckler, Keilinschriften, Textbuch zum A.T., 2nd edition (Leip-
zig 1902), p. 84 ff.


Harris = see Pap. Harris.

Himmelsküh = E. Naville, TSBA. iv. 1876, or: G. Lefebure, Les hypogées royaux de Thèbes (Mém. Miss. II, 14th part, Plates 17-20), Cairo 1886.

Hoffm. Theoph. Personennamen = Konrad Hoffmann, Die theophoren Personennamen des alten Ägyptens (Sethes Unters. VII. 1), Leipzig 1915.

Hungronsot-Stele = H. Brugsch, Sieben Jahre der Hungernot nach d. Wurtm.

Inscription = Transkription und Übersetzung des Papyrus Insinger von P. A. Boese, 1922.


Kairo = 28001-28086 = Pierre Lacau, Sarcofages antérieurs au Nouvel Empire. I. II. Cairo 1904-1906 (Cat. gén.).

KAT. = E. Schwander, Die Keilschrifttexte and the Alte Testament, 2nd ed. revised by Winckler and Zimmern.

KB. = E. Schwander, Keilschriftliche Bibliothek.

Köpfigelete = G. Ebers, Die Köpfigelete, ihre Bedeutung und Namen im Altsäg-


KWB. = W. Spiegelberg, Kopt. Handwörterbuch, Heidelberg, 1921.

Lacau, Textes rel. = Textes religieux, in Rec. de trav. 26 (1914) ff.


Lep. Toth = C. R. Lepsius, Das Totenbuch der Ägypter nach dem hierogly-

phischen Papyrus in Turin, Leipzig, 1842.

Liebenou(sie) = Pap. Hier. 


ABBREVIATIONS

Metternichstele = Waldemar Golenischeff, Die Metternichstele, Leipzig, 1877.
MK. = Middle Kingdom, 11-12 Dyn. from about 2000-1800 B.C.
Mythe d'Horus = Édouard Naville, Textes relatifs au mythe d'Horus, recueillis dans le temple d'Edfou, Genève-Bâle, 1870.
Nesi Amsu, see Aposhis.
NK. = New Kingdom, 18-21 Dyn. 1555-1045 B.C.
OO. = Old Kingdom, 3-6 Dyn. from circa 2600-2400 B.C.
OLZ = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.
Pap. Koller, see Anast. 1.
PERIODS OF THE EGYPTIAN LANGUAGE

1. Old Egyptian: (a) The language of the Pyramid texts.
   (b) The language of historical, legal, and other documents of the Old Kingdom.

2. Middle Egyptian: The 'classical' written language of the Middle Kingdom and of the XVIIIth Dynasty (until the time of Amenophis IV), used right on into the latest period in religious texts and official monuments.

3. New Egyptian: The written vernacular language of the New Kingdom, more especially after the XIXth Dynasty.

4. Demotic (= Dem): The written language of the Satric, Persian, and, particularly, of the Graeco-Roman periods.

5. Coptic (= Copt): The language of the Christian period, developed from the Egyptian of an earlier period, written in the Greek alphabet with some additional letters of its own.

The four principal dialects of Coptic are:
(a) Sahidic (Sa'idi) (= S.) Upper Egyptian.
(b) Akhmimic (= A.)
(c) Fayyumic (= F.) Middle Egyptian.
(d) Bohairic (= B.) Lower Egyptian.

DESIGNATIONS OF THE DIFFERENT EGYPTIAN SCRIPTS

1. Hieroglyphic, picture-writing in temples and necropolises, carved on stone or painted in colour.

2. Hieratic, the cursive writing in ink on papyrus, and sometimes on potsherds (ostraca); it was actually in use as early as the Middle Kingdom.

3. Demotic, the abbreviated cursive writing which developed from Hieratic; it appears already during the XXVth Dynasty, but comes into general use during the Graeco-Roman period.

PERIODS OF EGYPTIAN HISTORY

1. Old Kingdom, III-VI Dynasty, from 2686-2181 B.C.

2. Middle Kingdom, XI-XIII Dynasty, from 2040-1640 B.C.; after the XIII Dynasty, about 1790 B.C., begins the rule of the Hyksos, who were driven out of Egypt by Aahmose, king of Thebes, in 1580 B.C.

3. New Kingdom, XVIII-XXI Dynasty, from 1550-945 B.C.; the XVIII Dynasty begins with Amenophis I in 1550 and ends shortly after Amenophis IV, after 1380 B.C.; the XIX Dynasty attained the height of its power with Sethos I in 1350, the XX Dynasty with Rameses III in 1200 B.C.

4. The Satric period, opening with the XXV Dynasty, dates from just before the end of the eighth century B.C.

5. Later periods. In 525 B.C. Egypt was conquered by the Persians, in 332 B.C. by the Greeks, and in 30 B.C. by the Romans.

The period of the New Kingdom, particularly the time of the XVIII and XIX Dynasties, is the most important for us, because New Egyptian is chiefly concerned in our investigations into the linguistic relations of the Pentateuch to Egyptian.
### THE EGYPTIAN ALPHABET AND THE PHONETIC EQUIVALENTS IN HEBREW

Only such cases as can be adduced with certainty are given here. Rare or unique cases are indicated by (*). The order of the Hebrew equivalent letters is according to the frequency of their correspondence with Egyptian. The correspondence of some sounds, though etymologically different, such as Hebr. נ and Eg. d; Hebr. פ and Eg. b; or כ and Eg. k, etc., may be explained by the fact that the Egyptian sounds have become merged, e.g. d and 9; h and כ, and כ, &c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egyptian</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כ</td>
<td>כ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ו</td>
<td>ו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Egyptian, like most Semitic languages, survives only in consonantal writing, and the pronunciation is unknown to us, it is customary, when reading Egyptian texts, to insert an e-vowel after each consonant; thus, for example, we read *mnh.t* for md.t, *wht* for *bht*, *the thing, matter*; *mrtyt* for *mry.t*, *tear*, &c.; so, when final, it is pronounced like *u*, i.e. *a*; e.g. *shbhu* for *shba*, *swsw* for *swsw*.

---

### INTRODUCTION

During the many years in which I have been engaged in modern Biblical research, I have become more and more convinced that the literary, religious-historical, and especially linguistic problems of the Bible cannot be conclusively solved by archaeological and literary-historical methods only. These methods, it is true, have contributed very much to the elucidation of important questions; nevertheless, it is only on a basis of comparative linguistics—so far as this is feasible—that a final solution of such problems can be attained, since this provides the only sure ground on which extravagant hypotheses and far-fetched theories can be kept within reasonable bounds.

In all my Biblical studies I have had the following two facts continually in my mind:

1. During the two thousand five hundred years of their history with which we are fairly familiar, the people of Israel voluntarily or involuntarily led a wandering life; and indeed not as an uncivilized nomadic tribe, but as a people, seeking, creating, and transmitting spiritual and material culture did they wander from nation to nation, from land to land.

2. Through all the different periods of Jewish civilization, it was in the first place the language of the peoples among whom they dwelt that exerted the most intensive influence upon them. Although the Hebrews with their staunch conservatism preserved the Hebrew language throughout the centuries, in its original form and syntax, this language, even at times when only in literary and scholarly use, did not by any means cease to live in their midst but was continually enriched by the adoption of new elements through close contact with many other peoples and the most varied cultural surroundings. In the development of the Hebrew language, one can even follow the very route of Israel's wanderings during the last twenty-five centuries. In its expansion and enrichment, we can see reflected the fresh cultural values acquired in all periods. All the newly created conceptions, all the borrowed or imitated expressions, phrases and modes of speech, as well as the adopted, partly hebraized foreign words, are to be found embodied in the language and worked into its texture. Thus there are Aramaic, Assyro-Babylonian, Persian, Greek, Latin, and Arabic elements, finally even elements from modern languages in their most recent

---

5 For biblical references attention may be drawn to the note on p. 302.
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Babylonian period as the only possible time of origin for these portions of the Pentateuch, and in fact they are definitely regarded by them as products of the Babylonian exile.

My studies in this direction, however, have more and more convinced me that this later period cannot be taken into consideration for the origin of the Pentateuch, on the following grounds: such books of the Bible as Ezekiel, Daniel, and partly also Ezra and Nehemiah, which were admittedly composed during and immediately after the Exile, reveal in language and style such an unmistakable Babylonian influence that these newly entered foreign elements leap to the eye. And not only the language, but the conditions depicted, as well as many of the religious conceptions, make it so palpable that no doubt as to the intrinsic connexion with Babylonia can exist, any more than it can be doubted that these works can have originated in Babylonian surroundings and, as stated in the books themselves, during and immediately after the Babylonian Exile. On the other hand, however, in the first part of the Genesis narratives, where traces of an original connexion with Babylonian myths are unmistakable, Babylonian influence in the language is so minute as to make us wonder how it is possible for such stories, pointing so distinctly to Babylonia, and containing, inter alia, so ancient an Akkadian expression as #399 (Gen. 1, 2, 7, 11, 8, 2), to show so little linguistic relationship with the cognate Babylonian myths. Even in the Flood-story, in which Babylonian elements are so apparent, nay, even in the phrases which reveal an almost literal agreement with the Akkadian texts, the linguistic relationship is extremely meagre. Moreover, these parts of Genesis include so many elements totally alien to the Babylonian, not only in content but more especially in language, that the question of their origin forces itself upon us, and in particular as to whether the non-Babylonian elements were not later additions, so that the Akkadian elements could be regarded as mere reminiscences from an earlier period. All of which raises a host of new difficulties.

For all these reasons and others set forth in the Second Part (p. 105–118), I became more than ever convinced: first, that both the peculiar character of the Akkadian elements in the Pentateuch as well as the origin of the Akkadian sources point to a much earlier period than that of the Exile; secondly, that not even those portions of the Pentateuch which most strongly evince Akkadian influence, like the Flood-story, can be explained by a Babylonian environment alone, much less other portions of Genesis which reveal far slighter relationship with Babylonian; and thirdly, that the meagreness and paucity of course, the two latter books, like the Book of Esther, contain also many Persian elements. But this question does not enter into the sphere of our present considerations.

1 When Assyriologists speak of ‘Akkadian’ they mean both languages, the Assyrian and Babylonian together, whereas ‘Babylonian’ includes also Sumerian, which was alive before it was reduced to oblivion by Assyrians at the beginning of the second millennium B.C. Thus ’Akkadian’ is to be taken as a philological, ’Babylonian’ more as an ethnographical collective term. This is always to be borne in mind, especially when we discuss Akkadian elements taken from the Assyrian or Babylonian languages, and the Babylonian origin and sources from which certain portions or features of the Genesis stories and narratives are derived.
of the Akkadian elements and their isolated appearance in Genesis can only be explained as a receding to make room for new foreign elements that penetrated later, so that they must be regarded as a survival from the first Babylonian epoch, i.e. from the age of the patriarchs.

If this line of investigation brings us to closer grips with our thesis, we have still to solve the question whether among those new foreign elements superimposed upon the Babylonian, Egyptian elements may be discerned.

Before approaching this question, however, we must raise a number of other important points, namely: when and under what circumstances did the Canaanite dialect adopted by the Hebrews become a literary language? When and where are the first stages of this development perceptible and the literary beginnings to be placed? Under what possible cultural and literary conditions could this language achieve its individual character and that perfection revealed in the Pentateuch? And further, if the Pentateuch really represents the first product of this new literary language, and really originated at the time of the Exodus, before the conquest of Canaan, must the Hebrew language already at that time have attained this high degree of perfection? And if this be so, under what influence and in what environment could this have taken place?

If we consider how a cultured language develops and if we follow its growth, as far as possible, from its beginnings as a mere primitive spoken dialect to its full development as a literary language, we find that this generally proceeds in one of two ways:

1. The development may be autochthonous and genuine; it proceeds under specific local conditions, and attains perfection under the direct or indirect influence of more highly civilized neighbouring countries and languages simultaneously with the material and intellectual progress of the people concerned. In this case the process is slow and the language takes a long time to pass through all the phases of development to reach the point where it acquires its final literary form.

2. The development is determined more by individual than by local conditions, whether it occurs at home or in a foreign land, whether under the influence of one or more foreign peoples; it occurs when a highly gifted people, whose civilization and language are, however, on a low level, suddenly finds itself transferred to a higher cultural centre, when it rapidly raises itself from its own primitive state to a higher degree of culture and civilization. Far from allowing its individuality to be absorbed by the foreign people, it continues to live its own life in the new environment. It endeavours to adopt everything that was new or hitherto inaccessible to it. Hand in hand therewith it seeks to extend its own vernacular under the influence of the more highly developed foreign tongue in the new surroundings, enriching this vernacular by adopting new elements, rendered homogeneous by a process of close adaptation and thus perfecting it as a cultured, literary language. In this case the language rapidly passes through all the stages and intermediate steps of development, climbs one rung after another until it attains perfection and stabilization, becoming classical for all succeeding ages.

This process is still more rapidly accomplished if in the language under development a great epoch-making work is produced, which effects a violent revolution in intellectual, moral and political life, as may for instance be observed in the case of the Arabic language. Here the primitive dialect of the Kureish tribe in Mecca, which was extremely poor in intellectual and cultural values, rapidly rose to an infinitely higher level through the intimacy of the founder of the Islamic religion with the more highly cultured Jewish and Christian circles in Medina; and in the extraordinarily short period of half a century, through association and co-operation with the conquered peoples under the domination of Islam, it became one of the richest, most comprehensive, and elastic languages in the world.

To return to Hebrew: while modern Biblical scholars unconditionally accept the identity of the Hebrew language with Canaanite, they are not quite explicit as to how they conceive the mode of development of Hebrew and the conditions under which it completed its growth into a literary language; they seem, however, tacitly to assume that this development was initiated and completed among the Hebrews themselves in their own land, and thus followed the first of the two processes outlined above. That anything like a literary language or literary activity existed before the complete conquest of Canaan by the Hebrews is regarded by the modern Bible critics as out of the question, chiefly because this would not accord with their views of the religious evolution in Israel. Thus everything leads them to a conclusion diametrically opposed to every Biblical statement about the composition of any part of the Pentateuch, and to rank it on linguistic and literary-historical grounds, as quite a late product.

We do not propose to enter here upon a discussion of the worth and practicability of this method, for it would mean merely repeating all the arguments and counter-arguments which for decades have been raised by supporters and opponents of the hypothesis advanced by Bible critics.
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We prefer to confine ourselves to purely linguistic considerations and to follow the course already indicated. There is, on the one hand, not the slightest ground for assuming that the Hebrew language only began its development after the conquest of Canaan, when Israel was already settled in the country; on the other hand, a discussion as to whether previously, say among the Canaanites themselves, a language of a literary status was already in existence, is rendered superfluous by the fact that the princes ruling in Canaan in the fourteenth century B.C. used, in their correspondence with the king of Egypt, not the Canaanite, but the Akkadian language. We have, therefore, every reason for inclining to the view that the language of the Hebrews followed the second line of development, and this from the very moment when Canaan was adopted by the forebears of Israel, so that it straightway began its evolution as a language peculiar to the Hebrew race alone, continuing completely divorced from the co-operation of any other indigenous people.

Assuming this to be the case, we have to revert to the following argument: if by comparison with the Egyptian it could be proved that Egyptian influence on Hebrew was so extensive that the development and perfection of this language can only be accounted for and explained by that influence, then it would be clear that it can only have happened in a common Hebrew-Egyptian environment; and as a close intimacy between Hebrews and Egyptians prevailed in no other period than that of Israel’s sojourn in Egypt, it is only in the Egyptian epoch of Israel that Hebrew would gradually have begun to develop into a literary language, until it reached the perfection which we encounter in the Pentateuch. Let us then turn towards Egypt.

As we are told in the Joseph and Exodus stories, the Hebrews spent a long time in Egypt (Ex. 12, 40) as a tribe apart (Ex. 1, 8 f. etc.), with their own manners and specific customs (Gen. 43, 32. Ex. 8, 23), with their own worship (Ex. 5, 17. 8, 21 f.), living in a separate area assigned to them in the Delta near the Asiatic border (Gen. 47, 6 and 11. Ex. 8, 18. 10, 23 etc.), with their own organization (Ex. 4, 20) as a self-contained entity in the midst of an Egyptian environment. From all these and similar passages it is clear that the Hebrews were regarded by the Egyptians as an alien people and were so treated, not merely in the first period of their immigration, when they were singularly favoured under Joseph, but at a far later date, when they formed an important and influential element (Ex. 1, 9), more especially during the period of their oppression and servitude. In

* The Hebrews were not the only foreign tribe to settle in the Delta. We know of other Asiatic tribes who lived in Egypt in the frontier district, and who were tolerated as foreign colonies by the Egyptians, cf. e.g. Records III, § 698.

this long period the Hebrews cannot possibly have escaped the influence of Egyptian culture and Egyptian life, but must, on the contrary, (Gen. 50, 2 f. and 11, Ex. 1, 16) in spite of their segregation, have adapted themselves from the very start to Egyptian conditions, conceptions, and customs. The dialect which they brought with them from their Canaanite home likewise in the course of this period could not but have absorbed Egyptian elements, and in adaptation to the Egyptian have continued to develop, to extend, and even to modify its original grammatical form and syntactical structure.

Any attempt to decide these questions, however, depends upon the following points: if it can be proved that all the features which in a general sense mark off a literary language from a primitive dialect, namely those constituents of the language which reflect a higher cultural level, and that the meanings of words which indicate a higher stage in linguistic development reveal the spirit and style of Egyptian, then it may be taken as conclusive that it was under the influence of Egyptian that Hebrew soared from a primitive Canaanite dialect into a literary language. Further, if this influence is found to be extensive and distinctly traceable in all matters dealt with in the Pentateuch, so that there can neither be a question of mere accident, nor—as still alleged by many Egyptologists—of a faint influence, reminiscent of a dim past long preceding the composition of the Pentateuch, it will be evident that the language of the Pentateuch can only have been formed in this Egyptian environment, and so prove that this can only have taken place during the period when Israel was in Egypt.

Now in a more special sense the dependence of one language upon another is chiefly revealed in the following phenomena: first in the adoption of loanwords; then in the coinage of new words and expressions, technical terms, idioms, turns of speech, metaphors, and phrases quite in the spirit of and even in literal accordance with the other language, in which case the characteristic of such new formations is that they are alien to the spirit of the adopting language, and to the conceptions and institutions of the people speaking it, but reflecting throughout the spirit of the other language and the conditions of the alien environment; finally, in the adoption of grammatical elements and adaption to some syntactical rules of the alien language, so that even in structure and style there is a close assimilation in many respects.

The purpose of the present work is to show that all this is actually the case in the relation of Hebrew to Egyptian in the widest measure. Our method of procedure will be on the following lines: in the first place Egyptian influence will be demonstrated in a particularly characteristic portion of the Pentateuch. As in our case, however, the application of our
environment theory can only be valid if the Egyptian influence is vividly revealed in that portion of the Pentateuch which tells of the life of the Hebrews among the Egyptians, we begin with the Joseph and Exodus narratives. We designate this portion 'The Egyptian Epoch in the Pentateuch' as this best denotes the relation of its content to the Egyptian period and environment. In the course of our demonstration it will be proved by numerous examples from language and subject-matter that the Egyptian environment is most strikingly reflected in the Joseph and Exodus narratives not merely in single words, expressions, and idioms, but in the use of whole sentences, formulae, standing phrases, stylistic forms, and so forth. From the Joseph and Exodus narratives we shall proceed to deal with other portions of the Pentateuch in separate sections. The choice of these portions is determined by the period to which they are assigned according to the indications of the Pentateuch, in order to illustrate, in consonance with our environment theory, how much each is a faithful reflection of that period and the respective linguistic environment.

We first turn to that portion of the Pentateuch which tells of primeval time and of the events stated to have occurred before Israel's sojourn in Egypt. This portion comprises the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives dealt with in a section which we designate as the 'Pre-Egyptian Epoch in the Pentateuch'. Pursuing our method, we here, too, first investigate the elements originating from the Babylonian environment, discuss the linguistic relations to Akkadian, and then attempt to examine the origin and nature of the other elements alien to Babylonian. It will be shown that in the most important of these stories there are, beside Akkadian, also abundant Egyptian elements; that here, too, Egyptian loanwords occur, as well as idioms and phrases considered by Biblical scholars as typical of this portion of the Pentateuch, but which can only

It may be mentioned that Ed. Naville has discerned a much more marked influence of the Egyptian language in the Pentateuch, mainly in this part, than have previous Egyptologists. As, however, he was unable to imagine that at the time of the Exodus there could have been a literary Hebrew language, he took refuge in the strange hypothesis that the Pentateuch, like the Tell-el-Amarna Tablets of the fourteenth century B.C., was first composed in the Akkadian language and in cuneiform writing by Moses, and then after many centuries was translated by Ezra into Hebrew. Cf. Archaeology of the Old Testament: Was the Old Testament written in Hebrew? London, 1913 and The Text of the Old Testament (Schweich Lectures, viii, 1913). He is followed in the same direction by M. G. Kyle in his book Moses and the Monuments, 1920. Although he does not go much further than Naville, he emphasizes the strong Egyptian influence, adding a number of philological and archaeological parallels. On another occasion we shall deal more fully with the contributions made by earlier and more recent Egyptologists towards the elucidation of Hebrew-Egyptian relationships.

be explained from Egyptian; finally that there are other highly significant Egyptian influences on the composition, style, and mode of narration, and on many conceptions concerning the Creation, Paradise, the Flood, and even the Tower of Babel.

In this volume we chiefly confine ourselves to a proof of the relations to Egyptian of the two portions above mentioned, and reserve for the second volume a discussion of the remaining portions of the Pentateuch and a complete delineation of the process by which Hebrew was perfected as a literary language within the chronological and geographical limits stated in the Pentateuch itself. We nevertheless wish to make it clear at once that also in the remaining portions of the Pentateuch Egyptian elements are traceable to the same extent and with the same frequency, but that to these elements others reflecting a quite different environment are added. By a careful sifting and sorting of the linguistic peculiarities in many portions of Numbers, and especially of Deuteronomy—which, according to indications there given, were compiled during the wanderings in the Sinai peninsula, in the desert, and finally in the 'Arabah, close to the Jordan—we meet with many words and expressions which must have been taken from the peoples and tribes with whom the Israelites came into contact in those areas. This is evident since, on the one hand, these elements are peculiar to these portions, not occurring anywhere else in the Pentateuch, nor in later Biblical writings, and since, on the other hand, they are proper to the Bedouin dialects spoken in those neighbourhoods. That such linguistic elements, still alive among the Bedouin tribes, could go so far back as the time of the wanderings of Israel in the desert, is to be explained by the stability of customs and conditions of life among the desert inhabitants which have remained unchanged for thousands of years. The very fact that these elements comprise words and expressions which, on the one hand, occur in the Pentateuch and, on the other, are peculiar to the language of the Bedouin tribes of the Sinai Peninsula and Trans-Jordania, is in itself a strong indication both of their great antiquity and of their direct relationship.

This observation may suffice for the present. Let us now pass on and sum up in a general way the results of our investigations, so far as the evidence already presented in this book allows:

(i) The patriarchs took with them from Babylonia to Canaan an Aramaic dialect strongly sprinkled with Akkadian elements. This influenced the Canaanite dialect which they then adopted, inasmuch as reminiscences of Babylonian myths and Akkadian expressions, reflecting Babylonian conditions, passed into the Canaanite. This was the time
when the Canaanite dialect, through its assimilation by the Patriarchs to their Aramaic language, which, under the influence of the cultured tongues of Mesopotamia, had itself reached a higher stage of development, began to rise above the level of primitive expression. This was the very moment when Hebrews and Canaanites went their own ways, and when out of the Canaanite a separate dialect began to develop among the Hebrews.\footnote{In Deut. 26, 5 there is a distinct allusion to the Aramaic speech of the first forefathers before they settled in Canaan; Gen. 31, 47 marks the period when Canaanites had already been adopted by the first families of the patriarchs, whereas their relatives who remained in Aram still clung to Aramaic. Cf. also Yahuda, Die biblischen Rassen in ihren Beziehungen zur spr. Philologie, 1905, p. 15 f.; id., Uber בָּנָי וּבָּנָיו and בָּנָי יִשְׂרָאֵל im Alten Testament, in Z. f. Assyriol., 1902, p. 259 f.}

(2) This language, already modified and developed beyond primitive Canaanite, was retained by the Hebrews in Egypt, and, under the influence of the Egyptian language, was expanded, enriched, and embellished in sufficient degree to create the necessary conditions under which the literary language, which we call the language of the Pentateuch, was matured and brought to perfection.\footnote{We use Pentateuch as a whole, without regard to passages or occasional glosses which palpably are additions not belonging to the original composition. We also provisionally speak of the author or narrator of the Pentateuch, as it is only after the whole of our material is published that we shall explain with more precision our own position with regard to these questions.}

We will draw no further conclusions before the abundant material reserved for a subsequent volume is published. Here it may be merely observed that we attach special importance to the presence of ancient Akkadian elements in the first portion of Genesis, as well as to the emergence of specific non-Egyptian elements in the later portions of the Pentateuch, especially in Deuteronomy, of which mention has already been made. For this permits us to fix the earliest and the latest points between which the language of the Pentateuch was evolved, viz. (1) when the primitive Canaanite dialect adopted by the Patriarchs entered upon the process of its development, retaining some Aramaic-Akkadian elements, and (2) when, as a fully developed literary language under Egyptian influence, it acquired final perfection through new elements from the desert and 'Arabic tribes in the concluding portions of the Pentateuch.

From what has already been said, it will be seen that in the main we regard our task as essentially linguistic, and that our attention is principally directed to the relations with Egyptian. We will therefore attempt to deduce from the linguistic material of the Pentateuch those criteria which may help us to the discovery and differentiation of the foreign elements. We shall examine in the first place the expressions and phrases which are to be encountered in no other Semitic language, but occur alike in the Pentateuch and in Egyptian, chiefly those words and phrases which are only to be found in the Pentateuch, very rarely also elsewhere in the Bible, and which are of Egyptian origin; then we shall discuss other Hebrew coinages which are to be explained from Egyptian phraseology. In all these cases the proof of Egyptian origin will also help us to fix the period of the earliest use of a particular word or phrase and thus establish to a certain degree the chronological sequence in the Biblical scriptures.

From the course of our investigations it will further be seen that we do not, as still happens in the study of Hebrew-Egyptian relations, simply take isolated words or sporadically appearing single expressions for haphazard comparison, but that we systematically build up a complete structure, employing an overwhelmingly rich material of elements which support and complement one another, as well as elucidate and confirm our conception of the relations between Hebrew and Egyptian. In addition to this, it will be our object to prove that almost all the parallels adduced by us imply not merely casual coincidences or vague similarities, but that by their multitude they establish a real inner relationship and in many cases even reveal the sources from which the materials embodied in the Pentateuch are derived.

We abstain from all speculation. We attempt to group the facts which emerge from our comprehensive investigations, and thus exhibit the Hebrew of the Pentateuch as a living organism of language and thought. We also hope to be able to show that in this new organism the foreign material adopted from the highly developed Egyptian language was moulded and transformed in its own Hebrew spirit with a wealth and power of expression, elasticity, strength, and dignity, which bear an entirely individual stamp. Everything that Hebrew adopted or imitated from the Egyptian in the way of words or phrases, as well as what it owes to Egyptian in grammar, syntax, and style, invest this language with a quite unique character differentiating it in many respects from all other Semitic literary languages. With it begins the whole of Hebrew literature.

Although the limits of our researches are thus fixed, it will nevertheless be necessary in many instances to venture beyond purely philological considerations and include also discussions of non-linguistic materials in our investigation, especially in cases where this is necessary for the proper elucidation of linguistic problems. Such digressions may enable us in many cases to discover the meaning and origin of certain ideas and conceptions, or to reveal the technique of various crafts and even establish the derivation of their terminology. It is clear that a literary language,
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Unlike a mere spoken dialect, must reflect the entire culture and intellectual equipment of those who write it, and of those for whom it is written. We propose, therefore, to go still a step further, and through the investigation of the language, enter into the discussion of questions connected with the spiritual and material life described in the Pentateuch in conjunction with the Egyptian world of thought, such as religious conceptions and institutions, ritual prescriptions, laws and injunctions, manners and customs, crafts and professions, and similar questions of importance. Incidentally we shall also consider whether the issue of certain injunctions and laws was not actuated by the spirit of deliberate opposition to Egyptian ideas and customs; and on the other hand whether certain Egyptian practices and usages, perhaps even some religious and ritual conceptions, too deeply rooted to be removed, were not taken over and invested with a new meaning in order to bring them into harmony with the ideas and forms of the new religion.

With this work the foundation is laid of a new conception of the Pentateuch, of Biblical antiquity, and, in large measure also, of the origin and development of the religion of Israel with all its consequences. This conception may not be readily accepted. But the path here indicated will eventually be followed, even if it takes a longer time than could be anticipated. The reader cannot fail to realize that by the investigation of Hebrew in the light of Egyptian, entirely new vistas are opened up; that much which hitherto has remained obscure, now becomes fully clear, and that much that hitherto has been thought to be plain and simple, appears now in an entirely new light. The time may therefore not be far distant when Biblical scholars will abandon the scepticism due to certain Egyptologists with regard to Hebrew-Egyptian relations, and absolutely turn towards Egypt, so that side by side with the already explored Assyro-Babylonian ground, the hitherto neglected field of Egyptology may be fully utilized for Biblical research.

For many years unbiased Egyptologists and Hebraists expressed the desire that scholars equipped with adequate knowledge of Egyptian and Hebrew should undertake a penetrating investigation of both languages and cultures in order to find out to what extent such relationship could be established. Here a start is made; the way is laid open to be followed.

FIRST PART

THE EGYPTIAN EPOCH IN THE PENTATEUCH: THE JOSEPH AND EXODUS NARRATIVES
PRELIMINARY REMARKS

HOW THE EGYPTIAN ENVIRONMENT IS REFLECTED.
THE INFLUENCE OF EGYPTIAN IN THE JOSEPH AND
EXODUS NARRATIVES

It is obvious that those parts of the Pentateuch in which Israel is shown to
have been in direct contact with Egypt—like the Joseph and Exodus narra-
tives—should yield the richest material for the elucidation of the relations
between Hebrew and Egyptian. They must reflect most clearly the spirit
of the Egyptian environment and of Egyptian civilization, and consequently
display most visible traces of Egyptian influence on the language. This is
indeed the case, as in these narratives the sojourn of the Hebrews and their
experiences in Egypt are described, and incidentally a great deal of Egyptian
life is illustrated with a wealth of detail which could only have been derived
from thorough knowledge and exact observation at close quarters. As a
matter of fact none of the Biblical narratives which deal with the relations of
the Hebrews to foreign peoples have absorbed so much of the language and
life of the foreign environment as the Joseph and Exodus narratives have with
regard to the language and life of Egypt. From the very beginning, when
Joseph appears in Egypt (Gen. 39), down to the end of the Exodus story
leading up to the song of Moses at the Red Sea (Ex. 15), we get—as we shall
have ample occasion to show—a vivid picture of the manners, customs and
usages of the Egyptians in all domains of life and thought, set out in
a language which has likewise thoroughly absorbed the spirit of Egyptian
both in speech and style. Hence it comes about that this part of the
Pentateuch provides the model for both the manner and copiousness in
which the influence of the Egyptian language and mind was exercised, and
furnishes us further with a standard for the investigation of that influence
in other parts of the Pentateuch.

No sooner does he start telling the story of Joseph, than the narrator
plunges deeply into Egyptian life. He approaches his audience or readers
not as one conveying something foreign, something strange, almost unknown,
coming from a remote country, but he straightway assumes as a matter of

\footnote{The Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49) and the Song at the Red Sea are not included here,
solely for the reason that they are to be later subjected to a full examination, together with
other poetical passages of the Pentateuch.}
course a complete acquaintance with land and people. Manners and customs are mentioned by him which indicate, nay pre-suppose, a thorough familiarity with the structure and manifestations of Egyptian life. Many individual features of social, family, and court life are just touched upon by him that are passed over by the reader as devoid of special significance but which, on closer study of actual ancient Egyptian conditions, are found to be intentional allusions to common, very popular occurrences in connexion with certain ceremonies or important social and state institutions. From the brevity and casual nature of these allusions it may be clearly inferred that they could be understood in their full significance only by those who either knew them from first-hand observation or had themselves at some time participated in them.  

This surprising acquaintance, this most intimate familiarity, with Egyptian life is also apparent to the fullest extent both in the language and modes of expression employed. A mere superficial examination of the narratives dealing with Egypt reveals a whole series of non-Semitic words such as מָנָה Genesis 41, 18; נַפְלָה Genesis 41, 1–3 and et al.; בָּאָב Genesis 30, 17; יָדָא Numbers 14, 15; פַּרְשִׁיתָה Genesis 41, 45; בָּיָה Numbers 15, 11, which have long since been recognized as Egyptian (cf. Ges.-Buhl, ad loc.). But there are other words which occur, like מַעֲבָד Numbers 41, 45; פַּרְשִׁיתָה Genesis 43, 16; יָדָא Genesis 43, 16; אֶתְנָה Genesis 41, 8; בָּיָה Genesis 43, 16; et al., and which, as we shall show, were also taken from the Egyptian, although they look like Semitic words and indeed are regarded as such by most commentators. Nevertheless, these borrowings do not cover everything: they are merely external marks, sign-posts, and hints which indicate the direction in which the influence of the Egyptian language made itself felt upon the Hebrew. In order fully to appreciate the inner relationship between the linguistic usages of Hebrew and Egyptian, it is not sufficient to make a mere comparison of words or to prove the common origin of certain words in both languages. We have to penetrate very deeply into the psychology of the Egyptian language, and into the very fibres of its structure, if we wish to discern the true degree to which Hebrew was influenced.

It is only then that it will be possible to detect, in close connexion with

---

1 An excellent example hereof is provided by the laconic references to the honours bestowed on Joseph on his installation in office and the ceremonies performed on this occasion, as will be shown later on. Here attention may be drawn only to the ceremony of the conferring of the ‘Gold of Praise’ (Numbers 25:2), a description of which in Keinan-Banek occupies more than half a page (p. 134), whereas in Genesis 41, 45 it is dismissed merely with the words: ‘and he (Pharaoh) put a gold chain about his neck’ (cf. below, p. 22 f.).
CHAPTER I

POLISHED PHRASES, COURT FORMULAE, AND EXPRESSIONS USED IN EGYPTIAN CEREMONIAL AND OFFICIAL SPEECH

In the Joseph and Exodus narratives there are expressions and turns of speech, which are so unusual and appear so foreign that either their meaning is presumed merely from the context, as is usual in such cases, or they are taken by more modern interpreters as corruptions or mutilations. But as a matter of fact we have here to do with genuine Hebrew mingles in adaptation to Egyptian linguistic usage, formed upon the model of set formulae and expressions used in Egyptian court and official parlance as customary, or even prescribed, in Egyptian hierarchic circles, especially in intercourse with exalted personages.

In the description of the conversation between Pharaoh and Joseph we are given a correct picture of the polished manner in which official and high-class Egyptians carried on their intercourse. Both in form and in speech the narrator invests Joseph with the character of a ready courtier who unerringly commands all the niceties of palace phraseology. All the idioms and expressions used are permeated by the spirit of the Egyptian language, and the whole conversation of king and legian bears a thoroughly Egyptian stamp.

Even where Joseph speaks to his brethren, who as shepherds and 'Asiatics' were regarded by the Egyptians as 'barbarians', his words and expressions are cast in the superior tone of an Egyptian of high breeding, and the narrator very cleverly depicts how skillfully Joseph played the role of a genuine Egyptian before he revealed himself to his brethren. The same applies to his brothers and his father Jacob; they are, it is true, introduced to us as foreigners, but at the same time they are represented as notables who are thoroughly familiar with all the etiquette of the Egyptian upper classes.

Even ordinary phrases of deference such as are or might be in vogue at any court are here highly typical of Egyptian etiquette and only become clear in their right meaning in the light of Egyptian court-ceremonial and the Egyptian conception of good breeding.

It is of course the Hebrew narrator who displays here an extraordinarily fine instinct for the polished and elaborate court phraseology especially in passages where he employs metaphorical expressions or introduces Pharaoh and his Vizier Joseph in conversation. In highly finished but wonderfully simple Hebrew he reproduces all the expressions and phrases which one was accustomed to hear from the king of the 'two lands', from a vizier or a courtier, in his own Egyptian language. In short the whole intercourse between Joseph and Pharaoh so completely mirrors all we know of court institutions with all their elaborate details and nuances that the whole story could only have been told with such exact knowledge by one who was thoroughly familiar with all these things from first-hand observation.

We now enter into a fuller discussion of a series of such instances which are specially characteristic for our narratives.\(^1\)

1. פָּדָה ‘to kiss’ for ‘to feed’

Gen. 41, 40, Pharaoh says to Joseph: יָבֵא הָגָר, יָדַע הַגָּר This has always presented great difficulties to the commentators, as a verb פָּדָה is only known in the meaning of ‘to kiss’. By those who do not dismiss the whole passage as corrupt it is merely from the context that it is concluded to mean that the people should be ‘led’, ‘ruled’, or ‘administered’ by Joseph according to his decisions. On comparison with the Egyptian, however, פָּדָה proves to be a correct and thoroughly exact reproduction of what the narrator really meant to convey. Here an expression is rendered in Hebrew from a metaphorical one used in polished speech among the Egyptians. Instead of the ordinary colloquial expression סָמַך for ‘eating’, they spoke of ‘kissing’ (‘in) the food’. Thus סָמַך is used in Pyr. 1227 for eating a kind of pastry (רַבְּכָה) and Pyr. 1323 for ‘feeding on’ or ‘tasting’ a joint of beef.\(^2\)

\(^1\) As to this expression as translation of פָּדָה cf. below, p. 25 f.

\(^2\) For the explanation of Hebrew words and expressions from Egyptian we shall quote several examples even of such words and expressions in Egyptian, which are more or less common, so that their meaning and usage should be clear also to readers who are not familiar with Egyptian. In the choice of these examples, preference will be given as far as possible to such passages from Egyptian texts as incidentally also convey an insight into the life and thought of the Egyptians.

\(^3\) Although the original meaning of סָמַך is ‘to smell’ it is simply used for ‘kissing’. Thus e.g. סָמַך יָבֵא, ‘to kiss a woman’ (Schiffb. 133; יָבֵא is the customary expression for ‘kissing the earth before his majesty’) (מִבְּה יָבֵא). For the Egyptian the conception of kissing is connected with that of smelling, from which it may be derived in the last resort, as is actually the case with some animals and primitive men. Hence it is explained why סָמַך could be used both for ‘smelling’ and ‘kissing’ (Er.-Gr. 153; cf. also סָמַך, caus. 171), and also for ‘tasting’ and ‘feeding’. It may be noted that in figurative language סָמַך was also used of the water of the Nile when overflowing the fields, thus e.g. may the feet of the dead (סָמַך יָבֵא) be kissed by the holy water’, Pyr. 2065 and Grapow, Bildl. Abhdl., p. 121. For further details about the use of סָמַך see Ersterung, p. 13 f.
2. "A thing borne" נגזרת for "gift"; "bread" for "meal"

Gen. 43, 34, speaking of the meal given by Joseph to his brethren reads נגזרת ים יבש יבש, and 'gifts' were borne to them from before him. These gifts can only imply portions of food which he sent from his table to his brethren during the meal as is still generally customary in the Orient, where it is considered as a special honour for the guests. The word נגזרת is formed from נגזרת 'to bear, to carry' and thus means 'something borne, carried'. Here we have a formation analogous to the Egyptian expression ס phóng to carry, uplift, offer' (Er.-Gr. §57) specifically used of the offering of sacrifices, gifts or food, as for instance Vuk. iv. 209, 5 referring to the king 'who determines the amount of food ס רגל in this land', i.e. the food offerings for the gods. This expression originated from the custom of lifting up the offerings brought to the gods, as can be noted in many sacrificial scenes. This custom of elevating the meats or gifts was also

1 There was also a somewhat plebeian expression for 'eating' namely 'מ' to swallow' or מ for 'to bite' especially for snake-bites, which corresponds to the Coptic Ἀνά (B) to 'bite' (as translation of מ in Num. 21, 8). Also in Coptic it is vulgarly used for 'swallowing' (Spieg. W.B., p. 52); cf. Arabic מ for snake-bite, obviously a derivative from the Coptic.

1 The particular choice of נגזרת which in Hebrew is exclusively used for 'kissing' without any connexion with 'smelling' suggests that the Hebrew understood מ as in connexion with food only in the meaning of 'kissing'. Whether the same figurative sense is also implied in מ in Gen. 15, 2 is somewhat doubtful, as in this case it would at least read מ מ

1 Cf. Er.-Gr. §58; ה, the elevation of the gifts'; ה, 'elevation' means simply to bring offerings, cf. ה, to ד, ה (P. 61) 'to bring offerings of bread and beer'; cf. also loc. cit., Rec. 33, 3. 7. 'the bearer of the basket' (ם swelling) with the offerings for the Temple. Amenomop, 21, 5 (Erman, O.L.Z., 1924, 240) gives ה, 'was used simply in the meaning of 'gift', exactly as מ, e.g. in 2 Sam. 11, 8; 2 Chr. 29, 6 and ה מ מ, is nothing else but an old specific expression for the offerings of the Temple as so often in Egyptian מ, מ, and מ מ, מ מ, מ מ, 'to lift up', e.g. Harris, 28, 3; יי י, י, י מ מ to 'elevate their offerings' for the Temple. Obviously the chronicler took this expression from a very ancient source in which it was alternatively used with מ מ 'be heavens offering' ordained by Moses for the building of the Tabernacle, Ex. 25, 2 ff.

1 Cf. Erman, N firearm, 139, 140 ff. The same custom of 'elevating', 'lifting up' the offerings and portions of sacrifices occurs also in the Pentateuch, e.g. Ex. 29, 24 ff., as will be observed when presents were brought to the king, and such a gesture may also have been customary in the case of other high personages. Accordingly the vizier has meats 'carried' to his guests from 'before him' as a special mark of gracious princely favour. As a matter of fact this corresponded entirely to the custom observed in higher Egyptian circles whereby an exalted personage in the course of a meal handed his guests especially good portions (Lit., p. 58, n. 1). The narrator used the expression מ מ, the Egyptian prototype of which, מ מ, was deemed a choice and stately word.

Further, the word מ מ 'bread' for the meal provided by the Viceroy is also characteristic of Egyptian. Whereas the Semitic phrase in such a case would be 'bread and water' or 'bread and salt', not 'bread' alone, (the Egyptians used 'bread' simply and concisely for 'meals') generally (Erman-Ranke, 223, n. 2), not because bread was and is the chief food in Egypt, as elsewhere in the Orient, but because the Egyptians, more than any other people, had cultivated the art of bread-baking so extensively that in the sacrificial lists of the Harris Papyrus more than thirty sorts of bread and paty are mentioned, these including the choicest delicacies.

The remark that his brethren drank with Joseph at the meal and became drunk with him, which gives the repast the character of a common drinking-bout and seems to detract from the dignity of the whole occasion depicted so sedately, presents itself in the light of Egyptian customs as nothing undignified but on the contrary as a high distinction for the guests deemed worthy of carousing with the 'great lord'. For the Egyptian was fond of drinking and imbibed a great deal. The ordinary beer (ב) was a favourite drink among the populace; in better circles, however, there was a great variety of sweet and intoxicating beverages, and they liked to see wine flow 'like water'. The Egyptian spoke of drunkenness with great complacency and frequently referred figuratively to inebriety as the manifestation of the highest enjoyment.

Moreover, even among the offerings to the gods and the dead, intoxicating drinks were included, and the latter desired to receive so many libations as to make them drunk'. Thus, among others, in his very solemn prayer to Osiris the dead Rameses IV demanded (cf. Abydos-Stele, l. 16 = Records iv, § 470): 'and mayest thou give me food to repletion, and mayest thou give me drink to drunkenness' (ם י מ מ) י, y.

more closely discussed elsewhere; likewise other analogies in the use of מ מ and מ מ will be given.

1 That the expression מ מ was so felt is apparent from the A.V. euphemistic rendering, 'and were merry with him'.

1 Compare several such metaphors in Grapow, Bildl. Ausr., p. 145.
3. *רנה* 'to give' and *לְָּמַע* put for appointment to office.

The Infinitive used for command

The expression *לְָּמַע* 'to give upon, over' Gen. 41, 41, and also *רנה* 'to give to', in the sense of appointing to office corresponds to the Egyptian *rdy r* 'to give to' or *rady r* 'to put to' with object in the same sense, e.g. *rady r nmn* 'to give to king', i.e. 'to appoint as king'. Parallel with *לְָּמַע* is the use of *לְָּמַע* 'to put, place, set for placing in office', as אֶלֶָּפָא יָשָׁר* and He (God) set me as *father* [to Pharaoh]. For this, too, we have the Egyptian analogue *rady put, place, set* with the preposition *לְ* in the same sense of 'appointing to an office', e.g. Pyr. 1220 'thou settest him to thee as *fr i.e. prince*'; Papy. Berlin 3029, *AZ*, 72 (1874), p. 100, Pl. I, 6: *rady-f any r ssw l pm* 'he gave me to shepherd of this land'; *LD*. ii. 51, 1 right: *he was given to khb, i.e. appointed as ruler,* and directly of the elevation to vizier we find in Ka-Gemmi, Pap. Frise 1, l. 9 (= Lit. 67): 'Ka-Gemmi was appointed (rady r =given to) governor of the capital and vizier (jtyt).

As *rady* is often used for and also confused with *rady, both are alternative in the same way and sense as *לְָּמַע* and *לְָּמַע* (Ermann, *Worterbuch*, p. 914, examples are given; also 944).

The same is the case in Gen. 41, 43. Only here the infinitive form *לְָּמַע* strikes one as strange especially as it follows an imperfet and should as a rule read *לְָּמַע*. In 43, 16, the infinitive form follows an imperative and occurs frequently thus, especially for commands. Now from the Egyptian we learn that the use of infinitives in an imperative sense was a widespread peculiarity of the hierarchic official diction, especially at the beginning of solemn pronouncements, public proclamations, or reports concerning royal feasts of arms. Thus the well-known Israel-Stele of Merneptah begins with the words: 'To recount his victorious marches, to make known to all lands, to behold the glory of the triumphant deeds of the king', etc. in the sense of a command: Let be recounted, let be made known, let be seen, etc. *AZ*. 34, 14. Similarly the report of the incursion in Nubia (Maspero, *AZ*. 1888, p. 63) begins with imperative phrases, likewise the many hymns and speeches of kings and gods, and indeed with such frequency that the infinitival phrase may be regarded as absolutely typical at the beginning of poetic and solemn speech.  

1 The use of *fr* = נָעָל and *קָהָב* will be discussed elsewhere.


4. 'Make to stand' for 'let live'

Another meaning attaches to *לְָּמַע* Ex. 9, 16; there it says literally: 'In very deed for this cause have I made thee to stand (לְָּמַע) for to show thee my power'. That this is to be interpreted as 'let live' is obvious; and Spiegelberg, *AZ*. 34 (1896), p. 14 and n. 1. A quite usual expression for 'issuing of orders' is *rady m for n* 'to give in someone's presence'; it eventually became common in the official language simply for 'order'.

The Hebrew narrator reproduces here exactly the manner in which high Egyptian personages were wont to express themselves, and we have here a true transmission which can only date back to this time when feeling for Egyptian phraseology and intimate acquaintance with peculiarities of style and niceties of speech were still alive. The irregularity and harshness in our passage, of which all commentators are sensible, are thus cleared up, and it transpires that the sentence introduced with the infinitive 'and to set him over the whole land of Egypt' is to be taken in a jussive sense, namely as the very words to be shouted by the heralds at the proclamation of Joseph. The correct translation would thus read: 'And they called out לְָּמַע before him and that he was to set (by command of the king) over the whole land of Egypt'. Here we have another example of the extraordinary exactitude with which our text has been handed down. The use of such an infinitive appears still more distinctly in this imperative sense in 43, 16 where *לְָּמַע* לְָּמַע* 'to slaughter and to prepare' stands as a command. Here also it means that the house steward is to issue orders for the slaughtering and preparation of meats—thus: 'Take the men to the palace and let meat be slaughtered and prepared'. It should be explicitly noted that this idiom is also typical of the Egyptian ritual mode of diction. Almost all the headings in the sacred Books of the Dead, where certain prescriptions are set forth, occur in the infinitive form. Moreover it is the customary mode of command in decrees and ordinances.

The importance of this fact is specially to be emphasized because it supplies the right appreciation and correct understanding of the use of infinitive forms in the Pentateuch generally, notably in the fourth commandment לְָּמַע. Ex. 20, 8 and לְָּמַע. Deut. 5, 12, or Num. 15, 35, and many other passages. Here and elsewhere we have, as will be shown later, to do with a solemn turn of speech, which, of all the Semitic languages, occurs only in Hebrew, and, just as in Egyptian, is a characteristic form of diction used, as mentioned above, in legal official documents and in solemn address; and, just as in Egyptian, is set at the beginning of momentous pronouncements couched in high poetic strain.
but the origin of the word only becomes clear by reference to 'let stand, stand up', which is expanded to 'let stand, the standing' for 'lifetime, term of life, period of time'. 'let stand' is a rather poetical word, used also in benedictions and specially favoured for use in poetic and religious texts, e.g. Ps. 41.2: 'The lifetime (h'sh. = standing) of the deceased N. is eternity, his length of days is without end'. Bergm. Ewighk., p. 391, 76: 'let his lifetime (h'sh. = standing) be eternal, let his kingdom be everlasting'. Harris, 42, 6, in the prayer of Rameses III for his son (the heir to the throne) to Amun-Re: 'let his lifetime (h'sh. = standing) be as enduring as the solar star (my h'sh. = hr tp mwy mhyt [mwy]).' ibid. 44, 6: 'Praiseworthy' (Psalms) who keeps all men alive (h'sh. = nb) with the power of his soul (h'sh. = standing), long lifetime (h'sh. = standing), destiny and growth are under his control (h'sh. = standing). ibid. 79, 11: 'he (Amun) doubled his lifetime (h'sh. = standing) more than that of any other king.' From the Rameses period dates the benediction (Annales du Service, xiii (1913), p. 46): 'May thy soul attain the lifetime of Re (h'sh. = h'sh. = n pr r), i.e. as long as Re. The Demotic texts contain more frequent examples; thus in salutation of the king, e.g. Pap. Rylands, 9, 5, 20 (Persian period) and Kabun, 4, 24 and 5, 33: 'my (our) great lord, may he have the lifetime of the sun-god Re (h'sh. = standing)'. A similar frequent benedictory formula in Demotic letters is also: 'Re grant him long life (h'sh. = standing)'. But this formula, like most invocations of this kind, emanates from a much earlier period (Spiegelberg, ÄZ. 53, p. 112 f.). Likewise for 'great age' we find h'sh. nfr = 'a beautiful (good) standing', e.g. Westc. vii. 22 f. These examples of the use of h'sh. which could be indefinitely multiplied, suffice to demonstrate that h'sh. is in close accordance with the Egyptian mode of thought and diction. It should be noted that this is the only passage in the Pentateuch where h'sh. occurs in this significance.

5. **עִדָּה** 'to count, recount' = 'to praise, to glorify'.

An instructive example of identical use in Hebrew and Egyptian is provided by the word עִדָּה which immediately follows in the verse cited. It is derived from עָדָה 'to count', frequently used in the sense of 'recount', but here with עָדָה = 'name' as object, obviously used in its poetic sense of 'to praise, glorify', as occurs often in the Psalms (Ps. 22, 23, 102, 12, 96, 2, 10, 2, 26, 7, &c.); עָדָה therefore means 'in order to

1 For h'sh. and h'sh. (also h'sy) = 'duration, lifetime', cf. Ammennopet, inc. 3 f. referring to bushels of corn: Short is their life (h'sh.) in the barn; likewise for the permanence of heaven or of the two skies, e.g. Mar. Abid., i, pl. 7, 62: h'sh. p-t-y-fy, the duration of both his skies.

6. Court expressions of reverence

Addressing the king in the third person: 'Pharaoh was wroth with his servants' (Gen. 41, 16). 'Let Pharaoh look out a man ... let Pharaoh do this' (41, 32) and many other passages, corresponds thoroughly to the court etiquette of Old Egypt and is entirely official. Cf. e.g. Records, i, § 328: '

And the head Physician spoke before his Majesty: May thy person (h-br), beloved of Re, command that there be given me,' &c.; or Sin. 219: 'Let your Majesty command (afr sbr h-r-br) that they, &c.'

Very often out of respect to the king he was referred to simply as 'one' (tn); e.g. U. kh. iv. 27, 10: 'why does one, recall these things?', meaning the king: d'Orb., 2, 2, 1 = Litt., 157: his Majesty loved her very very much; one (tn) appointed her as dph.t (i.e. a 'freenowable, honourable great lady'); the same occurs again in other passages in the same narrative (compare also Litt., p. 50, n. 1). This usage dates back to very ancient times and was always characteristic of official speech, as e.g. in the letter addressed in the name of King Phiopt II (6th dynasty, about 2652-2475 B.C.) to General Herkhuf (h-br-br) ... your letter to the king in the palace so that one (= the king) should know', &c. (Records. i, § 351).

A characteristic formula is also the phrase recurring in several passages, rnh wr in the face of Pharaoh', or rnh wr: 'from the face of Pharaoh' (e.g. Gen. 47, 2, 7, 41, 46), meaning 'before Pharaoh'. This corresponds completely to hierarchic court custom especially in the New Kingdom whereby one might not speak to his Majesty (h-br-br) but only in the face of his

1 Erman sensationally translates: "who understands thee?" (Er.-Gr., p. 139 has for h'brp 'revives, check, assigns', which gives no sense here. But as it is causative of h'brp which means 'to count' (Er.-Gr. 10) it has here the meaning of 'to glorify'. Note that the same verb h'brp = 'to count' is also extended to mean 'to respect'.

2 In Semitic or Hebrew courts it was the custom, so far as we can ascertain, to address the king or prince in the second person: 'thou my lord, the king'. This differentiation emerges quite clearly in the Egyptian narratives of Sinuhe and Wen-Amon in which the Egyptian dignitaries address the Asiatic princes in the second person, as above, whereas Pharaoh is addressed by Sinuhe in the third person sing.

3 Here more distinctly referring to the king by the hieroglyph for king as determinative.
the narrator might quite well have had the dual nh.ty in mind, not only with reference to Pharaoh as lord of the ‘two lands’, but also to Joseph as vizier of the ‘two lands’ (see below on the name nṯḥ.nṯw), the more so as the same etiquette was observed towards king and vizier alike, as we have previously seen.

7. ‘By the life of Pharaoh’

Swearing by the life of the king, which appears to be quite usual and natural, and which, as a matter of fact, has always been current throughout the East from ancient to modern times, was by no means in such ordinary and commonplace use in Egypt, but was invested with an extraordinarily solemn character. Pharaoh was himself a god, of divine substance as son of Re and as the incorporation of every god in any form and in any quality. His life was eternal, his existence being from primordial days till time everlasting. ‘Swearing by his life was therefore a very responsible oath of far-reaching significance and could have the most dangerous consequences for the swearer, thus representing the most extreme means of assurance that could be employed. This is the reason why in Egyptian popular literature the oath by the life of the king, so common in oriental literature, is encountered comparatively seldom, and even less frequently than that by the life of the gods. Only on extraordinary occasions do we meet with the oath by the life of Pharaoh, when it was meant to produce a specially deep impression. Bearing this in mind one can understand why throughout the altercation between Joseph and his brethren, which might frequently have given occasion for all kinds of protestations and assurances, in only one instance is use made of the oath nṯḥ.nṯw ‘by the life of Pharaoh’, 42, 15 and 16; and even there only by Joseph, and this at a very critical moment when he warns his brethren of the most serious danger, accusing them of being spies and intimating by the life of Pharaoh his irrevocable resolve to put them to a test that meant life or death for them. The narrator makes Joseph seize the most extreme means so as to produce the impression that after such an oath there could be no going back for him. Only immediate acceptance of the condition imposed on them could clear them of grave suspicion and release the vizier of Pharaoh from his momentous oath.

incorporated, he was called nṯḥ.nṯw ‘the two mistresses’. Moreover I suspect that the person of the king was also spoken of as ‘the Lords’ in plural, presumably nḥ.nḥ, but so far I have not been able to find an example thereof (see below on the name of Pharaoh, p. 45, n. 4).

As this also applied to other high dignitaries whose official activities were extended to the ‘two lands’, it is clear why the plural was also used in referring to Potipher, Gen. 39, 2, 4c.

In nṯḥ lurks a singular of nṯḥ in the stat. concr.; this coincides completely with the use of ‘nh.ty’ in a similar apophoric formula of oath, e.g. ‘nh.ty nṯḥ nṯw.t ‘by the life

Also with regard to Joseph the narrator makes use of the same respectful
expression: nṯḥ nṯw ‘before Joseph’s face’ = ‘before him’ or nṯḥ nṯw ‘from his face’ = ‘from him’, Gen. 43, 15 and 34. This is likewise in accordance with the Egyptian custom of applying to the vizier and the highest dignitaries the same marks of respect as to the king. Similarly one might not speak ‘to the Lord Justice’ but ‘before his face’; not write ‘to him’ but lay the writing ‘before his face’ (Erman-Ranke, 82 and 93). All these forms of etiquette are admirably reproduced in Judah’s pleading to Joseph, Gen. 44, 18 ff.: he is addressed by him as if he were Pharaoh, ‘for thou art even as Pharaoh’.

A very peculiar form of expression which has often been noted but remains unexplained is the use of nṯḥ in the plural with reference to Pharaoh or Joseph. There is, of course, nothing strange in a king or other person of high rank being addressed or referred to as ‘lord’ or ‘our lord’. But what is most striking in the Joseph narrative is the use of the plural form ‘lords’, e.g. Gen. 40, 1 ‘the butler of the king of the “two lands”’ and his baker offended nṯḥ nṯw ‘their lords’, the king of the “two lands” instead of ‘lord’ in the singular. The same ceremonious turn of speech occurs also in 42, 10 and 31 with reference to Joseph: nṯḥ nṯw ‘the man, the lords of the land said harsh things unto us’ instead of ‘the lord’.

It should be noted how exactly the narrator makes Joseph’s brethren in their altercation with Joseph’s house-steward distinguish between him, the employee, and his master, the vizeyer, in that they address him as nṯḥ ‘my lord’ in the singular (44, 7 and 9), whereas they use nṯḥ nṯw ‘thy lords’ (44, 8), when speaking of the vizeyer.

Now we find that already in quite ancient times Pharaoh besides being referred to as nh ‘lord’ in the singular, also is spoken of as nh.ty in the dual, in the same way as he is also referred to as pr.t nṯḥ ‘the two lords’ in the dual. Consequently nṯḥ may quite as well be a dual as a plural since in the status constructus both are inflected exactly in the same way. Thus

1 For the literal meaning of pr.t and its use for king, cf. below p. 44 f.
2 For addressing the king or speaking of him in the term of ‘my lord’, cf. e.g. Reinisch, Christr. 7, 10, 1: nḥ nh-n ‘O King, our Lord!’ or pr.t py nh ‘Pharaoh, my Lord’ (Abott, pl. 5, 18 = Records iv, x, paragraph 246); similarly for other high officials, e.g. Bauer, i. 53, (also B. 90) ‘chief mayor, my Lord (nh-n)’. The use of nh in the dual for the king as double Horus occurs already in the Old Kingdom. Also in his capacity as protector of the ‘two lands’ in whom both Nebhet and Butu, the tutelary goddesses of upper and lower Egypt with the emblems of the vulture and the uraeus-snake (mr.t and pr.t) were
8. Frequent use of ꝑ nuru

The frequent mention of ꝑ nuru in the Joseph narrative, especially in the conversations of Joseph with Pharaoh and also with his brethren, so unusual in its constant iteration, appears very striking. Nevertheless this peculiarity, so typical of this narrative, is eminently characteristic of Egyptian diction. ‘God’ (ntr) or in the plural ‘the Gods’ (ntrw) was very often on the lips of Egyptians notably in court circles where Pharaoh himself was venerated as a deity. It was regarded as a special mark of courtly deference and obsequiousness to speak in the presence of Pharaoh as often as possible of the gods, to repeat to him on every opportunity that the gods were constantly concerned about him, that the gods protected him, that the gods advised him, thought for him, watched over his welfare, and always had him in mind. Such ostentatious reverence for the gods was to some extent considered as a protestation of loyalty and fealty to the king, who himself ranked among the gods. This note of demonstrative piety is mirrored in masterly fashion in Joseph’s conversations. Highly characteristic in this connexion is the exclusive use of ꝑ nuru in the plural in consonance with the Egyptian plural ntrw. The narrator is thoroughly aware that Joseph, the Hebrew, speaks to the Egyptians in their language and their own manner, so that the plural use of ꝑ nuru is an exact reproduction of the Egyptian ntrw without in any way jarring on the Hebrew reader. Thus in Gen. 40, 8 it is to ꝑ nuru that the interpretation of all dreams belongs; 41, 16 it is ꝑ nuru who is to give Pharaoh an answer of peace; 41, 25 and 28 it is ꝑ nuru who shows Pharaoh what He is about to do; in 41, 32 it is intimated that the dream was doubled because the thing was determined by ꝑ nuru and that ꝑ nuru would shortly bring it to pass; 41, 38 Pharaoh finds that ‘the spirit of ꝑ nuru is in Joseph’, a typically Egyptian expression for emphasizing god-like qualities in a man;1 compare further 42, 18: ‘this do and live, for I fear ꝑ nuru’, and also 43, 43-44, 16, 45, 8-9, 48, 6, 11, 15, 20, 21, 50, 17, 19, 20, 24, 25.

of Sesostris I’, Gensang, El-Azrakh, Stela of Sekhem-Khu, pl. 1, 1. 4, who lived under Sesostris III (1887-1849 B.C.).

1 It is true that these words are framed by the Hebrew narrator in a monothestic sense although it is Pharaoh who uttereth them, whereas an Egyptian in such cases would say that God or every god was in him’, so e.g. in d’Orb. i. 4 (= Lit. 151): ‘his younger brother was however a good ploughman, &c., and God was in him’ (‘if summ ntr im’); similarly it is said of his wife, ibid., ix, 8 (= Lit. 203), that she was more lovely of limb ‘than any woman in the whole land and every god was in her’ (‘in mts ntr m ib-m’). Another expression, rather harsh to our ears but very favoured among the Egyptians, is d’Orb., xi, 5 (= Lit. 150), ‘the word of every God was in her’ (‘in ms n ntr m ib-m’). Erman appears to suppose in the passage quoted from Lit. 151 a word like hkw or bsw is missing; this however need not necessarily be the case.

Used in Egyptian Ceremonial and Official Speech

A very noteworthy contrast is to be found in the conversations of Moses with Pharaoh, although the former was the man of God, in the absence of a similar iteration of ꝑ nuru. This is by no means accidental: it is true that the narrator in the Joseph story and also in the conversations of Pharaoh with others, even in those of the Hebrews amongst themselves, retained that popular show of religiosity; on the other hand it went against the grain to cause Moses to speak in the same ostentatious servility and adulation of the gods: in the mouth of Moses the mention of God, in the newly revealed name ꝑ nuru, was to produce a much more severe and austere effect than ꝑ nuru which recalled the Egyptian ntrw and was habitual with the Egyptians.1

9. Jacob before Pharaoh

Gen. 47. 9 Jacob replies to the question of Pharaoh as to his age: ꝑ nuru ꝑ yr, ‘the days of the years of my sojournings are a hundred and thirty years; few and evil have been the days of the years of my life and they have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their sojournings’. In the first place it must appear strange that Jacob describes his hundred and thirty years as few. When however, we consider that Pharaoh was regarded as an eternally living god endowed by the gods with millions and myriads (ḥḥ n rmw) of years, being as such praised and worshipped, it becomes clear why the venerable old man Jacob had to assure Pharaoh who was certainly much younger, that his hundred and thirty years were but few in comparison with the endless years of the eternally living son of Re.2 Furthermore the remark that his age was not so high as that of his fathers appears strange as in point of fact the life of his fathers was not so very much greater than his own as to justify it (Abraham lived 175 years, Gen. 25, 7 and Isaac 180 years, 35, 28). But again in the light of Egyptian court etiquette, so rich in the niceties of speech, such a remark must have appeared as very tactful and thoughtful especially on the lips of a foreigner; for it belonged to the good manners of obsequious court visitors to assure the king that they had been given a long life and that many happy years had been theirs because they had the good fortune to enjoy his royal protection and favour. Thus the wise Pashhoteb (Priesè Dév. p. 52, 640 L = Lit. 65), the vizier of King Isi (about 2675 B.C.

1 In the chapter on the names and attributes of God, we shall discuss in greater detail the origin and meaning of ꝑ nuru and ꝑ yr as well as the difference between ꝑ yr and ꝑ yr in cahita.
2 Cf. e.g. Records, ii, paragraph 66a, Stela of Thutmose III (= Lit. p. 152), when Amon-Re addresses the king: ‘I let thee linger on the throne of Horus for millions of years;’ Anasti. iii. 7, 9, Song to Rameses II (= Lit. p. 272): ‘thou wilt be as long as eternity, and eternity will be as long as thou art.’

D
or earlier) at the end of his book of wisdom: — "It is not little that I have
done upon earth: I have lived a hundred and ten years which the king
granted me with rewards exceeding those of my fathers because I did what
was right for him up to the place of honour" (i.e. up to my greatest age).
Another high dignitary, a favourite of Thutmose III says in his epitaph,
Urk. iv. 34. 11 f.: "I have reached a nice age, 1 an age as with a king," that
is a great age such as could only be attained in the company of a king and
favoured by his magnanimity. "Strength of life is the king (kr pw nsw.t),
abundance (of food) is his mouth," is said in the teaching of Sehetep-ib-Re,
Lange-Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine, Cairo, 20538, 15. (= Lit. 84). This,
because the king as "a god" was able to bestow upon his favourites long
life and many years of "good fortune and rewards". This was the meaning
of "give us life from thee" (Bentrehch. 8 = Records iii § 4.36 exclaimed also by
a foreign envoy prostrating himself, as usual, "on the belly" (fr h.t) kissing
the earth before him and imploring his grace. Over and over again it is
emphasized in pompous language and extravagant frequency that the king is
he who "gives life", he who "gives breath to the nostrils", e.g. Urk. iv.
15. 3, that he it is who "breathes in (the nostrils) the breath of life", etc.
In all these cases the king is addressed in the manner and terms in which
the great gods were praised and worshipped. 2

Taking all this into consideration, it suited the Hebrew narrator very
well to make the patriarch, who in his grief for his lost son had passed
through very sorrowful years, say to the king that his years had been evil
and few, as one who had not had the privilege of being "with the king".

But also the expression (nsw) "sojourn" for "duration of life", a term
which is usually applied to the stay of a foreigner, cannot properly be
understood unless one bears in mind the belief of the Egyptians that
earthly life denoted merely a temporary sojourn on the "face of the
earth" (fr t p t) in contrast to the "house of eternity" (pr ntt) where one
"settles" for millions of years. The notion that life on earth was merely
ephemeral in contrast to the eternal life in the world of the dead in the
west" was very clearly fixed in the consciousness of the Egyptian, so much
so that the dead are often represented in the books of the dead or inscriptions
on the tombs, as speaking of the years which they had spent "on the face
of the earth" before they had passed into eternal life, as for example

1 Lit. a beautiful, a good age, i.e. a great age, a term of speech of which the Hebrew
יָשׁוּבָה is a literal translation.
2 "To beg breath from the king" was equivalent to "submitting to him", e.g. Annals of
Thutmose III, Urk. iv. 46a, to of the princes of Syria who came to the king "crawling on
their bellies" to "beg breath for their nostrils (r dsh pr fng.s-mt-nq)."

Rameses III in his grave, of the days which he had spent 'on the face of
the earth' (Harris, 22, ii. 44, 8). From this and many similar examples
it will be seen how clearly the Egyptians distinguished between life 'on
earth' and life in the world of eternity. Thus in characterizing the
duration of life as nsw a mere 'sojourn', a temporary 'residence', the
Egyptian influence is very palpable.

On the whole the narrator was concerned to show that the patriarch, who
was treated by Pharaoh as a distinguished foreigner, and who could not be
expected to be familiar with Egyptian court etiquette, nevertheless behaved
in such a way that his bearing was bound to impress Pharaoh as modest and
highly dignified according to Egyptian notions of courtly demeanour.
CHAPTER II

EGYPTIAN TITLES AND OFFICIAL DIGNITIES

In the Joseph and Exodus narratives is to be found a whole series of titles and designations of higher or lower court and administrative state officials, which on a closer examination are revealed to be literal translations or imitations of genuine Egyptian titles. In some cases it is only by such an identification that one can obtain a correct idea of the functions and position of the officials in question. In other cases it is also possible to draw important conclusions as to the period concerned, and light is cast on the political influence, especially of the neighbouring Asiatic peoples, to which Egypt and some of its institutions had become subject. It is of the highest interest to note that some of these titles are of Semitic origin and were retained in their Semitic form by the Egyptians partly in the Middle Empire and beyond it down to the New Kingdom.

1. Joseph’s Offices and Dignities

The kernel of the Joseph narrative is his appointment as viceroy or Grand Vizier to Pharaoh.¹ For this office Gen. 41, 43 gives τραπέζιον. This expression is formed from τραφικόν, to do twice, to repeat, to double in the sense that he represented in relation to the king a sort of ‘double’ acting as his deputy, invested with all rights and prerogatives of the king. Exactly in the same way the Egyptian word ḫmnw ‘deputy’ was formed from ḫn ‘two. Thus e.g. Champ., Notices i. 481; ḫmr nfr ḫmnw n ḫmr ‘the second priest of the God Amon’; Kahun pl. XII, 4; Ḫmrw ḫmnw n ḫmr ‘the second reporter of the South’ i.e. for the deputy of a high administrative officer of the king in Upper Egypt: Urk. iv. 49, 4 speaks of the Court Chamberlain of the Queen Mother (of Amenemhat I, 1557–1536) as the ‘Second (in.mw) of the king at the Greeting by Name’,² and a still more striking parallel is given in

¹ Although we use here and there the designation ‘Viceroy’ following the current usage, vizier would probably be more appropriate. In Egypt it was only in Nubia (Kush) of the New Kingdom that there was a ‘vizier’ who was called the ‘son of the king of Kush’ (t ḫmr n ḫmr), also simply the ‘king’s son’ (cf. Urk. iv. 78, 12. 80, 17). The latter was the usual title of the Egyptian heir to the throne.

² This means that his was the only name to be publicly announced at official receptions by the king together with that of the king, whereas the remaining suite were referred to en masse as the ‘great, noble ones’.
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Urk. iv. 1172 ḫmrw n ḫmr where the vizier Rekh-Mr-Re, exactly like Joseph as ḫmrw, is described as ‘the second of the king’.

The functions and privileges conferred on Joseph as vizier are explicitly summarized in the words of Pharaoh on his appointment (41, 42, 43, 44) and this coincides completely with what we learn from Egyptian documents and monuments about the vizier. In this connexion we are particularly enlightened by detailed regulations for the office of vizier preserved in the tomb inscriptions of the above-mentioned Rekh-Mr-Re.¹ He was the vizier of Thothmes III (1500–1447 B.C.), and the whole description of his installation into his high office is so vividly reminiscent of the Joseph narrative that it can be regarded as an authentic confirmation of it and, even more, as an illustrative commentary on the details furnished by our narrator concerning the installation of Joseph into office.²

After the king, the vizier is the highest dignitary in the State with all the rights and powers accruing to a king. He replaces the king. In his absence he is the actual ruler, and in his presence no matter and no person can reach the king without his mediation; just as Pharaoh said to Joseph (Gen. iv. 43): ‘I am Pharaoh, and without me shall no man lift up his hand or foot in the whole country of the two lands’. It is the vizier who issues all orders, and he it is who carries out all the royal commands. Every officer from the highest to the lowest must come to him to report. Even in legal proceedings or in complaints by officers against one another, as well as in unconnected criminal cases, the decision rests with the vizier alone as the supreme judge. The king gives him his signet ring, the possession of which signified not only the confidence of the Crown, but a high privilege, the bestowal of which was reserved, particularly in the New Kingdom (1538–1200 B.C.), solely for the king, as emerges from the fact that most of the signet rings of that epoch bear only the names of reigning princes.³
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The Vizier furthermore is the supreme administrator of the crown lands, the country as a whole being also under his supervision, so that all questions and disputes in regard to landed property are reserved for his final decision corresponding to Gen. 41, 49 f.: 'Thou shalt be over my house and according to thy word shall all my people be fed' and, 'See, I have set thee over the whole country of the "two lands"' (cf. also 45, 8, 47, 14 ff., 21, 46). In the hands of the vizier lay the real direction of all court and state affairs so that his only differentiation from the king was that he was subordinated to him just as it is said (Gen. 41, 40): 'only on the throne shall I be greater than thou.' The difficulty of the with the omission of before is explained by its following the Egyptian construction.

Moreover particulars given of Joseph's honours which accompanied his installation such as conformation of the royal signet, his habiliments in garments of fine linen, his investiture with the gold chain (41, 44), with solemn ceremonies, perfectly coincide with Egyptian usages. They could not be better illustrated—we repeat—than by the Egyptian inscriptions and graphic representations themselves. That the wearing of byssus was a distinctive garb of kings and high personages is known from various sources and descriptions. In addition, the honour bestowed upon Joseph by the golden neck-chain is graphically depicted in the wonderful scene in the tomb of representing the ceremony of the king conferring on him the 'gold of praise', in which the hanging of heavy gold chains round his neck is the principal feature. Precisely the brevity with which the details

1. In addition to the works cited, cf. on the position and rights of the Egyptian vizier also Ermann-Ranke, 173 f. and Spiegelberg, Rechtswesen, p. 5 ff. As first Judge of the land he bore the title "s eighteen," 'Chief Judge', literally 'the Judge at the two Gates'. Cf. E. - Gr. 142 and 157 and Brugsch, Ägyptol., 207 and 211.

2. In Gen. 41, 45 the word does not, as many suppose, refer to Pharaoh but to the vizier, i.e. it is the gold carriage assigned to the vizier as office, see Gen. 46, 29. I am unable to adduce any example for an expression like 'chariot of the vizier' (perhaps, ḫn ṣiḏ n p.t.), but I can cite one for the 'boat of the vizier' p.t. n p.t., cf. Spiegelberg, Rechtswesen, 181 f., 32.

3. Further details are given in Ermann-Ranke, 139 f. and cf. 41, 41. Our narrator undoubtedly had in mind such neck chains, as he does not say 'a gold neck chain', but ird ḫn ḫn 'the neck chain of gold'. He hereby indicates that it does not relate to an honour particularly devised for Joseph but to the well-known conformation of the gold which belonged to the investiture ceremonial of high dignitaries as took place for example in the proclamation of Meri-Re as 'Great Son of Aton' by Akhenaton (I.D. iii. 67 f.; Davies, Amarna I, pl. 24 and 30 = Records, ii, § 982). This ceremony was of a very popular description and everyone knew what it meant for a 'favorite' when the king appeared at the great 'window of the palace' (I.D.) in order to bestow the 'Gold of Praise' on the man 'praised by or beloved of the king before all people, in the sight of the whole land'. The 'Receiving of the Gold' was reckoned one of the highest distinctions and many boasted of having received 'the Gold' from this or that king; cf. especially Ermann-Ranke, 132 n. 5 and Mém. de la Mis.
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are given by the Hebrew narrator, though nevertheless formulated with the most extreme exactitude, reveals the fact that such ceremonies were assumed by him to be familiar to his readers; he therefore did not feel it necessary to embark upon an extensive description, giving only a summary, just as to-day very complicated and lengthy court ceremonies are generally alluded to in a few words. Thus the words 'and he put a gold chain about his neck' sounded to them as would to us to-day' His Majesty invested him with the insignia of the Garder'.

Though this material coincidence is of the highest importance for the narratives, the real significance for our investigation lies in the linguistic setting and the mode of expression by which the Egyptian background is most clearly revealed.

We have already referred in the preceding chapter to the meaning, character, and origin of certain idioms and expressions; it remains for us now to discuss some expressions with which Joseph describes his office and dignities, because these also are derived from the Egyptian, and thus complement what has been said in reference to Gen. 41, 40-46. Joseph in summarizing them (Gen. 45, 8) refers to his three functions: (1) as 'father to Pharaoh', (2) as 'lord of his whole house', and (3) as 'ruler over the whole country of the two lands'. By this the three-fold nature of the position of a vizier at the court of Pharaoh is exactly described, namely (1) as a very dignitary, (2) as court chamberlain, placed over the entire court, and (3) as supreme administrator of the entire land, as we have seen above. Such a precise summary can only have emanated from someone intimately familiar with the hierarchic state institutions of Egypt, and who knew that these were the three most important offices which were embodied in the person of a vizier.

2. 'Father to Pharaoh' and 'Lord of his House'

The expression פָּרָהֲו 'father' is a reproduction of the Egyptian title ḫn = 'father', a very common priestly title which was borne by humble as well as very high officials including viziers. Thus we find e.g., that Pahhotep

Fr. v. 489-490, pl. i-vii where Neferhotep appears with the golden neck-chain conferred on him by Haremheb.

' This title is written ḫn, tlf, and also ḫn; the latter is an abbreviated form of ḫn. The full title is ḫn = 'Father of God'. The Hebrew writer however confused himself to indicate this priestly designation merely with 2n because an expression like םֹנֶרנִי 2n or יַנְוֵרְי 2n would have been tantamount to a monstrous blasphemy for a monotheist. It should be noted that here also the narrator refers to this appointment as to a very well-known one, without giving any further details. In addition to 'Father of God' there was
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the vizier of King Isy (about 2675 B.C.) referred to himself as "fit ntr mry-y-ntr: 'father of god, the beloved of god' (Pap. Prisse, ed. Devaup, p. 17, 45 = Lit., p. 56 n. 1). Also the above mentioned Eye who occupied a high office at the court of Akhenaton had the title 'father of God' (Davies, Armarna VI. pl. 29 and 30) as so many others who were close to the throne. In the statement that it was Pharaoh who installed Joseph as father we have implicitly an indication of the Egyptian character of this title. In a hierarchic state where Pharaoh was a god (ntr), his vizier had naturally to occupy a priestly rank, and it was precisely this which was conferred on Joseph by the title father. This qualification was enhanced by Pharaoh giving him the daughter of the priest of On (Heliopolis) to wife (Gen. 41, 45).

The narrator was quite clear as to the hierarchic significance of such a union, and of the high position occupied by the priests of On. For to the Egyptians On was the holy city par excellence. It was regarded as the seat of the most powerful of the cosmic gods, namely of Atum, and it was occupied by a numerous and important body of priests (Erman, Relig. 12). Its central sanctuary was established as early as the middle of the fourth millennium B.C. when the first god Re was already ruling there. The marriage of Joseph to the daughter of the priest of On therefore signified the reception of the foreigner into the highest priestly caste, and by his elevation to the rank of 'father of God' he was assigned one of the most eminent accedantal dignities of ancient Egypt.1

As to the title (45, 8) 'lord of his whole house' מִשְׁרֵי בַּתָּל, this corresponds to ms-pr 'lord, chief of the house' (Urk. iv. 1071, 6; Bauer, B 1, 16 etc.) i.e. of the palace, meaning the court chamberlain.2

also a 'Mother of God' (mrs.n-trt) as title of the high priestess of Edfu and likewise we meet with 'Fathers' and 'Mothers of God'.

1 Here we have an indication of the fact that the Joseph episode took place at a time when On was the centre of the priestly power.

2 The view advanced by Brugsch (Aegypt., 235 n. 1), and Lieblein (PSBA., 1898, 209, cf. also Kyle, Masses, 58) that 2tr is the Egyptian word ibh denoting a high office, can only be justified on dubious grounds and even then would not give a correct idea of what was really meant by such a title. The fact that in other cases the Hebrew narrator offers a rendering of Egyptian titles leaves no doubt that also in 2tr we have a Hebrew rendering of an Egyptian title and not an Egyptian word, especially as the title of an iff - Father, for a son-in-law of the High Priest of On or a vizier was particularly suitable.

3 There was also a ms-pr ur n ntr 'Chief Court Chamberlain of the King'. Among the titles of high court officials there were also: 'pr-n n 'the great one of the house of . . .', e.g. Bergh, Enlilch. 308; 'pr-n jn.nu 'major domo of the god Khon'; cf. also Erman-Ranke, 133, n. 4.

The third title of Joseph is of special interest, not so much on account of the official jurisdiction therein implied, as on account of the formula: ruler over the whole country of the 'two lands'. Thereby it is emphasized that both Upper and Lower Egypt were placed under his control as deputy for Pharaoh whose permanent official title was nb tr.ny = 'lord of the two lands'. It is noteworthy that in the Joseph narrative, especially when Joseph's official activities are referred to, the formal expression nb tr.ny is frequent, whereas elsewhere it reads merely nb ntr. The question then arises whether this seemingly casual use of the two phrases was not as a matter of fact intentional. In order to appreciate the far-reaching importance of this question in its right light, it is necessary first of all to make some observations on the origin and meaning of nb ntr as a name for Egypt, especially as its in itself is of no little interest.

The striking feature of this name is its dual form. It has been variously assumed that the dual form is to be explained by the division of the country into Upper and Lower Egypt. This is doubtless quite right; nevertheless there is no unanimity as to the meaning of the word nb from which the dual is formed. Thus whilst some explain it by the Akkadian mišru 'boundary', others connect it with the Hebrew ṣarm interpreted as equivalent to 'fortress'.3 But on closer examination it becomes obvious

1 To-day it appears rather remarkable that Samuel Bochartius in his work (very noteworthy for that time) Geographia sacra, London, 1646, i, p. 292 f. already expressed the view: 'Vox dualis Zawy dicit duplicem esse Aegyptum quum una superior appellatur, Tob. 8, 2, altera inferior.' Nevertheless Barth in his Nominalbildungen, par. 194 c, no. 1, prefers to see in Zawy no dual but a local termination, as he assumes this to be the case also in other place names in dual form. This view, however, has no sound foundation. In my mind it is beyond doubt that all such place names were actually conceived as duals, though it is difficult to detect the origin. Incidentally it may be observed that the name Masreu quoted by Wiedemann, Gesch. Aegypt., p. 43, n. 1, from Tidau, s.v. Ṣarmu for Egypt looks like a reproduction of the Hebrew Zawy in the Samaritan pronunciation (masreu). It often happened that Christian scholars from early centuries down to the end of the Middle Ages derived their knowledge of Hebrew words or Jewish matters from Samaritan sources, because they did not maintain such close relations with Jewish scholars as with Samaritans; hence many erroneous statements and unusual, even false reproductions of Hebrew words. I emphasize this fact because, as far as I can see, no one has drawn attention to it.

2 A detailed discussion of the many and various opinions about it is superfluous. For those interested in them, reference may be made to Ges.-Bab. under nb ntr and nb ntr. It is hardly necessary to enter into the controversy as to whether nb ntr denotes Egypt exclusively or includes also north-western Arabia (J), a suggestion which found no support and may be regarded as long since refuted.
that מֵאֱלַי is nothing else than a literal and grammatical adaptation of the Egyptian word tway, dual of t = 'land', i.e. the two lands or the 'twain land', this being as a matter of fact the designation given by the Egyptians to their country from time immemorial, with reference to Upper and Lower Egypt. Even assuming that the word מֵאֱלַי originally meant 'boundary' its selection should by no means appear strange, for 'boundary' was also in common use for 'territory, land' (cf. e.g. בְּאֵל 'boundary' and 'territory, land'). The origin of the word and its formation are, therefore, purely Semitic, but the background is Egyptian.

The question now arises whether this designation was coined in Canaan, in Aram, or in other neighbouring land from a Canaanitic or Aramaic dialect before the entry of the Israelites into Egypt. The fact, however, that in the Amarna tablets of the Fourteenth Century B.C. Egypt is called Miṣr Miṣarri in the singular, and that furthermore we possess no evidence from any other equally early Semitic documents or languages that Egypt was ever called by a name of dual formation suggesting the idea of 'two lands', leads us to conclude that מֵאֱלַי 'the two lands' was an original creation of the Hebrews from the Egyptian tway as the standing name for Egypt as a whole.

As to the origin of the division of Egypt into a kingdom of the South (ים.א) = Upper Egypt under the 'white Crown' (בֶּן-ד) and a kingdom of the north (ים.ב) = Lower Egypt under the 'red Crown' (דֵּרְפַּחְל also מֵאֱלַי), we know nothing apart from the fact that the memory of the union of the two kingdoms had early become very deeply rooted among the Egyptian people, and that despite the extraordinary vicissitudes and changeful destinies of the centuries, it remained alive down to quite late periods of their history. It may however be supposed that this union was first effected under Menes, the first king of the 1st dynasty (about 4186 B.C.), according to Borchardt, 3400 according to Erman, cf. Erman-Ranke, 658, or perhaps already at the institution of the Sothic calendar in the year 4236 or 4241 B.C. (Erman-Ranke, 398).

Although the two kingdoms were not always united, the name tway 'twain land' always existed, and if the Egyptians in ordinary intercourse counted their country kmt 'the black' (ibid. 15), tway still remained the official name for Egypt. One has however the feeling that in the use of tway the Egyptians had both lands in mind as separate units though they applied it to the whole country in general. Such a connotation was already current in the Old Kingdom (2900–2000 B.C.) as well as throughout the whole of the Middle Kingdom (2000–1580 B.C.) and must have remained still later in use. One has the same feeling with regard to the author of the Joseph narrative in his frequent use of the expression nfr nfr 'the whole country of the two lands' or nfr nfr 'in the whole country of the two lands' side by side with the more simple nfr nfr 'the country of the two lands' or nfr nfr 'in the country of the two lands'. It becomes apparent that thereby he intends to emphasize the fact that in Joseph's time both lands were united under the rulership of Pharaoh and under the administration of Joseph, as a special sign of consolidated power and unified government. Thus the narrator shows, in this connexion also, his complete familiarity with the changeful conditions in the Nile valley. Hence his concern to stress the fact of a united Egypt, as when he speaks of Joseph's installation over the whole country of the 'two lands' (41, 46); his extra-ordinary plenary powers over the whole country of the 'two lands' (41, 46); when he mentions that immediately after Joseph's appointment as vizier he journeyed through the whole country of the 'two lands' (41, 46) or that later he transferred the pessanth to the towns 'from one end of the country of the 'two lands' to the other end' (47, 1). In this last instance it is particularly clear that allusion is made to all the territories from the north to the south in both Upper and Lower Egypt. That such an intention is not a mere conjecture can be concluded from the fact that מֵאֱלַי does not precede the name מֵאֱלַי, not even in cases where Egypt as a whole is meant, unless it is intended to emphasize the political and administrative unity of the country.

This remarkable emphasis assumes special historical significance when it is recalled that before the New Kingdom there was only one vizier for both territories and that it was only in the New Kingdom that two viziers came on the scene—one for Upper Egypt with the title p.t n n.t rfy 'Vizier of the South', and the other for Lower Egypt: p.t n mfr n. 'Vizier of the North' (cf. Gardiner, Men, p. 33, Nos. 4 and 5). The author of the Joseph narrative must have known of these changed conditions, and therefore wanted to bring out the fact that in contrast to his own time, when there were two vizierates, Joseph was the sole vizier over the whole country of the 'two lands'. And this he emphasized not only because it had been the administrative system of that earlier time, but also because of Joseph's personal qualities as well.
as the high favour which he had gained with Pharaoh, in face of the necessity to prepare for the threatened catastrophe which rendered essential a unified and strong administration of the entire country in the hands of a wise and far-seeing counsellor. For if there had not been such a change in the conditions of the vizierate, and had the narrator no knowledge thereof, he would have contented himself with the simple statement that Joseph was installed vizier of Egypt, without emphasizing on every occasion that the whole country of the 'two lands' was under his rule. The narrator must therefore have been fully conscious of the great change that had taken place between the time of Joseph's government and his own time. It is consequently not possible to admit that Joseph's appointment was for him a mere legend. On the contrary he records it as a positive historical fact, illustrated by such features as could only be rightly understood and appreciated in the light of changes introduced in State institutions subsequently to the Joseph period. We have, thereby, gained an important clue which together with other indications discussed below will be of no little significance for the approximate delimitation of the epoch to which the Joseph period can be assigned.

4. The use of ꝏ‘‘The Man’’

Of especial interest is the above-mentioned word Ꝥ t.t. the official title of the vizier. As pointed out by Sethe the feminine form Ꝥ t.t. is only customary in texts of the new Kingdom. In the old Kingdom it was written in the masculine Ꝥ or Ꝥ Ꝥ ṣ which as Sethe (Vezier, p. 6, No. 13) suggests is identical with Ꝥ Ꝥ ṣ t.t. ‘man’; if this be so then the vizier as the highest and most powerful man next to the king was called ‘the man’.

This designation as ‘the man’ provides us with an explanation why Joseph is always described as Ꝥ‘‘the man’’, e.g. 42, 30: ‘the man’..., spake harshly to us; 42, 32: ‘the man’ did solemnly protest unto us; 43, 5 and other passages. Although Ꝥ in its ordinary sense is elsewhere used generally for ‘man’, sometimes also for a higher personage, one cannot overlook the fact that in the Joseph narrative, apart from the house steward 43, 17, 19, 24 and the brethren 44, 17, who are treated here not as ordinary people, the word is used only of Joseph, notably in passages where his quality as ruler of the land is emphasized (42, 30). Similarly t.t. from earliest times was also generally used for ‘man’ in contrast to hmt ‘woman’ exactly like Ꝥ‘‘the man’’

It should be pointed out that the form t.t. corresponds to a later mode of writing. For our purpose there is no difference whether it is transcribed Ꝥ t.t. or Ꝥ t.t.

5. The Interpreter

The word Ꝥ‘‘interpreter’’, Gen. 42, 23 corresponds in Egyptian to the office of ḫmnw ‘repeater’ for the interpreter, reporting-officer, and herald who also held other posts. ḫmnw signifies narrator, repeater, i.e. one who repeats what has been said to him, a sort of ‘reporter’, e.g. U 972, 19 ḫmnw ‘the great, the chief reporter; Pop. Kahun, pl. xii, 5 n ḫmnw in n rty the second reporter of the South, i.e. the deputy of the king or vizier?’ reporter for Upper Egypt; U 1120, 1 (Rekh-Me-Re), ḫmnw

P. Dhorme, Revue Biblique 1930, p. 444, draws attention to the fact that in the Tell-el-Amarna tablets the princes of the towns under Pharaoh's rule were called ḫmnw ‘the man’. It is very significant that though it is an Akkadian word it was never used as a title in Mesopotamia but only in Canaan at the Amarna-period, when the language used by the princes in their correspondence with the King of Egypt was in many respects influenced by Egyptian (cf. below, p. 44, note 1). Hence Dhorme’s suggestion that ḫmnw ‘the man’ was applied to the vassal princes of Canaan in juxtaposition to the Pharaoh who was called ‘the god’ is very plausible. But this would only confirm the interpretation of Ꝥ‘‘the man’’ as an adaptation to the Egyptian ḫmnw and not, as D. thinks, prove that the use of Ꝥ is to be explained from Akkadian! The very fact that ḫmnw is confined to those vassal princes would suggest an Egyptian influence.

1 Cf. below, p. 36 f. on Ꝥ Ex. 2, 14 used in the same meaning.
in Egyptian administration, namely, br-y pr ‘he over the house’, which as one sees is literally identical with the Hebrew and is the title for a higher administrative officer of the king, or of a high dignitary.

7. Joseph’s name ḫḏḥ rṬ ṭv ṭv

After having commented on the titles of Joseph it is opportune to discuss the question of the origin and meaning of ḫḏḥ rṬ ṭv, the name given by Pharaoh to Joseph (Gen. 41, 40). That the name is composed of Egyptian and not Hebrew words, as had been assumed, is now generally admitted. It is only concerning the form and meaning of the component elements of the name that Egyptologists differ. That Pharaoh should confer on Joseph an Egyptian name on his elevation as his viceroy was quite natural not only for the purpose of giving him, the foreigner, externally the character of an Egyptian dignitary, but also because on such occasions, even with Egyptians, it was customary for the king to bestow upon a favourite an honorific name denoting a special distinction and marking at the same time the beginning of a new and important stage in his career. This was based on the same idea as actuated the Egyptian kings from earliest times in taking, on their accession to the throne, one or more honorific and symbolic names, in which the special favour and love of the gods was implied, e.g. Snḥ-spḥr-md-R, i.e. ‘Pash maintain (or maintains) the life of the beloved of Re’ as cognomen of Pithoi 1 (6th dynasty); Snḥ-fr-R ‘he who makes good (i.e. rejoices) the heart of Re’ (12th dynasty) or Mry-R ‘the beloved of Re’ and Stḥ-p-R ‘the chosen of Re’, name of Rameses II (19th dynasty) &c. In many cases it happened that high dignitaries when assuming a particularly important office added the name of their gracious sovereign to their own, as a sign of their fealty, loyalty, and gratitude (Erman-Ranke, p. 187 f.). Attention may here be drawn to a particular instance, in which, exactly as happened with Joseph, a Canaanite with the name hm ṭeqm (져 ṭמח) from gรมח (?’ h Executors, having been elevated by King Merneptah, son of Rameses II,
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To a very high office at court, assumed or perhaps was given the name 'Rameses in the Temple of Re' and in addition also the cognomen 'the beloved of Heliopolis'. In the case of Joseph it is expressly stated that it was the king himself who bestowed on his favourite such an honorific name as sign of his admiration and esteem.

As for the origin and the meaning of ṛwš ṛwš, many attempts have been made to discover what were the Egyptian words of similar sound composing the name and to interpret it accordingly. Some support has been accorded to the interpretation proposed by Steindorf (AZ. 27 (1889), 41 and 30 (1892), 50). According to him it should be dissected into ḍḏ pi ntr ḫw-f nh perhaps ṛwš ṛwš ṛwš ṛwš which in syncopated script would look like ḍ p ṫ ṫ ṫ nh = ṛwš ṛwš ṛwš ṛwš and would give the meaning: 'the God speaks; may he live.' Such a solution would be quite admissible from the phonetic standpoint, and could be supported by the fact that such theophoric names were actually frequent among the Egyptians. Several of them contain almost all the elements of ṛwš ṛwš so interpreted, and others even present a direct parallel thereto. But this interpretation enjoys special favour among Biblical critics because no examples of such names before the ninth century B.C. have been found. This circumstance is even taken as proof of the contention that the Joseph narrative could not possibly have been composed before the ninth century (Steindorf, AZ. &c.). But this argumentum ex silentio is invalid as the mere fact that such names are not found before that period in Egyptian writing by no means constitute a decisive proof that they were unknown earlier. On the other hand one might just as well expect from the supporters of such views that they should date the

Steindorf has merely followed the suggestion previously given by Krail who changed ṛwš into ṛwš and read: ụ ṭ An ṭ ṫ nh, i.e. the god 'Month speaks: May he live', a name that actually occurs among the Egyptians as we shall soon see. The theophoric names of this kind both for men and women occur in extraordinary profusion especially in the eighth and seventh centuries in conjunction with various gods and goddesses. The oldest examples are probably ḍḏ ṫ ṫ ṫ nh for a man, ṛwš ṛwš ṛwš ṛwš for a woman, ṛwš ṛwš ṛwš ṛwš may be the New Empire, i.e. as early as about 1200 B.C. Many other names in conjunction with the deities Bastet, Maat, Meru, Pash, Month, Hapi (the Nile god), Huru, Rene, Thoth, Jah (the Moon god), and Amon, occur, always in the same formation as the above-mentioned, gies still cling to the Steindorf-Spigelberg interpretation, it must be most emphatically in which the name of the deity (such as Mis, Maat, Amon, Pash, &c.) is omitted. Even 'May she live' drop out, the name of the deity is never missing. Some of the above examples are from the Berlin Dictionary of Names still in preparation where many more are to be found.
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narrative back to the twelfth century because Poth-pherah, the name of Joseph's father-in-law, as Spigelberg, the staunchest supporter of Steindorf's conjecture shows (Aufenth. Israels, p. 53), is forthcoming as far back as the 20th dynasty (about 1200-1090 B.C.). Apart from all this, the identification of ṛwš ṛwš with ḍḏ pi ntr ḫw-f nh presents many difficulties of an intrinsic nature which give rise to some misgivings. As can be seen from the names quoted, and from many others of similar composition not here cited, but readily to be found in any number in Egyptian records, such names without exception begin with the name of a particular god, thus 'Amon, Isis, Maat, &c. speaks: may he live long', but nowhere is a name, such as 'God speaks: may he live long', without giving the name of the god, to be found. This has a good reason, because, when such a theophoric name was given to a child, the name of the god under whose protection the child was placed had to be explicitly mentioned. A more serious difficulty lies in the fact that names of this category had a specific augural character. They were numbered by the hundred, and were intended to protect the child from an evil fate by giving expression to the hope that it might be preserved in life by the protection and flat of the deity selected as patron. Now if the bestowal of such a name by superstitious parents, rendered anxious perhaps by the loss of several children, on a new-born, long-coveted child, to protect it against the recurrence of such a danger is quite comprehensible, in Joseph's case it would appear most astonishing and even ridiculous that the highest dignity on his elevation to the most powerful position in the empire should be given a name of this kind.

It is obvious that Steindorf's conjecture cannot be regarded as satisfactory; but besides there is another consideration of great importance. One would expect to find in the honorific cognomen conferred on the viser on so important an occasion, some allusion to his new dignity, some expression which in some way would point to the nature of his office, to his capacity and suitability for this office. Though this point has been taken into consideration, the interpretations given to ṛwš ṛwš are either phonetically unacceptable or only possible by the alteration or transposition of the letters.

I should, therefore, like to propose a much simpler explanation, one which is far more suitable to the occasion, and without any phonetic or grammatical difficulties. ṛwš ṛwš is to be dissected in the following fashion: ṭḥ (=-ōḥ) ṫ ụ ṫ nh = ṛwš ṛwš ṛwš ṛwš, i.e. 'food, sustenance of the land is the living' or 'this is the living one'. In support of this interpretation the following

Alfred Harkavy (Journal asiatique, 1870, p. 179), and later also Liehein (PSBA., 1898, p. 245, noted that thought of ṭḥ = food as the first element in ṛwš. Harkavy reads ṭḥ ṭḥ ṫ ụ ṫ nh = 'Nourishment, sauveur de la vie', but this is phonetically wrong as ṭḥ cannot possibly
points are particularly to be observed. First of all personal names with τ, dīf, as Liebhaber has already noted, are very old, occurring already in the Middle Kingdom, e.g. in theophoric names dīf y ḫy b'py; b'py dīf y; b'py dīf y 'my food is the Nile God' (Hoffmann, Theop. Namen, p. 69). Also the female name dīf š.t-nn = 'their food' which is obviously abbreviated, occurs very early (Petrice, Medit., 17; Sakkara Grab, 15, LD. ii. 48; Kairo, Scheintüre des A.R.). But even in the names of some kings of the 14th dynasty as early as the eighteenth century B.C., dīf occurs: thus the name of the second king is dīf mry rt 'food, sustenance, is the beloved of Re' and nā dīf rt 'lord of food, of sustenance is Re', the name of the fourth king (Gauthier, Le Livre des Rois, ii, 58; Burck. Piger, Handb. d. alt. Kyn., no. 182, 184; 187 reads similarly). The idea that the ruler of Egypt was also the feeder of Egypt is brought forth in both royal names and in eulogy and encomiums of the gods. Thus it is said of Khakon, Ameniophis IV (Davies, Amarna I, 38 East, 2) that he was the life-forces and the food of Egypt (ht dīfa n hmn). Consequently in dīf n hmn 'food of Egypt' we have a direct parallel to dīf n tr n tr = 'food of the land'. Further evidence is forthcoming in the fact that a king of the 13th dynasty (eighteenth century B.C.) bore the name dīf, n i.e. 'he who keeps alive, i.e. feeder of the "two lands"' (Hierogl. Texts, Brit. Mus. iv, pl. 22). Finally in p' nā the 'living' is to be taken in an optative sense: he who desires to live; or in an excited sense which is quite usual: he who is the living one. By our intermediary analogy to nī, according to Liebhaber it should read dīf mry p'y p' nā = 'Celui qui possède, ou donne, la nourriture de la vie'; but the Egyptian could only mean 'the food which is life', and never refer to a person who gives life. For dīf or dīf 'food', cf. Er. Gr. 200 a very common word for food, nourishment, and dīf or dīf 'to provide with food, to feed', p. 177. The defective spelling dīf is quite usual in Egyptian itself. The traditional vocalization may perhaps originally have been dīf n tr = dīf n tr = p' nā or p' nā or dīf n tr = dīf mry or dīf n tr = dīf mry (cf. tr n Coptic or (S) (B). A pronunciation which [and] would approach the reading handed down in the LXX, which possibly is corrupted from dīf n tr. Of course, this attempt to obtain the most probable pronunciation of the elements contained in dīf n tr transmitted in the Hebrew and Coptic texts is a mere speculation, the more so as the true pronunciation of Egyptian words is completely unknown to us.

This is how I regard these names and read them accordingly—the first name might be translated also 'My food (dīf n tr) is the beloved of Re'.

Cf. also 'the life force of the whole land' (ibid. iii, 19) or 'all men' (ibid. iii, 36; Genzow, Bild. Ausdr., 142). We find also n k n hmn 'nourishment of Egypt' as a title of the kings of the 19th and 20th dynasties, e.g. of Ramses II, Ag. WB., v, p. 98, also n k n hmn 'nourishment of every day' (ibid. p. 91). Later dīf n i.e. 'Feeding (or Feeder) of Egypt' as a title of the priest of Dendera, Ag. WB., iv, p. 38.

For p' nā one might also accept nā (nā) p' nā 'Food of the land, may be live'. The first reading, however, seems to be more plausible. Here p' nā or p' nā need not be a personal name although the names p' nā and p' nā occurring later (no. 1 dyn. 1200-1450 B.C. e.g.

8. Use of νο as title of high Egyptian Dignitaries

The title νο occurs several times in the Joseph and Exodus narrative in reference to high state or court officials, such as ṣerēpā (Gen. 41, 37, 39, 1); ṣerēpa (39, 21 ff.); ṣerēpa (40, 2 ff.); ṣerēpa (Ex. 11, 1). This word is of special interest because its use in the Joseph and Exodus narratives and elsewhere, in a specific meaning only becomes clear from Egyptian. As is well known in Akkadian larru = νο is an ordinary word usual for 'king, prince', whereas in Egyptian larru (Late-Egyptian written: sun) is a designation of high dignitaries. Now the Hebrew νο is generally explained from the Akkadian larru though in that case the Hebrew should be νο and not νο, nevertheless it could be admitted as an exception. It is most striking, however, that whereas larru in Akkadian, like maitu (םיאת), is used exclusively for king, prince, it appears in the Pentateuch, as the above examples show, only as a title of higher officials like larru in Egyptian. There is, furthermore, a circumstance which has not been sufficiently considered but which deserves special attention: Ex. 2, 14, reads 'Who put thee as νον, as a νο, and as a judge over us? Intendest thou to kill me as thou

on the mummy of Ramses III, Momics Regulier, 564, Ssehe, Karnak 21, 79-80; Spiegelberg, 'Briefe der 21 Dyn.' , ΑΕ, 53, pp. 5, 7, Rev. 14, p. 32 and 21, p. 13 ff.) may really have existed earlier.

1 For further details about this name cf. my Erweiterung, p. 20 ff.
killedst the Egyptian? That here "w" in the sense of prince does not really fit, especially after ḫw, has been felt by most commentators and translators, for which reason it has been generally more or less paraphrased. This suspicion is perfectly right and the fact that ḫw and ḥw appear together is not merely accidental. Now ḥw occurs in Egyptian already in Pyl. 1220 ('thou didst appoint him as ḥw'), and more frequently in later texts for high personages in various state and court offices. In many cases such officials are generally called ḥw.w (plural of ḥw) as well as ṣw.w (plural of ṣw 'the great').

But it is in the New Kingdom that ḥw appears with such frequency, notably in reference to judges in high positions, that one gets the impression that ḥw was actually a specific designation of a judicial office. We proceed to give a series of examples which show unmistakably the specific use of ḥw for judges or members of a high Court of Justice. Thus in Pyl. Turin 128, 6 ṣw.w n t n ḥw.t are 'judges of the town'; in Pyl. Anast. vi. 2, 8: the people were heard ṣ ḥw n ṣw.w 'before the judges'. Also in phrases like ḥw ḥw n ṣw.w 'standing before the ṣw.w' or 'the ṣw.w spoke' which often occur in judicial documents, obviously only judges can be meant. In many passages it is the members of the High Court ḥw.t who bear the title ḥw thus e.g. Pyl. Abbot 7, 8: ḥw ṣw.w ḥw.t n ḥw.t the great judges of the great ḥw.t (Court of Justice) of the town'. It is true that in earlier times as already observed ḥw occurs for high dignitaries generally, but already in the Old Kingdom and also in the Middle Kingdom the ḥw exercised judicial functions (Borchardt AZ. 1890, 89 ff.). L.D. ii. 149 c. a high dignitary is called, inter alia, also 'vizier and overseer of all the ṣw.w of judicial decisions (μυρ ṣw.w ούλων)'; in Pyl. d'Orb 19, 4 ṣw.w ṣw.w ḥw.t are 'the great judges of His Majesty', probably the members of the ḥw.t—High Court of Justice. Finally it may be added that not only in the above-mentioned Turin Pap. in reference to the trial relating to the harem inscription, but also in other judicial documents, judges are designated as ḥw.w (cf. also Spiegelb., Rechtsw. p. 15, 48, 104, 117). Thus the character of the ḥw as a judge of high rank is so palpably demonstrated that no further examples are necessary.

It is now clear that also in Ex. 2, 13 ḥw can very well have been used in the meaning of 'high judge'. It further becomes clear why ḥw is immediately followed by ṣw.w. By this interpretation of ḥw and the contiguity of ḥw and ṣw.w the presence of ṣw.w also is explained as being the equivalent

---

1 Significant for the Egyptian title ḥw is the fact that in the meaning 'prince' it was used only of Egyptian, but not of foreign princes (Er.-Gr. 165). Whether it is genuine Egyptian, or was originally derived from Akkadian, as W. M. Müller, AE. 44. 1 suggests, is a matter which cannot yet be decided.
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of which is said to be ‘beginning from sfr till Jupa’ (šfr m śfr r ḫupa), which is supposed to be identical with the land Ubi in the neighbourhood of Damascus mentioned in the Amarna tablets. In the edict of Haremheb (1350–1315 B.C.) sfr is mentioned several times as a prison for grievous offenders (Records, iii, 50 ff.), such as thieves, and tax collectors misusing their office to exploit the people, who were to be punished with having their noses cut off and being sent to sfr (parr. 51, 54, 55 and 56). In an inscription of Seti I (1319–1292 B.C.) sfr is mentioned again as starting-point of his campaign against Canaan in the words (L.D. iii. 126 a = Records, iii. § 88): ‘the slaughter (or destruction? = ḫh) which the mighty word of Pharaoh wrought among the hostile Shasu (ḫēša) beginning at the fortress of sfr down to Canaan’ (m šfr m ḫm n śfr r ḫw kµm m). In another passage (Records iii. § 109) it is called a ‘fortress’ (ḫm śfr) and in the adjacent scene Seti I is shown drawing the enemy prisoners into the fortress. Further, ibid., § 307 it is said of Rameses II (1290–1252 B.C.) that in the fifth year of his reign he passed through the fortress of sfr on his campaign against Asia; it is likewise mentioned (ibid., § 542) that when still Crown Prince he was commandant of the fortress sfr. The Karnak reliefs depicting the big campaigns of Rameses II in Palestine and Syria (L.D. iii. 126 a–b), show the fortress of sfr where on his triumphant return to Egypt, he was greeted by the great priests and the princes of Upper and Lower Egypt (cf. thereon also Erman-Ranke, p. 639 f.). Finally in an inscription of Merneptah, the son of Rameses II (1225–1215 B.C.), it is said that in the third year of his reign several Chiefs of the Archers were at the ‘Well of

9. The Chief Overseer of the Convicts and the ḫm n śfr for Penal Establishment

In the ṣfr n śfr ḫm Gen 39, 21 we have the title of the chief overseer of the convicts interned in the penal establishment called ṣfr n śfr ḫm, where also Joseph was imprisoned. That ṣfr n śfr ḫm really meant a penal institution is unmistakably implied by its fuller description in the preceding verse as ‘a place where the prisoners of the king were confined’. Now neither the origin nor meaning of the word ṣfr is clear, and as it occurs only in the Joseph story, and is exclusively applied to an Egyptian prison, it is highly probable that also the word itself is Egyptian.

Let us now see whether the Egyptian does not in fact give a clue leading to the discovery of the true meaning of the word and nature of the establishment. In many Egyptian inscriptions we find a word ṣfr which is also transcribed ṣfér with a final vowel. From a phonetic point of view ṣfr fully corresponds to ṣfr as Egyptian ḥ is quite regularly equivalent to Hebrew ḥ, and Egyptian ḥ is frequently represented in Hebrew by ṣ so that the transcription of ṣfr by ṣfr would be perfectly correct. As to ṣfr itself it occurs more in inscriptions of the New Kingdom than of any other time as the name of a fortress close to the Palestine frontier to which corrupt officials and notorious criminals were consigned. It appears for the first time in an inscription of Thutmose III about 1478 B.C., reporting a campaign undertaken by him from this spot in the twenty-second month of his reign ‘to enlarge the borders of Egypt’ (L.D. iii. 31, 16 a = Records, ii. § 412 and Erman-Ranke 629 f.). In Pap. Anast. iii. 1, 10 ṣfr is indicated as the boundary between Egypt and the land of Khar (or Khuru ḫruru), the extent

1 1 Kings 3, 1 shows quite clearly that the ‘daughter of Pharaoh’ is not to be taken literally, but as a title; otherwise it would have read simply ‘his daughter’; cf. also 11, 1.
1 In view of the pretension of some critics (e.g. P. Dhormes, Revue Biblique, 1909, p. 544, and Bergh Ztschrift f. Semit., 1926, p. 17) that ṣfr ḫm is not a Semitic word, according to the criteria applied by Semiticists, it is not enough emphasized that words of such nature can only be explained from the environment in which they happen to appear, and not by associating them with all kinds of words of similar sound. Not the hunt for etymologies through the search of words in dictionaries, can lead to a satisfactory solution, but the endeavour to understand things out of the conditions and languages with which they are closely connected.
1 The hieroglyph of the crouched lion can equally well stand for r as for ḫr; as far as I see, in passages where ṣfr is written in syllables, there is ṣfr w at the end, but clearly ḫr or alternatively ḥr (cf. below). I should like to go still further in suggesting that in the case of ṣfr and ṣfr the Egyptian spelling indicates that the pronunciation is ṣfr and ṣfr respectively. I shall deal more fully with this question elsewhere.
1 Under ṣfr or ḫm, the Egyptians understood a certain part of Palestine and it is doubtless identical with the ṣfr mentioned in the Pentateuch among the peoples of Palestine (cf. W. M. Müller, AE. 146 ff.). It should be noted that at the beginning of the fifteenth century B.C., the part of Palestine adjacent to ṣfr is called ṣfr = ṣfr, whereas in the twelfth century, under Merneptah, it is called ṣfr kµm ṣfr = ṣfr (see below).
1 The ṣfr are here, as elsewhere, doubtless identical with the ṣfr mentioned in Judges 2, 13 and perhaps in other passages, not in the accepted meaning of ‘plunderers’ but as a designation of certain Semitic tribes. Whether this word should be derived from the form ḫm ḫr ‘robbing, plundering’ is very doubtful. It should be noted that the word ṣfr is, as is generally admitted, contained also in ḫm ṣfr kµm ṣfr = kings of the Shasu, rendered by the Greeks as ἱάκων the Semitic kings who ruled over Egypt. Now it appears that according to the Coptic usage (ẖ) = shepherd, ḫr, WB. 207, the Egyptians associated this meaning with ṣfr; but it is questionable whether the meaning ‘shepherd’ is not derived from the nom. gentil. ṣfr. Generally speaking Egyptians understood under ṣfr = ṣfr, Asian š inject Judg. 2, 13 are the Shasu who settled in the neighbourhood of Canaan after they were driven out of Egypt;
1 Here as elsewhere Canaan is written with the article µr = the Canaan, and thus denotes the name of a country.
narrated in the Joseph story. Be that as it may, it is at any rate certain that at the time when the Joseph story was written the fortress *fr* was generally known as a place of confinement for criminals and political prisoners.1

It now remains to consider the purely phonetical question as to the pronunciation of *fr*. Until quite recently it was generally customary to reproduce the Egyptian name of the fortress by the spelling *taru* or *taru*. But since C. Kühtmann (Die Ostgrenze Ägyptens, Diss. 1911, p. 28 ff.) took up the identification of *fr* with *Sile* or *Selle*, already previously presumed by Dümichen (Geogr. äs. alten Äg., p. 238 ff.), strengthening it with some plausible grounds, it became customary to take it as a matter of fact that *fr* is *Selle* or *Sile* (cf. e.g. Erman-Ranke, p. 64 sg.) and to locate it in the neighbourhood of Al Kantaara instead of Ismaïla at the end of the Wadi-Tumilat as previously suggested. Now even if this be so it would not imply that the form *Sile-Selle* (Greek *Σηλη*, first transmitted in Graeco-Roman texts, actually reproduces the ancient pronunciation of the name in Egyptian. For although the transmission of Egyptian *r* into *l* is phonetically common, and in the Ptolemaic period *l* is also reproduced by *r*, this is not conclusive proof that the Egyptian pronunciation was *fr* not *r*.2 Indeed the spelling *sile* supports the pronunciation *r* in our case—even though it sometimes stands for *l*, which most surely emerges from the above-quoted passage Anast. i. 10: Ἐροῦ ἀπερί θητον αὐτῷ, and *fr* *fr* *fr* *fr* appear together, the sound value *r* in *fr* being written by the same hieroglyphic *l* as in *fr*. It cannot be assumed that the same scribe could have used one and the same sign in *fr* in one and the same sentence for a sound other than in the immediately preceding *fr* where the pronunciation *r* cannot be contested by any one.3 It is further to be considered that even in

---

1. The explanation of *sile* from the Hebrew *sul* given in Ebers Bücher Mess 317 and 319, is very far-fetched and has nothing to do with the cited Egyptian word *fr*/*l*, derived from *fr* (Brugsch, Lex. vii. 1242). On phonetic grounds, Naville's identification of *fr* with *fr* Gen. 13, 10 (PSBA, 1911) is just as tenable.

2. The transmission of *fr* into *sile* or *Selle* or *Zed* might, if the identification is at all correct, have taken place through the medium of one of the vernacular dialects in which the *r* was later replaced by *l* and is more usually the case in Fayumic Coptic, where in many cases *l* replaces *r* of other Coptic dialects, as e.g. *εροῦ* 'dough' for *εροῦ* = Hebrew *סילк*. For the correspondence of *l* in Fayumic to *r* in Egyptian or in other Coptic dialects cf. Denvael, Ezyiologie Copt. p. 51. For the explanation of this transmission it is necessary to mention that the Egyptian script has no special sign for *l*, probably because the Egyptians could not pronounce it. Hence all Semitic and Greek words with *l* were transliterated by *l*. Cf. below note 20 to p. 92.

3. Even Sethe who accepts without question the identification of *Sile-Selle* with *fr* and also follows Kühtmann in the localization of *Sile*, nevertheless clings to the previous transcription *fr*, cf. GGA, 1922, p. 235; also Erman, Ein Fall afgehornten Textes, p. 17, where *fr* is possibly derived from the fortress *fr*, i.e. 'he from *fr*'. Cf. also Burch., Aïtken, No. 1138, on *fr*. 

---
10. ‘Mouth’, as title and its relation to ḫn[t]n

Ex. 4, 16 f. reads: ‘he (Aaron) shall be unto thee for a mouth ḫn[t]n and thou shalt be to him a God’ ḫn[t]n. Here ‘mouth’ ḫn[t]n is not used by the narrator metaphorically for interpreter, representative, or the like—as is generally presumed—but is a literal rendering of the Egyptian ḫr ‘mouth’, a very well-known title of a high office at the court of Pharaoh. The office of a ‘Mouth’ was so important indeed that it was held by the highest state dignitaries. Thus especially in the New Kingdom the titles ‘Mouth’ and ‘Chief Mouth’ frequently occur in reference to persons of high rank who, as chief superintendents and overseers of public works, acted as intermediaries between the king and government officials. In some cases the highest dignitaries are called ‘Mouth’ or ‘Chief Mouth’ of the king. E.g. Ahmose, Urb. iv. 33, 8 says: ‘(I was) the ḫr Mouth (of the king) who brought tranquillity to the whole land [and who filled the heart of the king (i.e. with love and satisfaction) every day]’; Urb. 58, 6: ‘the Chief-Mouth’ of all building-works (ḫr ḫtw n kwn nth); Urb. iv. 405, 3: (the king) made me ‘Chief Mouth’ of his house (ḫr ḫtw n pr-f); ibid. 456, 17 f.: ‘Speaking Mouth (ḫr mdw) of the mistress of the two lands in order to give satisfaction to the whole country’; similarly ibid. 482, 2; likewise Harris 75, 3: n nwh ḫr ḫtw ḫrw ṣw ḫn[t]n ‘No “Chief Mouth” had they for many years’. In many cases we find also the title ‘Ears of the king’ e.g. ‘Ears of the king of Lower Egypt (ḫnw n btyy), Champ. Not. I. 481, i.e. the representative of the king who receives on his behalf the petitions of his subjects.

As a rule it was the heir to the throne who occupied the position of a ‘Chief Mouth’ to the king, thus e.g. Haremhab was, as Crown Prince, the ‘Chief Mouth’ to the king (TSBD. iii. p. 486 f.); Rameses II when ten years old received the title ‘Chief Mouth’ of the army as Commander-in-Chief.

1 Nektanebos is there described as ṣḫk[t] n ḫr m ṣḏr, i.e. ‘first prince in ḫr’; he is also called ‘prince (ḥk) of the foreign lands’.

2 As I shall explain elsewhere I have reason to believe that the manner in which ḫrw (ḥrw) is written indicates pronunciation of the first syllable as ḫ. Similarly ḫr (ḥr) may indicate a pronunciation ḫ of the first syllable.
would receive inspiration from him. The whole is conceived throughout
in an Egyptian spirit, and was intended for people thoroughly familiar
with the conditions and also the language of Egypt, so that they would
immediately recognize in the Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל ‘mouthish’ and יְהֹוָה ‘God’, used
contiguously, the Egyptian rm and ntr and understand that Moses was to
be the ntr = דַּוְיָל and Aaron his rm = לְהַל ‘mouth’; likewise that in con-
nexion with Pharaoh too not he but Moses was to be considered the ntr =
דַּוְיָל. ¹

In conclusion we would mention that also the title ‘the Ears of Pharaoh’
may perhaps be contained in יִשְׂרָאֵל Gen. 50. 4. It cannot mean here
‘publicly’ as e.g. Gen. 23. 10 ff. because, quite to the contrary, must it be
Joseph’s desire that his request should be confidentially conveyed to
the King. This mission would admirably fit within the functions of the
‘Ears of Pharaoh’ whose duty it was, as we have seen, to transmit to the
King the petitions of his subjects. We mention this interpretation as
a mere suggestion, as this phrase can quite easily be a respectful circum-
locution for the person of Pharaoh as יִשְׂרָיֶל in יִשְׂרָאֵל (cf. above, p. 13 f.). ²

11. The use of ‘Pharaoh’ as title for the King of Egypt

In conclusion we deem it necessary to discuss the title יִשְׂרָיֶל, though much
has already been written thereon. ² Within the bounds of our investigation
it is important to place the meaning and usage of this title in our narratives
in its proper light. It has always been a puzzling feature that there the king
of Egypt is never mentioned by name, but throughout merely as ‘Pharaoh’. As
Chabas already observed in 1865 יִשְׂרָיֶל is a reproduction of the Egyptian
Pr-3-y ‘the great house’ ³. Originally it designated the royal palace; it was

¹ Whether the Egyptians also used the plural ntr as ‘the gods’ in reference to Pharaoh,
I am unable to ascertain. It is, nevertheless, of significance that in the Amarna Tablets, the
Pharaoh is entitled ilitim, pl. of ilu, i.e. ‘the gods’ in the plural, cf. Knudtzon, i, no. 235.
² Cf. inter alia Steinendorf, Beiträge zur Assyriologie, i, 325 f.; W. M. Müller, Encycl. Bibl.
³ Az. 43. 130 and Kopt. Etymol., p. 32.

2 It must however be stated that P. E. Jablonski (Oxyriudes, Leyden, 1864-10, i, 370) had
already long before him recognized an Egyptian word in יִשְׂרָיֶל on the ground of the Coptic
(ί)πποο = king.
EGYPTIAN TITLES AND OFFICIAL DIGNITIES

Urb. i. 33 A. and B. = Records, l. § 186, in the time of the high dignitary of the kings Weserkaf and Sahure who called himself the Treasurer of the Holy Writings of the Great House (pr-sy). In the New Kingdom (1580-1100 B.C.) i.e. the period of Israel’s sojourn in Egypt, pr-sy was quite ordinarily used of the person of the king (Erman-Ranke, p. 63). Even in edicts such as e.g. that of Haremheb (1320-1315 B.C.) and in writings by order of the king as e.g. in the Pap. Harris written by command of Ramesses III (1198-1167 B.C.) in which he himself occasionally appears as the person speaking, the king is simply referred to as pr-sy. Pharaoh, without any mention of his proper name. It was only after the fall of the 20th dynasty (about 1100 B.C.), i.e. long after the Exodus, that the custom of referring to the king succinctly as ‘Pharaoh’ passed out of usage; and it is most striking that in many hieratic documents of the 22nd dynasty (945-743), i.e. as late as the Solomonic period, ‘Pharaoh’ or ‘King of Upper and Lower Egypt’ is followed by the proper name of the king, just as in the historical texts of the Bible as will be shown below.

Now though the omission by the narrator of the Joseph and Exodus stories to mention Pharaoh by name is regrettable from the point of view of historical accuracy, he was thereby merely following the custom of Egyptian writers of the New Kingdom, as can be clearly seen from the popular literature of that period, and precisely this fact is specially significant for the determination of the time when those stories were composed. A mere perusal of the tales and narratives of that period clearly conveys the impression that in referring to the king simply as pr-sy the name of the Pharaoh was well-known to the writer, and that he assumed a similar knowledge on the part of his readers. In the story of the two brothers Pap. d’Or. x–xvii = Lit. 156–161, pr-sy is almost always used for the king followed only here and there with ‘His Majesty’ (hm-sy) e.g. ‘The scribes and learned men of Pharaoh were sent for and they said unto Pharaoh etc.; ‘thou wilt be laden with silver and gold because thou leadest me to Pharaoh’; ‘and Pharaoh loves him much etc.; ‘Pharaoh had great pity for him’ etc.; ‘the princess rode on horseback behind Pharaoh’ etc.; ‘Pharaoh approached’ etc.; and similarly in many other passages. Likewise in ordinary letters of the New Kingdom the proper name of the reigning king was omitted and he was referred to simply as Pharaoh, e.g. Pap. Anast. v.

1 Breasted apparently read: lst pr-sy ntr ‘palace of Pharaoh the god’, an interpretation which can hardly be substantiated. It must read: mg.l ntr pr-sy ‘holy writings of the great house’. Moreover, one would hardly have referred to the king as pr-sy at so early a time.

2 The papyrus is from a disciple of the time of Menepthah (about 1220 B.C.), the story, however, is much older (cf. Lit., 150, n. 8).
in historical texts an Egyptian king should be mentioned by name. It is still more natural that in a land outside Egypt and writing in an environment outside the sphere of Egyptian influence, a Hebrew historian should mention the kings of Egypt in the same way as he did those of other neighbouring lands, like Moab, Aram, Tyre, and other countries like Assyria, and Babylonia, for the simple reason that he could not assume that the names of these kings would be known to every one. Although this reason is in itself sufficient, another very remarkable fact is to be added viz. the custom, during and after Solomon's time, of mentioning the name of the king before the name of Josh 1 7 or after the name which is also in complete conformity with a usage that first at that period became current in Egypt itself. For just as 1 Kings 11, 40 and 14, 29 refer to יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל or 2 Kings 23, 29 and Jer. 46, 2 יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל or יְהֹוָה יְהוָא יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָא יִשְׂרָאֵל Jer. 44, 30, so at the beginning of the Dachau-Sieila (Rec. 21, 13 = Records iv. § 726), there is reference to Sheshonk I, the contemporary of Solomon (945-924 B.C.) thus: in the year five etc. of the king, the Pharaoh, Sheshonk (נִשְׁנָק) pr'-t 'nd. stb) Others dating down to as far as the 26th dynasty (663-525 B.C.) and later read similarly, wherein the traditional custom of prefacing the name of the king with the complete list of his high-sounding titles is departed from. Of these, mention may be made here of the kings of Egypt named in the Bible. Thus Gauthier, Liere des Rois, iv. p. 31 f. in the third year of Pharaoh, Taharka (n pr'-t 3 'thrw = יְהֹוָא יִשְׂרָאֵל 2 Kings 19, 7) ibid.: in the fifth year etc. of the king of Upper Egypt (n nwm) Takeh: ibid.: in the seventh year etc. of the king of Lower Egypt (byty) Takeh: ibid.; p. 86 ff. in the first year etc. of His Majesty (br hm n) the king of Upper and Lower Egypt (עָרְבָו לִבָּד) Hehemibea-Necho (n konw) 1 נְכֹר 2 Kings 23, 29; ibid. p. 105; in the third year etc. of King Apries (עָרְבָו לִבָּד-רְפֵעַ) 2 קְנֵנ יִשְׂרָאֵל Jer. 44, 39. After the 22nd dynasty pr'-t appears generally very infrequently; as a rule the title ָבְו ָן 'lord of the two lands' or nisq t bytyt king of Upper and Lower Egypt 1; sometimes also, הָבְו יְהוָא יִשְׂרָאֵל 'ruler of both shores' was added to the name. 1

1 Cf. Loyd, Status des Neuen Reiches (Poth., no. 20): pr n pr'-t. It occurs particularly frequently in Demotic literature (Spiegelberg, Demoti. Studien, v. p. 26 no. 5). In Coptic υπερπηγα (S) is used simply for palace, as may be seen from the Coptic translation of Esther 4, 6, 7, 8 (Spiegelberg, W.B., p. 94 and Kopt. Etym., p. 19).

2 Spiegelberg, Zeitshr. f. Semiti., 1939, p. 122 went so far as to declare that the whole Joseph story is based on a confusion with the history of the Hyksos rule in Egypt. But this misleading theory which he shares with some other Egyptologists, is merely a reproduction of the far-fetched suggestion by Josephus that the Hyksos kings were of Hebrew origin. It is only astonishing that Josephus, spurred by Spiegelberg, as by so many others, as a very unreliable authority, sholud insist in this case be credited with having hit the mark! 2 This cannot be emphasized strongly enough because in spite of all the crushing evidence

adduced in the German edition, there are still critics who go on repeating Spiegelberg's argument as to the lack of historicity of the Joseph story because of the omission of the name of Pharaoh! This is only possible because these critics, relying too much on Spiegelberg's authority, did not apparently deem it necessary themselves to examine the contrary evidence.

1 In the Ptolemaic period we again find pr'-t followed by the name simply for 'king', e.g. ְיִשְׂרָאֵל 'king Ptolemaus'. The use of pr'-t for the queen was new, cf. e.g. W. M. Miller, Egyptol. Researches, vol. iii. Bilingual deities of Philos, p. 21, col. 2. Demotic text: pr'-t p’utnwm m pr'-t, dpyw = 'King Ptolemaus and Queen Arinone'. The fact that here in the semi-sacred hieroglyphic text the king is called w-nw = 'son of Re' instead of pr'-t
CHAPTER III
ORDINARY EXPRESSIONS AND PHRASES MODELLED ON EGYPTIAN

To the above selection of polished speech and court phraseology in Egyptian we would add a number of expressions and phrases from the Joseph and Exodus narratives which are of a more general character and belong to ordinary life.

In many cases we encounter peculiar expressions and turns of speech, which are Hebrew in origin and form, but the sense of which cannot be explained from their customary use either in Hebrew or cognate languages. In other cases the current and generally accepted interpretation seems so unquestionable that one thinks of making it the subject of special study to consider whether it is at all tenable. Yet on closer examination in the light of Egyptian, we find that they are true Egyptianisms, and that some of them have a quite specific meaning which likewise only becomes clear by comparison with Egyptian.¹

1. 'Hear' for 'Understand'

At the beginning of his conversation with Joseph, Pharaoh says: 'I have dreamed a dream and there is none that can interpret it; but I have heard of thee that thou understandest a dream to interpret it'. For 'understand' the Hebrew has נֵצַּ֣ן (natzan) to hear: 'thou hearest a dream'. This corresponds entirely to the Egyptian use of ἰδέξ (iđex) 'to hear'= 'to understand', a meaning which is most clearly shown by its use in the phrase, Sin. 31 f.: ἱδέξ ρέν ἑξ κν : 'thou hearest the mouth of Egypt' i.e. thou understandest the language of Egypt, or in Wen-Amon, 77: iex iđex md.t knt. 'he hears the speech of Egypt', i.e. he understands the language. Likewise in Gen. 42, 23 נֵצַּ֣ן stands for understanding the language, exactly as in Egyptian.²

¹ To avoid misleading suggestions, it should at once be pointed out that many expressions in modern languages (especially German and English), which coincide with the Hebrew expressions dealt with here and elsewhere are not genuine, but based on Bible translations, whence they passed into those languages, and are therefore to be regarded simply as Hebraisms, some of which go back to Egyptian.

² It is worthy of note that in the Pentateuch נֵצַּ֣ן in the sense of understanding a language occurs only in the two passages cited and in Gen. 11, 7 where it is likewise an Egyptianism as will be shown later on.
make live (=feed) their herds (šnḥ nm.y.w. in.w.f) on the pasturage of Pharaoh. In later Egyptian (Demotic) šnḥ occurs quite frequently for ‘feed’; and šnḥ is used for ‘alimentation’ Sethe-Partsch, p. 68 (note) 369, 387. Cf. also Mar. Dend. i. 18 and ii. 42 b. As far as Ṣnḥ is concerned, we find also in Egyptian the feminine form śnḥ.t, ‘living’ for ‘corn’ in the sense of ‘food’; cf. Admon 6, 9: ‘śnḥ.t n lm.t ‘Nourishment, Food of Egypt’, a striking example of this usage of the New Kingdom, which is of prime importance for the period of the Pentateuch under study.1

The Egyptian also threw full light on the unusual construction šnḥ Ṣnḥ in the passage Ṣnḥ Ṣnḥ in Gen. 50, 20 which has given rise to various interpretations and emendations. For it corresponds literally with the Egyptian ṣəy ‘to make’, ṣnḥ ‘to live’, i.e. ‘to make live’ in the sense of ‘feed’ e.g. Bauer, i. p. 81: ‘ḥt n ṣnḥ.t bnm.t šnḥ.t bnm.w.f, literally ‘make thou the living of his wife and his children’, i.e. ‘feed them’.2 A still more striking example is to be found in Harris 78, 13 = Records, iv. § 410 where ṣnḥ like śnḥ appears in the causative form and is linked with ṣy to make = śnḥ so that the whole construction ṣy-ṣnḥ coincides literally with śnḥ even from a grammatical point of view. There Rameses III says of himself: ṣy-ṣnḥ ṣnḥ t ḫ t ḫf ‘I caused to live the whole land’, that is, maintain and feed the whole land. Similarly it is said of the king, in the Stele of Nastesen, Urkh. iii. 14(1 = Egypt. ṣy-ṣnḥ t ḫ t ḫ t ṣnḥ t my ḫn. ‘He makes live (i.e. feeds) all beings like Amon’. That also šnḥ Ṣnḥ is a typically Egyptian idiom = m ḫw Ṣnḥ will be shown elsewhere.

4. The meaning of śnḥ.

Ex. 19 the Hebrew midwives said to Pharaoh that the Hebrew women were not as the Egyptian women, ‘for they are śnḥ and before the midwives come in unto them they have borne’. This word śnḥ is generally considered to be obscure and even doubtful. We shall find that in this case also the Egyptian can help us out of the difficulty.

In the first place it should be remembered that śnḥ Ṣnḥ, as Spiegelberg, Randlouns, p. 19f. has proved, is a specific Egyptian birth-seat or stool, 1 Though the usual rendering of śnḥ.t is ‘corn’, it obviously means ‘nourishment, food’, 2 Other substantiations of this meaning from that period are not known to me, though there are some from later periods like the passages quoted from Mar. Dend. Apparently also Bauer, B, i. 81 and B 125, ṣy-ṣnḥ, had originally the feminine šnḥ.t (cf. Vogelsang, ad loc., p. 82).

The expression ṣy-ṣnḥ followed by a suffix (or genitive) everywhere means ‘to provide the maintenance of someone’, i.e. to feed (cf. Vogelsang loc. cit., as well as the examples there quoted, Pyram. 131, 9, Urkh. ii. 110, Mar. Abyd. ii. 63).
which already in a papyrus of the sixteenth century B.C. (Zauberzüge f. Mutter u. Kind, 6, 5, Abb. d. Berl. Ak., 1901, p. 25) is called the two bricks’ (gbd.ty, dual of gbd.t; neo-Eg. gbd.t). It was a seat of two large, fairly high bricks, on which the woman to be confined squatted whilst the midwife sat in front to receive the child in her lap. As the midwives were the first to recognize the sex of the newly-born at the bearing-seat of the two bricks’, Pharaoh’s plan clearly consisted in causing them secretly to stifle the boys in the very moment of birth, before anyone could notice it. That is what is meant by the words (1, 16): ‘When ye deliver the Hebrew women, ye shall look on the pibub, i.e. the “two bricks”’. This was only possible for the midwives to do, and they simply did not carry our Pharaoh’s behest. When Pharaoh reproached them for their remissness, they sought to justify themselves by the fact that the Hebrew women were miw.t and were delivered before the arrival of a midwife. The rapidity and ease of delivery is given as the obstacle preventing the midwives from being on the spot just in time to carry out Pharaoh’s command. Accordingly it must be precisely the facile birth which is the most characteristic feature in miw.t. Proceeding from this point of view we do in fact, obtain through Egyptian a clue to the meaning of this word: for the Egyptians had in addition to the collective designation for small cattle as (neo-Egyptian lw.t, Er.-Gr. 23 and 3) also the living one, in fem. form (Er.-Gr. 27) for goats, sheep, an expression which presumably had some contemptuous tinge (also in masc. from nb, probably for be-goat, ram). We thus have in nb.t a word which in form and meaning provides us with the model on which miw.t was formed and this is what is meant by miw.t, since goats, and in still greater degree sheep, are most easily and quickly delivered. What the midwives wanted to convey was that the Hebrew women were like goats and sheep: before a midwife could possibly arrive, they were already delivered. In using this comparison the midwives sought not only to explain the reason for the frustration of Pharaoh’s plan, but also to simulate contempt for the Hebrew women before Pharaoh, and even their anger against them for coming to

birth so quickly, and thus dispel in Pharaoh’s mind any suspicion of favouring their own people. As to pibub, the dual form is of particular importance because in Egyptian also the dual form gbd.ty ‘the two bricks’ was in use before the twelfth century B.C. (the time of the Exodus), whereas later the bearing-stool was simply called ‘the brick’, in the singular, or more fully ‘the brick of bearing’ (hōt.n miw.t) in the later Demotic period (Pap. Rhind 1, 2, 2). As a matter of fact, as will be seen from the grouping of the various determinative hieroglyphs for the bearing-stool in Spiegelberg, loc. cit. p. 22, the older and more primitive bearing-stool actually consisted of two single bricks. It only later developed into one piece put together from several bricks and having the form of a semi-circular seat with an opening in front, hence the use of the singular is explained by its referring to the seat as a whole and not to the two bricks of which it had previously consisted.

The circumstance that the two bricks’ were a typically Egyptian apparatus, that pibub is used in the dual form and finally that it only occurs in our passage, there being in the whole of the rest of the Bible no trace of

1 From the form pibub it follows that the singular is pibub not pibub. Whether it was intendedly formed to distinguish it from pibub or whether they are from different roots is a question awaiting solution. It may be mentioned that hēm.t in Egyptian denotes a sort of stone, e.g. Uruk. iv. 831, b: “a gate was made for it of stone of hēm.t (m tw n hēm.t)”. It must have been a hard stone as it was used for millenniums, which were therefore called simply hēm.t.

2 This observation of mine has been confirmed by experienced veterinary authorities. Though it is likewise the case with the sow, this naturally does not come under consideration because the pig was, to Egyptians and Hebrews alike, an abomination.

3 In the Coptic translation of the Pentateuch (ed. Lagarde) pibub is rendered by ṭerabet which might correspond to the Egyptian hōt.n miw.t: ‘the place of birth’. Spiegelb., loc. cit., p. 20, though we have no example thereof in Egyptian texts. It is curious that this translator should not have known the specific Egyptian expression gbd.ty ‘the two bricks’, though the word db.t was still in use in the Coptic ëthwën, ëthk (Sp. W. 141), and even the bearing-seat of bricks was known as late as the Middle Ages, as appears from the Elia Apocalypse 28, 7 ‘she who gives birth . . . speaks: wherefore do I sit on the brick to bring children into the world?’ The expression used here ëthk ëthk coincides literally with the above-cited older Egyptian phrase hēm.t (Spiegelb., loc. cit., p. 22).
such a delivery-seat in Israel, can only be explained by the fact that our narrator had personal acquaintance with, and exact knowledge of, these things.

It should further be observed that also כַּיִּים 'to cause to bear, help delivery' (only Ex. 1, 16) completely coincides with the Egyptian appid ('Ex.-Gr. 162), causative form of nág 'bear', i.e. 'to make bear'. Likewise נָאָפַת midwife (only Ex. in Chap. 1 and Gen. 35, 17, 38, 46) corresponds to appid.t 'she who causes to bear' (Urkh. lv. 225). Although these two are expressions quite naturally formed and might occur in any other language, it is, nevertheless, remarkable that they are to be found only in the Exodus story and coincide completely with Egyptian.

5. מֶשֶךְ—The 'Houses' of the Hebrew Midwives.

The astuteness with which the Hebrew midwives evaded Pharaoh's accusation must have impelled Pharaoh to resort to another more promising measure. The appointment of Egyptian midwives would not suit his purpose as they would certainly not have been accepted by the Hebrews; just as little could the organization of a detective service have been practicable as it would always have been successfully eluded. No other means was left to Pharaoh but to continue employing the Hebrew midwives for his design, and so he was prompted to use a new method whereby the midwives, as well as the prospective mothers, could be prevented from concealing the birth of boys. In a country like Egypt, where magic and clairvoyance were far more widely spread than in any other land, only a magic means was calculated to work terror and intimidation. The narrator indicates how such a means was found by which the end in view could best be achieved. Though he is not explicit, a clue is given us in the word מֶשֶךְ = 'houses' (Ex. 1, 21), which shows what he had in mind. According to 2 Kings 23, 7 מֶשֶךְ means 'houses for idols'; and the use of this word coincides exactly with the use in Egyptian of pr.w 'houses' (pl. of pr house) for 'houses' or 'arks' for the idols in the Temples and elsewhere, cf. e.g. Urkh. v. 164, 1: 'the gods of Buto who are in front of their houses', i.e. houses, arks (pr.w p.j.y.t: nág pr.w-lí).

If this meaning is accepted also for מֶשֶךְ in our case, the situation at once becomes quite clear: Pharaoh commanded the placing in all the Hebrew houses of images of terrifying deities (e.g. Sekhmet or Bes), as awesome watchmen to inspire constant fear in the Hebrew women, not only for the new-born boys, but also for the girls, whose lives had to be spared by Pharaoh's command, and even for their own lives. In this way the women were to be forced not to conceal male births, so as to avoid the wrath of such frightful observers. The narrator tells us of the counter-measures taken by the Hebrews to frustrate Pharaoh's plan: being familiar with Egyptian conceptions regarding their gods and their ways of treating them, they resorted to that means, wherewith all heathen peoples and even to-day superstitious persons seek to nullify the effects of the inconvenient presence of an idol or an image; what they did was to make מֶשֶךְ 'housings' for these idols, and hide them therein, so as to deprive them of all control. In connection herewith it is to be noted that in this passage מֶשֶךְ is used for idols.

That the narrator of Exodus sometimes applied מֶשֶךְ not to מֶשֶךְ but in the Egyptian sense of pr.w = god, is proved by Ex. 4, 16, where as we have shown above (p. 43), it occurs in this sense and therefore no difficulty arises in treating מֶשֶךְ here also as pr.w referring to the Egyptian gods or idols, which Pharaoh commanded to be set up. Now we are in a position to understand the whole passage. And it came to pass that because the midwives feared the "gods" they (the Hebrews) made for them מֶשֶךְ "houses", i.e. "housings". It will now be understood why Pharaoh found it necessary to command the whole people to cast every newborn Hebrew boy into the river: he had to resort to this measure because the 'gods' had proved completely ineffective.

6. 'People of the land'.

In Ex. 5, 4 f. Pharaoh says to Moses and Aaron: 'Wherefore do ye disturb the people (מְנֹּה) in their work. Get you unto your burdens!' and Pharaoh says further: 'Behold the "people of the land" (מְנֹּה הָאָדָם) now are many, &c.' Here Pharaoh seems to refer to a particular class and not to speak generally of the people, so that מְנֹּה לְאָדָם 'the people of the land' is not the same as 'the people' (מְנֹּה). Now in Egyptian literature, particularly of the New Kingdom, we meet with the expression rm.t n p.t 'people...
of the land'; denoting folk belonging neither to the lower nor the upper class; cf. Abbott, 4, § Records, p. 257; rmjt n pr ti 'folk, people of the land'; Harris, 1, 1, rmjt n pr ti 'people of the land' are mentioned besides 'high officials' (Ir.w), 'standard bearers' (J.t.w-b.rj.t), and 'inspectors' (rdq.w). Thus standing between the upper and lower strata (cf. also Erman, Ag. 188) they were a middle-class composed of what one might call ordinary citizens. This is the people that Pharaoh had in mind: they were people who were not subjected to forced labour, and were allowed to pursue their own affairs and move about freely like Moses, Aaron, the Elders, and many others not fitted for work.

In the light of this fact it becomes intelligible why two different expressions, viz. pr.wn and rdq.w, are used. The first can only imply disturbance of a particular continuous work like the forced labour in our case: the second is a causative of nšm 'to abstain from work, to be idle' and relates to the suspension of voluntary activity or some undefined business. Now Pharaoh told Moses and Aaron that they should not 'disturb' the labourers in their prescribed work which they had to perform continuously day by day, and he adds angrily and scornfully: there are enough 'people of the land', i.e. leisured folk who do not work and produce nothing; let these people 'go idle', make them leave their affairs and occupy themselves with such things as sacrificing to your God.

7. To Make the Saviour Stink.

Ex. 5, 21. The Hebrews say to Moses and Aaron: 'You have made our savour stink (וּמָנוֹר רְעָצוֹן) in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants' (cf. also Gen. 34, 30). This is an idiom which coincides with Egyptian ḫwāt 'to stink' in conjunction with mn 'name'; to 'make the name of anyone to stink' means 'to libel, to accuse, to impute', as is shown by the following examples: Pab. Anzst., l. 28, 7, Gardiner, Egypt. Hieratic Texts, p. 20 = Lit. 234) that you should not say thou hast made my name to stink (mn mn-rw-⟨γ⟩) before all other people'; Ani, L'Egyptologie Nov. 1874, p. 87, max. 9: 'go not in and out at the Court of Justice that thy name should not stink (tm mn-rw-⟨γ⟩)'; Ani, ibid. July, p. 150, max. 22: 'ally

1 For more details about rmjt against Spiegelberg's allegations, see Erwiderung, p. 8f.
2 The same differentiation occurs also in Gen. 42, 6: first of all it is the common people, i.e. the ordinary citizens (נָוֹר נְבִיָּה) who are supplied by Joseph with corn; it is only later that the landed proprietors and peasants are also dealt with (47, 16 ff.). It is now clear that in Gen. 33, 1, 2, 17, rōwn means the citizens, and thereby the difficulty felt by many commentators is removed. It has the same meaning also in 2 Kings 23, 30; it was the middle class, not the peasantry, who proclaimed Jehoshah as king.
3 Here a warning is given to avoid having too much to do with Law Courts, in order not

8. 'Voices' or 'Voices of God' for 'Thunder'.

Ex. 9, 33, 39, 34, 20 'voices' and 9, 38 'sōn nēf 'voices of God' are quite common designations among the Egyptians for thunder. For them it was ḫwāt n ntr 'a voice of God' or ḫwāt ḫw 'a voice of Heaven'. Wen-Amon, ii. 15, Rec. xx. 37 has: mk tr inmn ḫwāt mn tr p.t. 'take care, Amon will "make a voice" in Heaven, i.e. thunder'; here it is called the voice of Amon exactly as Ex. 9, 28 the voice of God'. Besides ḫwāt ḫw 'to make
come under suspicion of abetting bribery. Even to-day in the East such shady agents haunt the Law Courts, and even idle speculators, if they too often frequent the Law Courts, are suspected as such. It is, therefore, not considered respectable to be seen in a Law Court unless one has business there.

4 The allusion is to a man who is under suspicion of misusing his slave for unclean purposes, an evil which was already very common in ancient Egypt as one can see inter alia from the various 'Confessions before the Court of the Dead' (Tell el Amarna, 2. 15 = Urk. Wander, p. 376, 19-30).
5 Exodus, 2, 1 and 10, 1 are based on the antithetic conception of the bad and good savour of the name.

6 Also in Ex. 7, 16, 21 ḫwāt is used of stinking of fish, which for the Egyptians was particularly intolerable and therefore proverbial. It is used also of frogs, Ex. 8, 10, and of the rotten and maggotty manna, 16, 20, 24.

7 ḫwāt ḫw is the prototype of the Coptic ḫrīyētā (S) sēpārētā (B) 'thunder' (Spiegel. WB. 14 and 243). The Coptic also has ḫrīyētētē and ḫrīyētētē for thunder (ibid. 245), which also points to an Egyptian ḫwāt n p.t. 'voice of Heaven', though no example in Egyptian texts has yet been found thereof. Pyy. 1120 gives ḫwāt p.t. 'speaking of Heaven' in the sense of thunder (when the Heaven speaks, the earth trembles, etc.).

In Schellin, pl. iii, 57, ḫwāt stands in conjunction with ḫw: 'kōf ḫwān, y ḫwāt ḫw 'then I heard the voice of a thunder'; possibly ḫw means 'storm' or perhaps it is synonymous
CHAPTER IV

PARTS OF THE BODY USED IN PHRASES

Among the expressions in which particular parts of the body occur as e.g. head, arm, hand, lip, heart, there are some of idiomatic character, and others which are used as mere formulae coinciding literally with the Egyptian in both cases. The coincidence is so close that in many instances the correct meaning of the Hebrew expression only becomes clear by comparison with the Egyptian. In some other cases especially where parts of the body are used metaphorically, there is such an exact, almost literal coincidence between the Hebrew and the Egyptian that they elucidate each other. This branch of linguistic study is so extraordinarily prolific and comprehensive, that here we merely confine ourselves to a few characteristic examples from the Joseph and Exodus narratives under review, leaving to another occasion a fuller discussion of the subject as a whole.1

1. Lift up the Head

Gen. 40:13 reads: 'Yet within three days הָעָשָׂי אֵלֶּיהָ shall Pharaoh lift up his head and restore thee unto thy place.' In וָעָשָׂי we have a literal reproduction of the Egyptian expression תָּאִי (also עָשָׂי) לְפָק֣וּד יָרְאַת to lift up, to elevate the head' which in ritual speech was quite usual for awakening the dead to new life. Thus e.g. Gen. 1:14. In the dead king: 'I lift up his face, I raise his head (תָּאִי לְפָק֣וּד יָרְאַת) that he may convey a command.' Ps. 150:1; (to the dead king) 'thy head is uplifted by the two godly Enneads... thou livest! thou livest!' 150:1. His head is uplifted by Re etc. Always it is a deity that 'lifts up' his head. So here it is represented to the incarnated butler that Pharaoh will 'lift up' his head in order to restore him to his former place. In this sense וָעָשָׂי occurs only here, and the narrator expressly translates a select phrase so full of fateful significance to an Egyptian, in order that he may exactly

1. P. Dhoron, L'Amploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu contient many parallels to a similar use in Hebrew; but as will be shown on another occasion, it is only by a comparison between Hebrew and Akkadian on the one side, and Hebrew and Egyptian on the other side, that it can be decided whether the use of a Hebrew phrase is more akin to Akkadian or Egyptian.

1. As everywhere the hieroglyphic for 'head' can be read both לְפָק֣וּד יָרְאַת and לְפָק֣וּד יָרְאַת, we will transcribe it always by לְפָק֣וּד יָרְאַת except in passages where לְפָק֣וּד יָרְאַת is written syllabically.
reproduce the Egyptian idiom in the conversation of the Hebrew with the high Egyptian officials, thereby emphasizing Joseph's familiarity with the select speech and the religious conceptions of the Egyptians in his intercourse with exalted personages, even before his summons to Court. Thus in this passage also there is an intentional approximation to Egyptian.

2 Heavy Eyes.

In Gen. 48, 10 it is said of Jacob, that his eyes became very weak because of his great age. The text יִפְסַל כַּוָּשׁ reads literally: 'and Israel's eyes became heavy for age.' This remarkable expression which only occurs in the Joseph narrative, and has no parallel in other Semitic languages, is an exact reproduction of the Egyptian דָּתָח to be heavy, used in connexion with the eyes in the sense of being weak and dim, in consequence of great age. Just as in our case, Sinuhe, complaining of his senile debilities, says: 'Weakness has overtaken me, my eyes are heavy (tr. yb y dnt), my arms are weak, and my legs do not follow' (Sin. B. 169-70 = Lit. 22). It is obvious that יִפְסַל having the same concrete meaning as dnt to be heavy, and being used also metaphorically in the same sense and for the same occasion, cannot but be an adaptation to the Egyptian mode of speech.

3 Eye of the Land.

Ex. 10, 5 we are told that the locusts were so numerous that they covered ' and the eye of the land. It is taken to relate to the face of the earth, yet the difficulty is generally felt as to the use of the eye as a metaphor for the face of the earth since no other example for such a metaphor is to be found. From the Egyptian we learn that 'eye of the land' means nothing else but the sun, which was conceived by the Egyptians as the 'eye of Re.' The Hebrew may have deemed it on religious grounds to be better, and probably also considered it on poetic grounds to be finer, to transfer the

1 On the word יִפְסַל for 'post' as Egyptian borrowing cf. below, p. 92. That יִפְסַל is used also in other Hebrew phrases and expressions analogously to the Egyptian יִפְסַל will be shown elsewhere.

2 As we shall presently see (p. 60) יִפְסַל is used in a similar way to dnt in another metaphor in connexion with 'heart.'

3 The sun as the wandering eye (tr. 1 or usg.1) of Re was a very widespread conception among the Egyptians, and was transferred from Re also to Osiris and Horus. The eye of Re as well as the Horus-eye play a great role in Egyptian mythology. It is the right eye in particular which is taken as the sun whereas the left eye represents the moon. Thus: Hymn to the Evening Sun, Totenb., chap. 139, ii, 10 (= Lit. 130), sun and moon are described as the two eyes (tr. ty) of Re. In the Naples Stele, L. 4, Baugrach, Thuc. iv, p. 624, the same is said of another god: usg.1 f.su in usg.1 f.su (h') (this) his eye is the sun (and thin) his eye is the moon.' Cf. also Ebers, Körpersنة, p. 53 ff.

mythological conception of the eye from Re to the earth and designate the sun as יִפְסַל יִשָּׁב the eye of the land which means the 'eye of the world,' since יִשָּׁב signifies for the Hebrews, as tr.land did for the Egyptians, both land and world. That יִפְסַל יִשָּׁב actually refers to the sun is best shown by Ex. 10, 15 where it is said that the locusts 'covered יִפְסַל יִשָּׁב as the eye of the whole land' so that the land was darkened; this conveys that the locusts flew up in such dense swarms that they obscured the sunshine as with a thick cloud. This phenomenon has actually been observed and related on several occasions by numerous reliable eye-witnesses. By the covering the eye of the land reference was made to the extraordinarily terrifying, immeasurably large size of the locust swarms which darkened the light of the sun. In course of time this phrase remained in use simply to characterize enormous quantities, without being taken literally, as is the case with other similar metaphors. So we find that Num. 22, 5 in describing the panic of the Moabites at the appearance of the Hebrews applies the same metaphor to their great numbers that cover the eye of the land.

4 'Lip' for 'Shore,' 'Bank.'

That the metaphorical use of 'lip' יִפְסַל for 'shore,' e.g. יִפְסַל יִשָּׁב Gen. 41, 15; Ex. 2, 3, 7, 15 'bank of the River Nile' or 'shore of the sea' as in Ex. 14, 30, &c. was current also in Egyptian at all times has long been established as e.g. by Ebers, Die Bücher Mose, p. 339. The Egyptians spoke of the lip of the water for the bank of the River Nile, thus e.g. Lebensmide, xv, L 66 f., p. 42, of the fish on the lip of the water spt n mn, i.e. on the bank of the Nile; 1 Wen-Amon (Rec. xxii, 86, 13-14 =

1 From similar motives the biblical collector of proverbs in adopting the sayings of the Egyptian sage Amenemope in the 'words of the wise' (Prov. 22, 17 ff.) uses the eye יִשָּׁב instead of רָע: 'goose' (Amenemope, 23, 5). Cf. Erman, Eine ag. Quelle der Übersetzung Salomos'; Stitt, d. Pr. Ak. d. W., Berlin, 1924, vol. xv, p. 87. This occurred not as Erman remarks, merely because he regarded the eagle as more poetical but also because geese were for the Egyptians the usual sacrifice to the dead and therefore, were, as I assume, an abomination to the Hebrews. That the goose is included among the prohibited clean animals is shown by the mention of רָע, Deut. 14, 13. This is the true reading and not רָע, Levit. 11, 14.

2 I would refer here inter alia to the description of the great plague of locusts in 1915 in Palestine. There the darkening of the light of the sun by swarms of locusts was the most prominent feature as was emphasized in several newspapers and scientific periodicals in almost identical language. The same phenomenon recently occurred (July 23, 1931) in Angola, when swarms of locusts were so dense that, according to newspaper reports, they "completely obscured the sun for some hours."
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Lit. 179) ip.t pr ym for the shore of the sea; and in the Diadochen-Stela (Ptolem. Soter) Brugsch, A.Z., 1871, 2, we find ip.t w.wt-wr ‘lip of the great green’, meaning the shore of the Mediterranean Sea. The dual ip.ty was used for both banks of the river.

It is noteworthy that ip.t is the same word as niw and that it was also used in Egyptian for the lip as well as p.t as Prathotep, Devaud, p. 46, 230, (= Lit 63), ‘right are his lips (ḥḥ pr.t-ty-fy) when he speaks’.

ip.t belongs to the Semetic loan words introduced into Egyptian very early, already long before the Hyksos period but more especially in the New Kingdom and then remained in use side by side with genuine Egyptian words. Thus they used ip.t = niw for ‘shore’ side by side with the Egyptian word nqbn; similarly hb = Sem. ḫḥ together with ḫḥy ‘heart’; ẓn = Sem. ṭḥ ‘together with ṣr.t ‘eye’; ln = Sem. ṣn with ṣmh ‘ear’; Ṃi = Sem. ṣmḥ with ṣmrw and Ṣn (new-Egyptian) ‘tongue’; ṃḥ = Sem. ṣn with ṣḥ ‘belly’, and many others.

Also the use of hand in Ex. 2, 5 ‘on the hand of the river’ ṣmrw ṣḥ by corresponds to the Egyptian use of ṣḥ as forearm, hand, for ‘side’. Actually ṣḥ here does not refer to the bank as a whole but to the edge of the bank nearest to the river, viz. the spot where Pharaoh’s daughter bathed. The distinction between niw and ṣḥ is thus intentional and testifies to the stylistic finesse of the Hebrew narrator.

It may further be observed that the Egyptians had for ‘shore, beach’ another word, viz. bsfr.t or ḥfr, e.g. Bergm, Buch der Exeget. p. 379, 30: ‘thou landest at the shore (ṣfrn) of Busiris’. Cf. also Wreszinski, Ag. Inschr. Musik. Wien, p. 161 ḥfr shore, beach (Vienna Sarcophagus, I. 30 has ḥfr for shore) and Er.-Gr. 126 ḥfr, late Egyptian ḥfr = beach, meadows. This word is probably identical with Sem. ṣḥ; the ṣ in ḥfr is to be explained by the conversion of ṣ into š and ṣfr seems therefore to originate from ḥfr.t. Nevertheless the coincidence of the Hebrew ṣḥ and Egyptian ḥfr, ṣḥ on the other of ṣn and the Egyptian ip.t, ḥfr is of great interest.

5. ‘Mouth’ for ‘command’.

‘Mouth’, which in Gen. 41, 40, 45, 21 is used in the sense of ‘command, injunction, precept’, displays exactly the same usage as the Egyptian

The Egyptian narrator obviously endeavours to reproduce in Egyptian as far as possible the words of the Prince of Byblos spoken in the Canaanite or Phoenician language as they were by using the Semetic loan words (current also in Egyptian) ip.t = niw and ṣm = ṣḥ ‘sea’ for ‘shore of the sea’.

We find in Coptic also the same word śr’ōt (S) cōrōt (B) for shore, strand in the singular and plural, both of the river and of the sea. Sp. WB. 122.

6. ‘Hand of God’.

In Ex. 9, 3 it is said that the cattle plague is to be conjured up by ṣḥ. In the ‘hand of God’ (ḏr.t ntr alternatively ‘ntr), the Egyptian saw the saving power which always protected him from misfortune, and when he spoke of ‘the hand of God that is with Egypt’ he thereby referred to the security and impregnability of his country as well as the invulnerability of his people against enemy attacks. Cf. e.g. Stela of Nefer-Abu, Erman, Sitz.-Ber. Berl. Akad. 1911, 1993: ‘She (the goddess) was gracious to me after she had let me see her hand (ḏr.t-ḥt), i.e. vouchsafed her protection and brought me healing. But ‘the hand of God’ is also directed as punitive power against the sinner and is the instrument for all blows of fate. Cf. e.g. Sinuhe 26a where he describes his anxiety in the presence of the king, saying ‘it is like the hand of God (‘n ntr), it is a fright that is in my body’. Amenemope, xxiv, 11: ‘mock not a man that is in the hand of God’ (m d.t (d.t)-ps ntr); xxiv, 20: ‘how doth he rejoice who reaches the West (= the nether world) when he is safe in “the hand of God” (m d.t ps ntr), i.e. without incurring the punishment of the Court of the Dead; likewise xxvi, 20 ‘in the hand of the God’ speaking of the dangers of a storm at sea (?).

It is now possible to gauge the biting irony that lay in Moses’ announcement of one of the worst plagues by which the Egyptians were to be so sorely tried in the use of the phrase ṣḥ as the punitive instrument. Thereby Pharaoh was to be told that d.t ntr ‘the hand of God’, to which he and his people looked up in hope and fear, which they at one moment regarded as the symbol of the highest and surest protection, and at another treasuringly beheld as fate immutable, would now prove to be helpless against ‘the hand of ṣḥ’, which would be raised against him as a menacing

1 Cf. also Gen. 45, 21, Ex. 38, 21 and many other passages. On ‘mouth’ as title cf. above p. 42. Elsewhere further examples of the use of ṣḥ as title will be given.
power, destroying the whole wealth of Egypt, the cattle and all domestic animals, by sickness and death. In the ears of an Egyptian the use of *dr.t* ntr = 'the hand of God' must have sounded from the mouth of a Hebrew uttering threats as a terrible blasphemy and felt as an intentional insult.

7. Hand and Arm as symbols of Strength

The strong hand  ngữ ꜣꜣ, 'the outstretched arm' ꜣꜣ ꜣꜣ ꜣꜣ, frequently mentioned in the Exodus narrative and repeatedly occurring elsewhere, Ex. 3, 19, 6, 1, 5; Num. 20, 23; Deut. 4, 34, etc., are quite ordinary expressions in Egyptian, especially in reference to battles and conquests. Thus e.g. *dry* 'to stretch forth, to turn towards' (Ex.-Gr. 218) in conjunction with 'arm' ꜣꜣ to stretch out the arm in hostile intent against someone, to oppose him, to resist him, e.g. *dry* ꜣꜣ Admon. 12, 2 and the passage quoted from Pyr. 498a, ibid., p. 82 with *dry* ꜣꜣ; also Rec. 16, 125. Further in the same meaning ḏḏ-ꜣꜣ ꜣꜣ 'stretch out the hand' e.g. *Einsetzung des Mondes*, 1. 72 (= AOT. 2, 184): 'I will make thee stretch out thy hand (ḏḏ-ꜣꜣ ḏḏ-ꜣꜣ) against the face of the primeval gods' (par. v. 69).

Particularly frequent is the expression ḏḏ-ꜣꜣ ꜣꜣ 'strong arm' (or hand as means both) from ḏḏ-ꜣꜣ to be bold, strong, courageous, also in the causative as e.g. *Annal. of Thutmose* iii. 1, 85 or *Urk. iv.* 637, 9 and his father Amon strengthened both his arms hbr ṣḥmt 'my-ṣḥm'). ḏḏ-ꜣꜣ was also used succinctly for victory and strength (Ex.-Gr. 86) without any lingering thinking of the action of the hand; this seems also to be the case in many passages in Hebrew. Similarly frequent is ḏḏḥ bḥy ꜣꜣ 'strong, mighty arm', e.g. Sall. iii. 8, 2 ( = Litt. 267): 'thou destroyest the land of the Khaty with thy strong arm' (ḥḏḥ bḥy ꜣꜣ); cf. also Sall. iii. 8, 10, 9, 1 ( = Litt. 268): 'hundreds of thousands (had he) overthrown with his strong arm'.

8. The Finger of God.

When Moses inflicted the third plague on the Egyptians (Ex. 8, 13–15) the magicians of Pharaoh were not able to reproduce it as they had done with the previous plagues (Ex. 7, 13, 20, 8, 3). In order to justify their ineptitude they declared that it was 'the finger of God', ꜣꜣ ꜣꜣ ꜣꜣ (Ex. 8, 15). The fact that this expression is said to have come from the mouth of the magicians, and further that such an explanation was considered

---

1 ḏḏḥ is used both of the thigh and of the forearm, just as Cypriic *ϝάρββ* (Sp. WB. 203). Originally the king would have been conceived as a lion who strikes down his prey with his forepaws.

2 To be fully sufficient to excuse the failure of their magical efforts, suggests an Egyptian origin for the expression itself, as well as for the whole conception connected with it.

3 Cf. Mariette Tab. 22, *Abidos Ritual Texts*, Chap. 4, the formula spoken by the King when removing the bolt from the shrine of the god: 'The finger of Seth is removed from the eye of Horus, so that it heals'. For spell-formulæ for the dead, e.g. Pyr. 48 (Seth’s additional pages to Vol. 1, 27–8); 'Take to thyself (m r-h) the finger of Seth (ḏḏḥ ḏḥ) which causes the white eye of Horus to see'. Pyr. 130a are the fingers of Atum (ḏḏḥ ṣḥt m tḥ) mentioned as a threat to a god or demi-god.

4 Cf. *Apophis*, 30, 8–9: 'Re diarasembab, thee . . . the finger of Thoth is in thy eyes, his spell seizes thee, smites thee in thy figure', etc. I think that the whole object of the counting of the fingers (Seth, ÅZ. 1918, 1f. and Gunn, ibid. 1922, 71 f.) is connected with the spell against the eyes being damaged by the finger of Seth or other gods on the way through the nether world.

5 Although ḏḏḥ may be a very old Semitic loan-word in Egyptian, the phrase itself is typically Egyptian.
11. Bone, Limb = 'Self'

The expression הָנָּחַל הָנָּחַל הָנָּחַל הָנָּחַל הָנָּחַל 'on this very day' occurs in Ex. 12, 17, 41, 43, and elsewhere, most frequently in the Pentateuch. Here we have a metaphorical use of 'bone' or 'limb' for 'self' without retaining the memory of the original meaning of הָנָּחַל. Exactly the same metaphorical use of הָנָּחַל 'limb' for 'self' (sometimes in the plural) is also found in Egyptian.

Of many examples we only quote: Sin. 66 (R.) ‘the inhabitants of his town loved him more than וָּשֵׁל their limbs’, i.e. themselves; Amenemope, viii. 17 f. ‘Plough the fields, so wilt thou find thy need; thou receivest the sacrificial loaves from thy very own threshing floor’ (נָהֲרָה חַטָּה literally ‘threshing floor of thy limbs’).

Further, the fact that הָנָּחַל is the classical expression for 'self' and by far the most widespread (Gr.-Er. § 154), whereas on the other hand הָנָּחַל is usually both in Demotic and Coptic, gives grounds for the suggestion that הָנָּחַל was a less choice expression and belonged rather to vernacular speech. This is far so far of interest as it presents an example for the modelling of the Hebrew on a vernacular mode of expression.

In this connexion it must be pointed out that the Egyptian used 'bone' and 'limb' alternately though for bone he had the separate word וָּשֵׁל. Exact the same occurs in Hebrew where הָנָּחַל means both 'bone' and 'limb'.

1 The Egyptian also used the plural וָּשֵׁל 'limbs' collectively for the bodily frame, for the lineaments and appearance of the body. Thus it was quite usual to say of beautiful women that they were beautiful in all their limbs, e.g., Westcar, ii. 10 f. (= Lit. 66): ‘women m v. 11 וָּשֵׁל with beautiful limbs, i.e. of beautiful appearance, of comely build.

In ZAT, 1935, 150 Hess draws attention to a custom which he observed among the Bedouin of the 'Osebe who avoid breaking a bone of the sacrificial sheep which they slaughter on the seventh day after the death of a relative. Nevertheless this cannot serve as a parallel, as the motive here is quite different, being for the purpose of keeping the bones intact and putting them together after the consumption of the meat on the grave of the deceased in order that he may ride on the camel as a sacrifice for the dead and then heap up the bones near the grave to serve the deceased as a steed at the resurrection.

'limb', as appears from many Bible passages. Only later was הָנָּחַל fem. plural used as collective for all limbs.

The establishment of the fact that הָנָּחַל was used for limb leads to the correct meaning of an injunction in Ex. 12, 46 which has been completely misunderstood. It says there of the Paschal lamb: 'in one house shall it be eaten, thou shalt not carry forth unblest of the flesh abroad out of the house, וָּשֵׁל וָּשֵׁל וָּשֵׁל neither shall ye break a bone thereof'. Here הָנָּחַל does not refer to the breaking of a bone as such during the meal. הָנָּחַל here is not 'bone' but 'limb', and the meaning is, that in roasting the lamb it is to be kept whole without severing a limb, as expressly stated previously in 12, 9 that it should be roasted 'head with legs and body' i.e. as a whole. This is based on the injunction that each house (v. 3) was to have a whole lamb for itself. Now, in order to prevent the lamb from being distributed among various houses it was not to be cut up in the roasting. This is more clearly brought out in 12, 4 where it is provided that in the case where a whole lamb be too much for one house, the nearest neighbour was to come in to participate, so that the sacrifice should be consumed in one house and no parts taken out. We now realize that 12, 46 'in one house shall it be eaten; thou shalt not carry forth unblest of the flesh abroad out of the house; neither shall ye break a bone thereof', far from constituting a contradiction to 12, 9 as suggested by critics is in reality in thorough accordance with it.1
CHAPTER V

FORMAL PHRASES; PROVERBIAL MODES OF SPEECH AND STOCK EXPRESSIONS FROM THE EGYPTIAN

In addition to the words and expressions which have been shown to be modelled on Egyptian prototypes, there are also many formal phrases, proverbial modes of speech and stock expressions which are characteristic of the Joseph and Exodus narratives, and at the same time typically Egyptian. We proceed to give a selection of specially noteworthy examples.

1. Introductory Formal Phrases in Narratives

The account of the serfdom of the Hebrews begins with the words: Ex. 2, 23: בָּשֹׁד שבָּדֹת הָעָם וַגַּם 'and it was in those many days', a strange phrase which has always given rise to speculative interpretations. Now it is most typical of the Egyptian narrative style to begin certain sections of one and the same story, with ‘after many days’ to introduce fresh notable events. The phrase runs בָּשֹׁד בָּדֹת (more frequently: בָּשֹׁד בָּדֹת בָּשֹׁד בָּדֹת) בָּשֹׁד בָּדֹת בָּשֹׁד בָּדֹת, which reads literally: ‘and after many days after this’, and could be best rendered: ‘And many days after this had happened.’ This is what the Hebrew narrator had in mind in using the above phrase. So begins for instance the report of the campaign of Rameses II against Kadesh (Rev. Egypt, iii. 157): בָּשֹׁד בָּדֹת בָּשֹׁד בָּדֹת בָּדֹת בָּדֹת, which has already been observed, the phrase is a quite usual, almost colourless formula of naïve, popular story-telling, having long since lost its literal meaning. This is so much the case that this phrase is repeated several times at the beginning of different sections in one and the same narrative, just to mark the advance in the sequence of the chief events, without implying any lapse of a long period between the various phases of the narrative. This is shown by many popular stories mainly of the literature of the New Kingdom; but the most striking example is furnished by the well-known story of the two brothers (Pap. D’Orbney = Lit. 147 ff. of the thirteenth century B.C.) in which almost every new paragraph begins with the same phrase: בָּשֹׁד בָּדֹת בָּשֹׁד בָּדֹת בָּדֹת בָּדֹת בָּדֹת בָּדֹת בָּדֹת, and after many days after this’, although the events related follow quite shortly on another (Pap. d’Orb., i. 4; ii. 7 f.; viii. 8 f.; ix. 1; x. 4 etc.). Thus soon after the opening (= Lit. 151) we read: ‘and after many days after this his younger brother was tending his cattle’; then p. 199 ‘and after many days after this they were on the field raising corn’; p. 203 ‘and after many days after this his younger brother was in the Vale of Cedars’; a few lines later ‘and after many days after this he built himself a castle in the Vale of Cedars’. The same phrase is continually repeated at short intervals, where the many days comprise very short periods especially towards the end where in case the ‘many days’ hardly cover the time of pregnancy of the princess (p. 209).

In Pap. Westcar (= Lit. 36 ff.) which belongs to the much earlier Hyksos period (see ibid. note 2), the same phrase occurs but somewhat more fully. Thus at the beginning of the first narrative (= Lit. 37) it reads: בָּשֹׁד בָּדֹת בָּדֹת בָּדֹת בָּדֹת בָּדֹת בָּדֹת בָּדֹת, literally ‘and after, when days had gone by over this’. Also in the tale of the birth of the three kings, the same phrase recurs (Westcar, xii. 8 = Lit. 46) as well as in narratives of later periods e.g. in the tale of the adventure of Seteny with the mummies (Demot. Maspero, Contes Pop., p. 131), and in other stories. Now although this phrase, as we have seen, is found in various epochs of Egyptian literature, nevertheless for no period of Egyptian popular literature is it so characteristic as for the first period of the New Kingdom, that is about the time of Israel’s sojourn in Egypt.

We would further observe that Ex. 2, 11 must originally have read the same as verse 23 רַעַף נַעַף תְּרֵיסָא שֵׁל שֵׁל, as is actually shown by the text of the Septuagint. Thus we have a repetition of the very same phrase in the same chapter in perfect accordance with the literary usage of the Egyptians.

Another formal phrase of the same nature used at the beginning of

1 The omission of the word רַעַף is indicated here, as in many cases where a word is missing by the Pasq. | after רַעַף. Although its use as a critical sign is later than is assumed (cf. Gesenius-Bergräßer, Hebrew Gram., i, § 12 n), it may have come into use instead of another sign employed in older Bible manuscripts for the same purpose. In any case also the simpler formula מֵאֶשֶׁת תְּרֵיסָא would have been used as is to be seen from Judges 19, 1 and 1 Sam. 28, 1. Nevertheless their use in the Pentateuch and disappearance soon after the early historical books remains significant for the estimation of the age of such phrases.
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a story or a new section thereof is w'm nn hrw hpr 'one of those days it happened that', e.g. Pap. Westcar ix. 21 (=Lit. 44): 'One of those days it happened that Red-Dedet felt pains', etc. In the inscriptions of Rameses II, this phrase is repeated more frequently, e.g. Mar. Abyd., i pl. 6, 261 (=Records, iii. § 261): 'One of those days it happened that, in the first year, in the third month of the first season the king journeyed forth' etc.; further Kuban-Stela i. 8 (=Records, iii. § 286): 'One of those days it happened that His Majesty was sitting on a lofty throne', etc.

To the category of these merely formal phrases belongs also Gen. 38, 12 sqq: 'and the days were many when etc.' and also Gen. 26, 8: 'saw | the | days | of | his | life | & | it | was | when | the | days | had | become | long | for | him | there | & | after | a | long | time'. In both these cases only a short period is really meant. Similarly we read in the annals of Thutmose IV. iii. 1, 9, Úrk. iv. 648, 2 (=AOT, p. 236): 'lit. 'h'w m 'r n | b.f.' m 'r.w | w' | and when this time became (great) in years, i.e. when many years had passed, it happened that, etc. As the word '[r]' 'great' is not quite certain it might just as well have read 'r.f.' 'long' which is equally said of time (Ex-Gr. 1) so that the passage would read: 'now when this time became long in years', and thus we would have in this case an exact coincidence with the Hebrew.

Another formal expression with reference to time which thrice recurs in the Joseph narrative at short intervals (Gen. 39, 7, 40, 1, 48, 1) is 'm n hpr 'one hundred years', whereby new phases of the story are introduced. Characteristic therein is the use of hpr = 'words' from hpr = 'to say, speak' specifically for 'things, affairs, events', just as in numerous analogous cases the Egyptian mtw or mt. plural mdwt = 'words' from mdw = 'to say, speak' (Ex-Gr. 74), is employed for things and affairs.

I have purposely quoted numerous examples from the Egyptian narratives, tales, and historical texts in order to give a clear idea of the actual use of these formal expressions of time, and to show how strongly the Egyptian narrative mode, especially in the literature of the New Empire, is reflected in the mode and style of the Joseph and Exodus stories. Thereby all the conjunctions, both of a historical and textual-critical character, so widely made in regard to Ex. 2, 23 as well as 2, 11 fall to the light. In the light of the above examples, especially those from the Tale of the Two Brothers, it is quite certain that Ex. 2, 23, far from marking the beginning of an entirely new narration distinct and remote from events related in the preceding story and by a different author, on the contrary denotes a direct continuation, and that consequently we have to deal here with one and the
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same author. For, as the use of such phrases in Egyptian shows, their purpose is precisely to introduce successive phases of one and the same narrative.

On other occasions we shall show by many examples how instructive the study of Egyptian tales and narratives is for the understanding of the style and whole structure particularly of those portions of the Pentateuch which deal with Egypt. The very fact that 'and it happened after these things' recurs in the Joseph narrative alone three times and that 'and it happened in those many days' or 'it happened in those days' (perhaps 'on one of those days') occur exclusively in the Exodus narrative, at short intervals as in the Egyptian, unmistakably shows how close is the relationship between Hebrew and Egyptian in this genre of literature.

2. hpr for 'Abomination'

The conception of something being an 'abomination' bnyt which is expressed in Hebrew by hpr especially in connexion with Egypt, e.g. Gen. 43, 32, 'for it was an abomination to the Egyptians' (to eat with Hebrews); or 46, 34, said of the shepherds as hpr hpr 'an abomination to Egypt', or Ex. 8, 16, of the cattle sacrifices, is typically Egyptian. It occurs profusely in both sacred and profane literature of all epochs and exactly like hpr is an expression of loathing and strong abhorrence against everything disgusting, repugnant or execrable, e.g. Harem conspiracy Pap. jud. de Turin, v. 4-5 (=Records, iv. § 454, of the sorcery in the conspiracy) 'these were great deadly sins and hpr w.n pr't 'great abominations to the land' (i.e. of Egypt); further Israel-Stela, 9 (=Lit. 276); Maroqiu (the prince of Libya) is bn.f.t 'an abomination, abhorrence to Memphis'. The Egyptian origin of the phrase is, however, not to be deduced only from the circumstance that it is used in the Joseph and Exodus narratives in connexion with Egypt and in the mouth of Egyptians, but also from the fact that the Egyptians generally said of anything sinful and criminal that it was an abomination to the god bnyt b. just as hpr hpr thus e.g. Deut. 7, 22 f. 12, 31, 27, 15 of idolatry; 17, 1, 23, 19 of animals invalid for sacrifice; of unchastity 24, 4 (also Lev. 18, 12, 20, 12); of sorcery, 18, 12; of false weights and measures, 25, 16.

1 Kyle, Moses and the Monuments, p. 26 identifies hpr hpr with an Egyptian word hpr which is said to mean 'abomination' or 'pest' and which the Egyptians are said to have applied to the Hyksos. Unfortunately, he does not give his source by which one might perhaps have recognized the true Egyptian form of the word. Had he perhaps in mind hpr a sort of illness (Ex-Gr. 121)? Or was he thinking of r' or r' = barbarian (Ex-Gr. 1 and 23)? In this case the feminine form of aat would be inexplicable; moreover the Egyptians applied aat to all foreigners, not only the Hyksos.

2 That also the word hpr itself is of Egyptian origin is shown below, p. 95.
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With the same frequency we find the expression in Egyptian cf. Redesiyye-Inscription, Rec. 13, p. 76, pl. II, 16 (= Records, iii. § 192) but n ntr 'an abomination to God is an offence against His people'; Vestier, p. 18: 'an abomination to God (but ntr) is to be partial'; Pap. Lex. 7 (= Records, iv. § 453): 'he committed all of them (sins) together with the other great crimes, the abomination to every god and every goddess'; Amenemope XIII, 13 f., Chap. 10 (= Erman, OLZ, 1924, col. 246): 'speak not falsely with a man, (this is) an abomination to the god (ti but n ntr)'; cf. also xv. 20 f., further Chap. 13 of the compilation of false tax lists (?) that is 'an abomination to the god (by but n ntr)'. Sometimes the name of the god is given, e.g. Toth. Urk. v. 58, 1, Spruch, 17, § 23, of Re to whom 'sin is an abomination (but-t-t sfet)'; Amenemope XVII, 23 f.: double measures are an abomination (but-t-t) to Re. 1

Sometimes but-t is combined with ka (k) the life-spirit, the soul-force in gods or men or more simply 'soul'. Thus e.g. Pthahtep, Devaud, p. 22, v. 119 f. (= Lit. 89), where a warning is given against casting greedy glances during the meal at the host and the meats that lie before him 'for an abomination (but-t) to the ka is one who so behaves'; cf. also ibid., p. 26, v. 189 (= Lit. 58), where the same expression 'abomination (but-t) for the ka' is used in another connexion. Elsewhere but-t is said of the dead, e.g. Lamp. Text. Relig. xxviii n. 51, Rec. 30, 19, 11 = Roeder, Urk. 208 '1', (the dead) am lord of the sacrifices, my abomination is sin (but-t p n p sfet) and similarly Chabas, L'Egypte, 1874, Oct., p. 91, Mazimmes d'Animi, pl. 11 (= Lit. 296): 'the houses of the gods—their abomination (but-t) is climour.'

3. 'As the Sand of the Sea'

Gen. 41, 49: 'And Joseph gathered corn ָיָּדָּא יִֽדְּוֹ תּוֹ לְּאָֽו רֶשֶּׁיָּא בַּלְּיִֽתִּי as the sand of the sea, very much, until he ceased counting for it was without number' (cf. also Gen. 22, 17, 32, 13). This simile

1 The eighth, at text gives: mér irxm-nk (p. 1 x 92). Literally: 'do not make thyself a bushel that holds two'. Erman, ibid., col. 248 is in doubt as to the meaning of the last two words. They can, however, be translated quite simply: 'that comprises double' as ify 'to take, seize' (Er-Gr. 207) can also be interpreted in the sense of 'to take up, embrace, comprise' like the Copitic 21. What is meant is a corn measure with a double sliding base which actually comprises double', i.e. a two-fold measure. In corn markets in Cairo and Bn-el-Salih, the old ָיָּדָּא נָכָא, I have to myself observed the confirmation of such a measure by the authorities. Should however, in ms. be correct, then it would read: 'a bushel of holding a second' i.e. bushels of different sizes, a big one for measuring corn when buying, and a small one made to fit into the other so as to diminish its capacity when selling. In connexion with the text cited, note the word p.t = ָיָּדָּא and cf. Deut. 8, 14 יִֽזְּרֵּפָּא and v. 16 יִֽזְּרֵּפָּא, also Prov. 20, 18.
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together with that of the dust of the earth (Gen. 13, 16, 28, 14, etc.) or the 'stars of the heavens' (Gen. 22, 17. Ex. 32, 13, and frequently in the historical and poetical books of the Bible) is very common in Egyptian for infinite numbers. Thus e.g. in the Annals of Thutmose, iii. 1. 6. Urk. iv. 6, 16 (= AOT, p. 241) speaking of the booty of grain in Arwad in the land of Zaby (Zaby = Palestine), it says that the grain in the barns was 'more plentiful than the sand on the shores' ַּלְּאָֽו יִֽדְּוֹ בַּלְּיִֽתִּי in the plural). The fuller Egyptian form reads: as plentiful my ַּלְּאָֽו הַרָּאָֽו יִֽדְּוֹ בַּלְּיִֽתִּי as the sand (probably grains of sand) of the shores' (ַּלְּאָֽו in the plural or ַּלְּאָֽו in the dual for both banks of the Nile). 2

It occurs especially frequently in the texts of the New Empire, e.g. in Pap. Harris in several passages such as pl. 49, 12: 'the products of the land of Egypt are like the sand of the shore'; Pl. 86 'oil more than the sand of the shore'; Med. Habu, Düm. Hist. Inschr., i. 31 (= Records, iv. § 29): 'the word of King Rameses III unto his father, Amon-Re, King of the Gods, take gold and silver like the sand of the shore.' 3

Often this phrase is abbreviated into sand alone e.g. Harris pl. 8, 4: 'flowers from every land etc. like sand'; pl. 46, 3: 'I made them [the gifts for Ptha] more numerous than sand'; Anast., iv. 9, 1-3 f. (= Lit., p. 212): 'five acres as vegetable land with cucumbers . . . as many as the sand'; and Anast., i. 21, 2 in reference to the sea at Tyre: ַּלְּאָֽו מְּסֵּא הַרָּאָֽו יִֽדְּוֹ 'it is stronger (i.e. more prolific) in fish than sand.'

In the description of the Battle of Kadesh under Rameses II, Sall. 3, 1, 1 (Lit. 262) the simile of the sand is followed also by the words 'without number', as in Hebrew ma ָיָּדָּא ַּלְּאָֽו יִֽדְּוֹ as numerous as the sand etc. 'armed with all manner of weapons' ma ַּלְּאָֽו 'in without number, without their being counted' (the usual form is ַּלְּאָֽו - Er-Gr. 92). Elsewhere also both phrases often occur side by side e.g. Harris, pl. IV, 4 'their lands, their herds, their multitude were as ַּלְּאָֽו יִֽדְּוֹ כָּנָא 'the sand of shores', and further 1. 7: 'Vessels of silver and copper ma ַּלְּאָֽו - ַּלְּאָֽו without being numbered'; pl. 76, 8-10 of the prisoners who were more numerous than sand 'on shores' (ַּלְּאָֽו כָּנָא), and then of their men, their cattle etc., that they were 'innumerable' (ma ַּלְּאָֽו - ַּלְּאָֽו). This last

2 The Egyptian would probably as a rule rather have thought of the sandy banks of the Nile than of the shores of the sea, as appears from the frequent dual sign in ַּלְּאָֽו (or ַּלְּאָֽו). It should be remembered that the real cultural life of the Egyptians was developed in Upper Egypt in the interior of the country on the 'two banks of the river', not on the sea, in Lower Egypt, where mostly the foreign settlements were concentrated.

3 This passage being of the period of King Solomon is very instructive with reference to 1 Kings 10, 21, according to which only gold vessels were used in Solomon's palace, silver being 'worthless' or as in v. 37 'like pebbles'.}
than all the women in the whole of this land (m ti pn r dr-f); Ka-Gemini Tab. II. 6 f. (=Lit. 67): ‘they read it as it was written and it was more agreeable to their hearts than anything that is in the whole of this land’.

In Gen. 41, 26 we have the same use of 3n for ‘good’ and ‘beautiful’, as the Egyptian nfr for ‘good’ and ‘beautiful’; the same as yr v. 27 for ‘bad’ and ‘ugly’ as the Egyptian bsw for ‘bad’ and ‘ugly’.

Sometimes we have b3r = ‘border’ instead of yr = ‘land’ combined with Egypt, e.g. ḫn-nw b3r 3n Ex. 10, 14, 19 in the whole border of Egypt = in the whole land; also b3r alone in the same meaning, e.g. Ex. 7, 27, 10, 4, 13, 7; also the phrase occurring in Gen 47, 21 that ḫn-nw b3r has a similar meaning ‘from one end of the border of Egypt to its other end’. This corresponds exactly to the Egyptian ts/h km.t ‘border of Egypt’ for ‘the land of Egypt’, e.g. Harris, pl. 77, 4 ‘I brought it about that they (the enemy) abstained’ r ḫn ts/h km.t ‘from placing foot on the border of Egypt’ wherein ts/h = ‘border’ is used for land, not for frontier, as ts/h is elsewhere used succinctly for territory, e.g. Mery-Ka-Re, Petersb. Pap. 116a, 106 (=Lit. 81): ṣrs ṭs-k ‘If thy border (i.e. thy land) is in revolt towards the south, then...’ etc., that is exactly like 3n b3r in the passages mentioned, equally with reference to the land of Pharaoh.

5. ‘The Good’ or ‘the Best of the Land of Egypt’

Gen. 45, 18 Pharaoh says: ‘And I will give you 3n yhw b3r the good of the land of Egypt’; and further v. 20 ‘for the good of the land of Egypt is yours’; v. 23 Joseph sends his father ten asses laden 3n yhw b3r with the ‘good of Egypt’; 47, 6 Pharaoh says ‘the land of Egypt is before thee yhw b3r in the best of the land make thy father and brethren dwell’; (dem. 47, 11 and elsewhere). This turn of speech recurs insistently in Egyptian literature and usually it reads ḫn nb nfr ‘all good’, ṭs nb nfr ‘all good things’ or also ḫn-nw, the selected, the chosen, exactly like 3n the chosen, Ex. 15, 4 and elsewhere. Here again our narrator exactly reproduces the true Egyptian as would naturally come to the lips of Pharaoh. In Egyptian records and narratives we find this same phrase occurring again and again in the same manner as in passages of analogous subject matter in the Pentateuch, as will be seen from the following selection of examples which could be greatly extended: Anasti. iii. 2, 2 (=Lit. 206): ‘His field is full ḫn nb nfr of all good’; Anasti. iv. 3, 10 f. (=Lit. 213): ‘thy

4. ‘In the whole Land’ or ‘in the Boundary of Egypt’

With unusual frequency the formal phrase 3n w 3n ‘in the land of Egypt’ or ḫn-nw ḫn-nw ‘in the whole land of Egypt’ recurs again and again, e.g. Pharaoh speaking of the lean kine, Gen. 41, 19 ‘such as I never saw 3n w 3n ḫn-nw in the whole land of Egypt for ugliness’. This emphatic phraseology is a particularly common feature in Egyptian narrative style, e.g. D’Orb. i. 4 (=Lit. 151): ‘his brother was a good ploughman’, 3n w ḫd-f m ti dr-f ‘his like was not in the whole of the land’; ibid. ix. 8 (=Lit. 156): ‘And Hnum made for him a companion (ḥn-bmtw i.e. a wife) and she was beautiful of limb more than any woman in the whole land (m ḫl ti dr-f)’; Urb. iv. 219, 2 of Queen Hatchepsovet: ‘more beautiful is she

1 Names of non-Egyptian tribes who were at all times employed by the Egyptians as mercenaries.

2 Besides ‘sand on the shore’ other things are used to illustrate great quantities. Thus the wish is expressed for Amenophis IV that he may be vouchsafed jubilees and other desirable things ‘as many as the grains of sand on the shore, as the fish in the river have scales, and the oxen have hairs’ (Davies, Amarna, iii, 29, 8 = Lit. 39).
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galley comes from Syria laden with ḫt nb t nfr t all good things' (cf. also Gen. 24, 10 and Deut. 6, 11); Śimha b So f. (= Lit. 9) 'he let me choose something from his land from the choicest (m ṣtp.w) of what he possessed' (cf. also 86 f.); Med. Haba = Records, iv. § 16: 'flagpoles of genuine cedar from the best of the (mountain) steps' from the choicest of the lord of the 'two lands'. Also with reference to people, the Egyptians employed similar expressions, thus e.g. Schiffs., AÉ 43, 6 c. 28 (= Lit. 30): '120 seamen were therein m ṣtp.w n ḫmt of the choicest of Egypt'; Mery-Ka-Re, Pap. Peterb. 1116 A, recto 89 (= Lit. 81): 'towns' filled with men m ṣtp.w nt tr ṯr ḫl of the choicest of the entire land'; Harris pl. 27, 2: 'I filled it with beautiful slaves n ṣtp n l, with the choicest of cows'. Finally the Egyptian was never tired of speaking again and again on every occasion of ḫt nb t nfr t 'all good things', especially in records enumerating gifts or war booty. In the case of offerings to temples, gods, or the dead he never forgot to add that they comprised 'all good and pure' or 'holy' things (ḥt nb t nfr t or wḥb).

6. 'All the Gods of Egypt'

Ex 12, 12 says of the plague of the first-born ḥw w b ḫn ḫlm bn ḫn ḫlm ʿlm bn ḫm ʿlm against all the gods of Egypt I will do judgements,' 'All the gods' (nts ṭb n ṭb or 'every god and every goddess' (nts nb ṭb n ṭb) are phrases which were very familiar to the Egyptians; e.g. Harris, pl. 25, 2 of the prayers and favours which the great god (Ramesses III) offered to his father Amon, etc., and 'all the gods of On (= Heliopolis) (nts nb w twnw); Tob. Urk v, 138, 17, Spr. 19, Intr., l. 4: 'Every god and every goddess (nts nb ṭb n ṭb) in heaven and on earth justify Horus'; Rec. 13, 76, pl. II, 18 (= Records, III, § 193): 'May all the gods and goddesses of my temple (nts ṭb n ṭb t ḫm b ḫm) wage war against him'. That in conjunction with this plague of the firstborn particularly, all the gods of Egypt are mentioned adds a note of scorn to the threat in view of the fact that every sanctuary and necropolis was full of priests, servants and slaves dedicated to the gods, and so the plague was to be extended also against the first-born of these classes in mockery and in spite of all the 'gods of Egypt' watching over them.

1 This was the name given to Lebanon by the Egyptians on account of the terraced character of the mountain slopes.
2 It should be remarked that in almost all passages ṣtp.w is in the abstract, and thus exactly as in Hebrew.
3 As from a grammatical point of view nb nb can also be taken as an abbreviated plural, it is quite possible that here and elsewhere it means 'all the gods' and not 'every god'.
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Even the expression ḫw ḫm ḫm 'do judgements' for the carrying out of punishments, here as elsewhere, is of genuine Egyptian character viz. ṣry = to do = ṣtps = judgements, i.e. 'execute judgements', e.g. Redeniyeh Inscri. Rec., xii. 76, pl. 2, 19 (= Records, iii, § 194): 'in ṣtps in ṣtps in ṭr, and may they (the gods) do their judgements on him' i.e. carry out their punishments.

1 Thereby the use of ḫw here, as in Ex 6, 6, 7, 4, and elsewhere e.g. Num. 33, 4, and especially frequently in Ezek. for 'punishments', is shown to be an adaptation of ṣtps, which particularly in legal terminology implies judgements, laws, which are to be executed.

7. 'The Marvellous Deeds'

Ex 3, 20 reads 'and I will smite Egypt with all my marvels ʿmn ṭb which I will do in the midst thereof'; Ex 34, 10: 'before all thy people I will do miracles ṭb ṭb and such as have not been done in the whole land (i.e. world) nor among any peoples'. 'To do marvels' (ḥy bbyy.t) is a very typical and frequent phrase in Egyptian; e.g. Mar. Karnak, pl. XI, 2 f. (= Erm. Lit. 254) Amon-Re says to Thutmose III in recognition of an image being dedicated to him 'I set thee fast in my dwelling place and do marvels for thee (ḥtr ṭb ṭb n ṭb).

Similarly Merneptah expresses himself about his victories, Mar. Karn., pl. 54, 47 (= Records, iii, § 587): 'All the towns and places rejoice at these marvellous deeds (ḥmr nhm b bbyy.t)'. As so often in the Pentateuch when the mighty deeds of God against Egypt are referred to, Ex 6, 6, 7, 4. Deut. 4, 34, 7, 19, 10, 21, 29, 2, so the Pharaohs loved to speak again and again of their 'great deeds' both as hostile acts against their foes as well as in reference to beneficent actions on behalf of the Temples, the gods, or the country.

Cf. e.g. Harris, pl. 25, 1 f.: 'the prayers, praises, and benedictions, great deeds of might (mnh) as well as benevolences which the king . . . did for his father Arum . . . .

1 The Text has ṣtps as masc. plur., exactly as in Hebrew, and not ṣtps fem. sing., as Ag. W.B., i. 302. This seems to be the vernacular mode of speech, and here also, as in other instances, it is followed by the Hebrew. See p. 39 f. For the analogous use of PN = bḥt with' cf. o Chron. 24, 24.
2 I so understand the words: ḥmr y b bbyy.t as ḥmr may mean both establish and immortalize (Ex-Gr. 161). Erman translates: 'ich stelle dich in meinem Wohnort auf', 'I place thee in my habitation', and interprets it that the god will place the image of the king also in the sanctuary as a reward.
3 The word bbyy.t (fem.) 'something astonishing, wonderful' (Ex-Gr. 47) coincides grammatically also with ḫw ḫm 'marvel'. In Ex 15, 11 ṭḥ ṭḥ and parallel passages in the Psalms 77, 15, 78, 12, 82, also ṭḥ corresponds to the Egyptian bḥt 'a wonderful thing'.
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It is noteworthy that not only in the Pentateuch, as the passages cited show, but almost in all passages of the Bible (and there are very many of them) the 'great and marvellous deeds' of God relate exclusively to the exodus from Egypt or the theophany on Sinai. This striking circumstance is only to be explained by the fact that the going out of Egypt was represented and hailed in all times as 'marvellous deeds' נופל הנשים. Thus in using the same phraseology it is apparent that the prophets and psalmists clung to ancient sources, such as the Book of Exodus.

8. 'In all the Seats, Habitations'

A very frequent phrase in our section of Exodus and elsewhere, chiefly in the Pentateuch, is נופל הנשים 'in all your seats' i.e. habitations, dwellings, places, or נופל הנשים 'in their seats'. E.g. Ex. 10.23 'all the children of Israel had light in their seats'; 12.20 'in all your seats shall ye eat unleavened bread'; 35.3 'ye shall kindle no fire in all your seats'; Lev. 7.26 'Ye shall eat no manner of blood... in any of your seats'; 23.3 'it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your seats'; 23.14, 21, 31 'Throughout your generations in all your seats'. With just the same frequency we find this phrase literally in Egyptian מ liệt נבטי 'in all seats i.e. habitations dwellings', wherein מ liệt means 'seat' exactly like the Hebrew word נפעל, and is likewise a feminine formation. With particular predilection this phrase is used by the author of Admon. thus e.g. 1, 9 (=Lit. 94) 'the foreigners have become men מ列入 נבטי in all seats' i.e. 'everywhere'; 2, 2 (=Lit. 95) 'the evildoer is in all seats מ列入 נבטי'; 2, 3 m列入 נבטי 'blood is in all seats'; 2, 4 (=Lit. 96) 'men are few; he who throws his brother to the ground is in all seats'. Also in a negative sense e.g. 3, 2 'men are not מ列入 נבטי in all seats' i.e. nowhere. Cf. further 4, 7.

1 'Men' (רמי) means 'Egyptians', compared with whom all foreigners are mere 'barbarians'. In both passages the poet complains that nowhere are Egyptians to be seen but only foreigners. Cf. Gardiner, Admon., ad loc., and Erman, Lit., 94, n. 1.

2 In the text: מ列入 נבטי מ列入 נבטי, literally 'who gives his brother to the earth' according to Gardiner and Erman, Lit. (Germ.), 94, n. 2, it refers to the interment of the dead. I believe, that this interpretation shows lack of understanding of the spirit of the Egyptian language in associating the conception of 'the earth' with the Egyptian and German meaning of this phrase. It really means 'to throw to the ground' like מ列入 נבטי, e.g. Bauer, i, 196, מ列入 נבטי מ列入 נבטי 'the back of the lie is given to the earth', i.e. 'the obtrusive lie is thrown to the ground, shattered, destroyed'. Similarly also Hi. i, 197. Thus here also, as frequently in Admon., the reference is to violation and murder. Perhaps also something similar is to be detected in מ列入 נבטי 'give him to the ground'; Pphothep Dév. p. 20, v. 80, Erman (Lit. (Germ.), 89), however, interprets it differently.
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9. 'The Maid servant behind the Millstones'?

Ex. 11, 5 reads: 'and all the first-born in the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, unto the first-born of the maid servants that is behind the millstones'. This phrase is to be found literally in the Wisdom of Pashhoep, Pap. Prisse, Brit. Mus. 1909 ed. Dévaud, p. 18, v. 58 (=Lit. 56) 'hidden is a fair speech, more than the green jewel (and?) to go to it מ列入 נבטי for בนะ נבטי 'yet is it to be found among the maid servants at the millstones' meaning that a word of wisdom, though precious as jade, is sometimes to be found even with the lowest and most degraded employment, because it was included among the lowest slavery labour. So we read in Admon. 4, 8 (=Lit. 98f) where complaint is made of the utter degeneration of the better classes that 'the citizens are put to the millstones'; and some lines further (4, 12 f) that free-born women (בנה נבטי) had become as maid servants (בנה נבטי); that the song of the girl musicians had become as a wail; and concludes: 'those who spoke (i.e. who had “the say”)... sit at the millstones (בנה נבטי)'. Similarly we find sitting at the millstones is characterized as the most lonely occupation in Pap. Leyden, 543, recto 2, 8 (=verso 4, 2) where the evil spirit of an illness is exorcized with the following words: 'So mayest thou mill (corn) on the millstones (בנה נבטי); so mayest thou serve at the millstones (בנה נבטי).'

It is most probable that in referring to the 'maid servant at the millstones' allusion is made to prison hard labour as in the parallel passage Ex. 12, 29 which reads: מ列入 נבטי מ列入 נבטי מ列入 נבטי 'down to the first-born in captivity in the house of the pit', denoting the gaols and mine-pits where native and foreign prisoners were set to hard labour. Actually from Gen. 40, 15 we know that מ列入 נבטי the ‘pit’ was a prison for forced labour (cf. Gen. 39, 22).

10. Formal phrases referring to the primeval time of Egypt

(a) 'Since Egypt was founded'

Ex. 9, 18 Moses says unto Pharaoh: 'Behold to-morrow about this time I will cause it to rain a very grievous hail such as hath not been in Egypt

1 The same idea of degradation and humiliation is expressed in Job 31, 10: grinding work and rape are placed on a level. The interpretation of מ列入 נבטי as a euphemism is unnecessary. Apart from the toil involved this work is considered the greatest degradation for a better-class woman, precisely because of the indecent posture which the work demands with her legs round the millstone.
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from the day it was founded until now'. In the last words we have the literal reproduction of an Egyptian phrase to characterize a thing or an event as unusual, monstrous, unheard of, from the earliest times within human memory; thus Urk. iv, 162, of Thutmose III says: 'He (Amon) rejoices over me more than over all the kings ḫprw m ti ḫrw.γw.tw-f who have been in the land since it was founded'.

Quite similar is ibid. 141. 7 of Thutmose III: 'because his father Amon loved him so much, more than any king ḫprw ḫrw.zw ti who has been since the primordial time of the land' and ibid. 170, 5 also of Thutmose III: 'because he (Amon) loved his own son (i.e. the king) so very much more than any king who has been since the primordial time of the land'; further ibid. 312, 13 of the new construction of a fortress n sp ḫtw myvt.t ḫrw pt m.t ti 'never had its like been made since the primordial time of the land'. These examples which could be greatly multiplied show how closely our formula coincides in wording and spirit with the Egyptian. It is true that the Egyptian by 'land' always thought of Egypt and therewith associated the conception 'world'; also he conceived the 'foundation' of Egypt in the sense of creation as he similarly speaks of 'foundation' for creation of the world, e.g. Hymn of Aton, Davis, Am., vii, pl. 27, 13 to the Sun that whenever it rises it brings forth crops for the king ḫr int-k ti since thou didst found the land', i.e. the world.

(b) 'Since Egypt became a People'

A similar expression is that of Ex. 9, 24 where it speaks of the hail: 'such as was there none like it in all the land of Egypt ḫr ḫrw n-pj since it became a people'. The real meaning of this allusion in its full significance only becomes clear to us when we learn that the Egyptians from the earliest times regarded the foundation of the Kingdom of Upper and Lower Egypt as the greatest and most significant event in all their history, and although the exact date was not known, nevertheless the memory thereof reached back to the remotest period, still remaining vivid as late as the New Kingdom. It was always conceived as the moment when Egypt
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began to exist as a united people, when the rule over Egypt was transferred from the gods of primeval days to the kings who thenceforth became their heirs representing the last of the god-kings, Horus, son of Osiris. For the Egyptians indeed the beginning of that epoch marked the boundary-line between the world of the gods and that of the men descended from them, thus forming the oldest epoch of their history within memory. This is the event to which our passage alludes and this in the same manner as the Egyptians themselves spoke of it, e.g. Harris, pl. 78, 7 l. (= Records, iv, § 409), where Rameses III is said to have been brought wonderful genuine malachite in numerous sacks 'the like of which ḫw ḫtw ḫrw ḫnw.yt had not been seen since the time of the kingdom'.

Cf. also Kahun-Stela, l. 29 and Virey, Rec., xiv, 97, 29 (= Records, § 291) of a well which by command of Rameses II was dug on the road to the land Akita: 'the like of which had not been made ḫr ḫnw.y w ṣm.w ḫw.t since the kings and the former ones'.

How closely the foundation of the kingdom and the period of the rule of the god-kings were bound up together in the mind of the Egyptian is shown by the fact that he harked back also to the time of the gods whenever he spoke of something very ancient, or exceptionally unusual, that had never been seen before. The familiar formula was ḫr ḫt ntr 'since the time of the god' meaning either Re as the first, or Horus as the last, of the god-kings on earth whose throne was then occupied by the first man-king as the heir to Horus, e.g. Harris, pl. 26, 11: of a 'glorious weighing-scale of burnished copper, the like of which had not been made ḫr ḫt ntr since the time of the god' (Thoth).

Mar. Abyd. I, pl. 7, 59 (= Records, iii, § 270) the court addressing Rameses II: 'since the time of the god (ḏr ḫt ntr), since a king shone forth, there has been none like unto thee, neither beheld by face nor heard in words'.

1 The word 'kingdom' is determined by the dual sign, a distinct indication that thereby the combined kingdom of Upper and Lower Egypt is meant. The Hebrew obviously avoids speaking of the 'kingdom', as it could only be understood in the hierarchic-dogmatic sense of the Egyptians and might have been taken to be an implicit recognition of the divine character of the king.

2 The text ḫt.ntr 'prince' corrected by Breasted to ḫr.ntr is uncertain. If it stood in the plural, ṣm.w might be struck out as erroneous and the passage interpreted 'since the kings and princes'. The former ones, the forefathers' must hence be correct. The 'Former Ones' or 'the Forefathers' refer both to the first kings and to the primeval god kings. Thus e.g. Liebesch. Pap. Harris, 500, pl. 12, 3-4, about the period of Sety I (1913-1903): 'my body passes away, others endure', ḫr ḫw ṣm.w ḫw.t 'since the time of the Former Ones'; somewhat different ib. Liebesch. Pap., p. 31 f., pl. 1, 2-3 (‘commemoration of the 18th dynasty’): 'the bodies pass away ḫr ḫt ntr 'since the time of the god'. Cf. also Lit., 132 f.

3 The same idea is found in Job. 29, 3 ḫw ḫnw 'as the days of God' which will be discussed elsewhere in another connexion.
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On the other hand they furnish the Egyptian background for Deut. 4, 39, and on the other hand show us clearly how Egyptian mythological formulae of a dogmatic-hierarchic nature were transplanted on to monotheistic soil in the Pentateuch, and thereby received a religious and moral force which they never possessed in Egypt. Here, just as in Egypt, great events are described as something which since the earliest days (נְפַלְפַלְפַל יָשָׁר) have neither been seen nor heard. But by the further description of these ‘earliest days’ as ‘the day when God created man upon earth’, the idea of the primeval age is freed from every polytheistic and mythological element, and is defined as the true beginning of the real world in which, through the creation of man, conscious perception first became possible. Precisely such a passage clearly indicates how familiar the author was with Egyptian phraseology, and that the alteration was deliberately made for the purpose of adopting Egyptian wording to the monotheistic thought.

In this connexion it is interesting to observe how in the early days of Israel’s history (Judges 19, 30), the going out of Egypt became a formula to mark the beginning of an era the same as the foundation of the kingdom in Egypt. Furthermore taking into consideration the extraordinarily wide-spread use of all such hyperbolic expressions in Egyptian and that unmistakably they were absorbed very early in Hebrew literature, such passages as 2 Kings 23, 25 and 25, 2 Chron 35, 18, or Neh. 8, 17 will not be taken so literally as they are, nor will far-reaching conclusions be drawn from them as is usually done.

(c) The Forefathers of the Kings

Another phrase which the reader passes over without noting in it anything out of the ordinary but which is extraordinarily instructive, and reveals the deep understanding of Egyptian hierarchic conceptions by the narrator, is Ex. 10, 6: speaking of the locusts, it says: ‘and they shall fill thy houses and the houses of thy servants and the houses of the whole of Egypt’ (םש ושד והועה הֵעֶשֶׁהוּ), i.e. the kings that followed Horus; Rec. 20, p. 40: ‘never has the like occurred since the primordial time of the two lands’ (בִּשָּׁמֶשׁ שֵׁל הָעֵצֶּה הָעֵצֶּה). All these expressions, especially those relating to primeval times and first beginnings, are in another respect very instructive inasmuch as on

1 Similarly in the teaching of Amenemhet, p. f., Až. 24, 41 (Lit. 72): ‘an attempt was made against me, a blow without its being heard (in śm.tw-t)’ and a great fighting without its being seen (n.mn.tw-t), i.e. the like of which had never been seen or heard. This is the correct meaning of the passage and not as Erman suggested.

2 In another connexion the expression שֵׁל הָעֵצֶּה Levit. 26, 45; Deut. 19, 14, בִּשָּׁמֶשׁ Deut. 33, 7, as well as the Akkadian phrase ‘from the time of the flood’ (KAT. 537) will be treated at greater length.

3 Just because it was a conscious rhetorical exaggeration, the Biblical chroniclers did not take it seriously as a terminus a quo, and thus in 2 Kings 23, 25 it is replaced by ‘the time of the Judges’, and 2 Chron. 35, 18 by ‘the time of Samuel’.
section just as typical as for Egyptian narratives, thus e.g. *LD. iii. 155*: 
'the servants of Pharaoh killed them'; they did not escape, not one of them 
(*w† lm-im*)' *Urkh. iv. 84*, of the stricken foe: 'not one remained of them 
(*n sp w† im*)'. *Schiffbr. AZ. 43*, 6 c. 37–9 (*= Lit. 31*): 'the ship went 
down (most literally: died down): of those that were in it not one remained 
(*sty. w† lm-im nn sp w† im*)'; the narrator forgetting in this case that he was 
one that did survive. As will be seen, we have here a formal phrase which has 
almost shed its literal meaning and which belongs to those hyperbolic 
formulæ which are so frequent in Egyptian, and which also appear in our 
section.

Special attention should be paid to the agreement between Hebrew and 
Egyptian, even in grammatical construction, in the passage relating to 
Pharaoh *Ex. 14*, 28 רַפָּא יָד וְנָפָם and in *LD. iii. 155 w† lm-im* 'one among them'. 
The construction in Hebrew contested and emended by so many now 
appears as perfectly correct in consonance with the Egyptian idiom. The 
establishment of such a complete coincidence is very important because, 
coupled with the fact already mentioned that it is only in the Exodus story 
that this formal phrase recurs so closely, it is bound to dispel all doubt as 
to the literary unity of this section.

11. 'Not One'

In the Exodus narrative the phrase גְּדוֹל 'not one remained', 
occurring not less than three times at short intervals, thus of the גְּדוֹל (flies ?) 
8, 26, and of Pharaoh and his host 14, 28: רַפָּא יָד שָׁבָם וְנָפָם 'there 
remained not so much as one of them'; of the locusts 10, 19 'there 
remained not one locust; and similarly 9, 6 and 7. This is for our 

1 Of the many references which could be quoted, the following is most characteristic and 
appropriate: m hæs ʃ(w)h mtr. x. *ldn w b* 'at the time of thy kings, the Kings, the 
2 Cf. e.g. the oft-quoted *Lepsius*, p. 121, p. 28 f., referring to the dead kings: 'the gods 
that were before rest in their pyramids'; further references to the divinity of the kings will 
be found in Erman–Ranke, p. 62 f. and above p. 43, n. 2. 
3 Elsewhere it occurs only in Judges 4, 16 in the same meaning as *Ex. 14*, 28 and similarly 
(שָׁבָם) 2 Sam. 13, 30, 17, 12 and Ps. 106, 11 with reference to the same happening 
CHAPTER VI

EGYPTIAN LOANWORDS IN THE JOSEPH AND EXODUS NARRATIVES

As we have already remarked above (p. 4) the Joseph and Exodus narratives contain Egyptian loan-words now generally recognized as such. As the latter have already been dealt with by others we do not deem it necessary to go over them again, but propose to add a series of other words (1) the Egyptian origin of which has not hitherto been discovered and are still derived from Hebrew or other Semitic stems, and (2) some others which we identify with altogether different Egyptian words from those hitherto considered as their origin.

1. ꞌm for Food

One of the most familiar words in our section of the Pentateuch is ꞌm as verb, and ꞌm as noun obviously meaning sustenance, food. The fact that this word is so characteristic of the Joseph narrative, is in itself a warrant for its Egyptian origin. As a matter of fact ꞌaw also ꞌaw (=? ꞌaww) for 'foods or sacrificial meats' was particularly current in the New Kingdom though it occurs already in the Old Kingdom (Ex.-Gr. 18o, cf. also Erman, Wortforschungen, Sitz.-Ber. Berl. Ak. 1907, 414 f.). In Urt. iv. 155, 17, the vizier Rekh-My-Re is depicted as ꞌm-aww 'inspecting the foods for the daily sacrifices; Urt. v. Toth., Spr. 17, ꞌm-aw stands for 'foods of the dead'; Pyr. 290 d: 'the looters of his meat (ꞌaw) are with him'; sometimes ꞌm-aw stands for the offering of meats to the dead, e.g. Pyr. 64.a. There are

1 For detailed references cf. Ges.-Buhl, on the above-quoted words, p. 4. In other chapters we shall revert to the Egyptian loanwords in the other portions of the Pentateuch.

2 Occurs elsewhere in Deut. 2, 9 and 28, as well as in five other passages of the Bible, Is. 55, 1, Amos 8, 5 and 6, Neh. 10, 32, and Prov. 11, 26, the last most probably influenced by the description of Joseph as ꞌm/apt. All derivations from the Akkadian or Arabic (cf. Ges.-Buhl, s.v.) are far-fetched, differ in root, and yield only indirectly a meaning which is merely impersonal. The same applies also to other words in the Bible that are explained from Semitic languages, but are, as we shall show, Egyptian loan-words.

3 It appears to be related to ꞌlth 'to feed oneself' (Ex.-Gr. 41), but it is hardly idiomatic with it. In addition there was a ꞌm for 'meal' which was also used for a table with meats, customarily offered as a gift of honour. According to Erman, loc. cit. this has nothing to do with our ꞌm, though in the New Empire the two words are not graphically differentiated. There are numerous examples of dropping the ꞌr at the end of a word in Egyptian, as in ꞌ for ꞌfr, etc.

2. ꞌm ꞌm the Khorii Baskets

(Ex. 40, 16 speaks of ꞌm ꞌm, a kind of basket for pastry. From among the numerous explanations of this enigmatic word the most plausible is that which connects it with the neo-Hebrew ꞌm, a sort of pastry (Ges.-Buhl, s.v.). This derivation might be linked with the Egyptian ꞌm-tif (n. ꞌm) 'food', and the reference would be to baskets employed in the carrying of food and pastry. Nevertheless it appears to me that ꞌm does not refer to the contents of the basket but to the nature of the basket itself. As a matter of fact it is simpler and more appropriate to explain it by ꞌm- ꞌm or ꞌm- ꞌm, which the Egyptians applied to a land or people in the neighbourhood of Palestine identical with the Biblical ꞌm Khorites in Edom. Likewise they characterized vessels, articles, or materials which came from the land of Kharu, or which were fashioned in Khorite style, as a product of Kharu, the designation Kharu thus being a sort of trade-mark. Such Kharu products and manufactures were particularly well-known in Egypt in the New Kingdom, as it seems that at that period the Khorites had not yet lost their independence or existence. In the report on the battle of Megiddo (about 1475-70 B.C.), Annals of Thutmose, iii. 1. 100 (= Urt. iv, 665, 16), we find among the precious vessels captured also an ꞌm ꞌm bif ꞌm hbrw 'a great ewer in work of the Kharu'.

1 Cf. Burch. Altkarm., No. 324 ff.; as foreign people they appear inter alia Urt. IV, 649, 10. In general Kharu is interpreted as name for Syria or Palestine, Ex.-Gr. 122; cf. also Ges.-Buhl, s.v. ꞌm II and recent commentaries on Gen. 14. 6, 36, 20 and above, p. 38, n. 4.

2 Cf. Burch. Altkarm., No. 324 ff.; as foreign people they appear inter alia Urt. IV, 649, 10. In general Kharu is interpreted as name for Syria or Palestine, Ex.-Gr. 122; cf. also Ges.-Buhl, s.v. ꞌm II and recent commentaries on Gen. 14. 6, 36, 20 and above, p. 38, n. 4.
3. **Stand for a Vessel and Post**

Gen. 40: 13; 41: 13 is a metaphorical expression for 'position, post' and is used specifically for the 'base' of the bronze laver in the outer court of the Tabernacle Ex. 30, 18-28 etc., as well as in the Temple of Solomon. Kings 7, 29 f. This word has in reality nothing to do with the Hebrew ב (Gez.-Buhl.), but is borrowed from the Egyptian 𓊕𓅓𓊖, a specifically technical expression for the stands of bowls and other objects placed in Temples and sanctuaries, thus e.g. LD. Ill. 65 a, 14; AZ. 37 (1899), 95 𓊕𓅓 of copper; the same perhaps also in Harris, 49, 8. Cf. Er.-Gr. 198.

4. 𓊕𓅓 for Magicians

This word is applied in the Pentateuch exclusively to magicians at the court of Pharaoh Gen. 41, 5, 54; Ex. 7, 11, 22, 8, 3, 14, 12, 9, 11, though the usual designation for sorcerers and magicians is 𓊕𓅓. Now though practically all commentators agree that by 𓊕𓅓 a particular category of sorcerers is meant, there is a difference of opinion with regard to its origin and the Semitic stem or language from which it is to be derived and as to how the strange form 𓊕𓅓 is to be explained. Even Egyptologists are inclined to regard it as a Semitic word not being able to explain it with certainty by an Egyptian word. It is true that in Er.-Gr. 153 the suggestion is advanced that the first element may be identical with the first component of 𓊕𓅓 'a kind of priest, learned and skilled in magic', but even then the second element 𓊕 is still remains obscure. And yet it must surely be an Egyptian expression for the simple reason that in all the passages cited it is solely used to designate Egyptian magicians.

It appears to me that it consists of the two Egyptian words 𓊕𓅓 (rather than 𓊕𓅓) 'be that is upon, over something, chief' (Er.-Gr. 113) and 𓊕𓊕 (𓊕𓊕) 'book, papyrus roll' (Er.-Gr. 218), hence, 'He who is over the books, writings', i.e. 'learned in the writings', whereby the writings of the magic art are meant in contradistinction to 'el-sa-ar t' the 'divine writings' for the books of the Law or mgf.t ntr likewise for the holy writings. Although such a compound expression for magicians has not yet been found in Egyptian, the first component, 𓊕𓅓 occurs frequently in titles (Er.-Gr. 114) like 𓊕𓅓-nš.t 'he over the army = General, Field Marshal; 𓊕𓅓-nš.t 'he on the throne = heir to the throne; 𓊕𓅓-aš.t 'he over the shore', title of agricultural administrator (because the fertile land is on the shores); 𓊕𓅓-nš.t 'he over the ship = captain, Rec. xxi. and many others. There were inter alia also a 𓊕𓅓-nš-t-nš.t 'chief scribe of the house of God' for the chief hierogrammatist, Rec. xvi. 56, 1 and a 𓊕𓅓-nš.t 'he over the secrets' i.e. 'integrated into the secrets' as a title of a high official, learned in the mysteries and all

It only occurs elsewhere in Dan. 1, 20 and 2, 2, in conjunction with other designations for chramatographers. Whether the reference there is to Egyptian magicians employed at the Babylonian court, or whether the original Egyptian expression had in course of time become so acclimatized in Hebrew and Aramaic dialects that it was used in general for sorcerer, is difficult to decide.

The word 𓊕豕 is New-Egyptian, i.e. from the period with which we see specially concerned. 𓊕豕 is probably the syllabic writing, the root being 𓊕豕 like 𓊕豕 in Hebrew. Possibly it is identical with or akin to mgf.t 'book, document' Er.-Gr. 74. One might also conceive the Egyptian 𓊕豕 (𓊕豕) 'to name, speak', the equivalent of 𓊕豕 in the meaning of 'incantation'. But the above interpretation seems to be phonetically better founded.
5. Ề̀m̀ to Linger

This reduplicated verb which occurs in Gen. 43, 10; Ex. 12, 39, also Gen. 19, 16 is derived from the Egyptian myh (meye or ye) 'neglect' (Er.-Gr. 68 'forget' with br). This meaning is clearly indicated in the passage Louvre C. 55, 13-16 (cf. Vezier, p. 174), where it reads: 'I directed my attention to that which he (the king) said; nought have I neglected (myh-y) that he enjoined upon me'. Cf. also Pthahoteb, p. 24, vers. 154, 'be on thy guard against neglect (myh or mh.t ib)'.

It should be remarked that tam (taw), seems to be the same stem as myh meaning 'to be slow, to come late, to remain behind, to hesitate' and sometimes also, 'to hold up something', which in Bauer R 123 parallel to Bauer B I, 78 lvw caus. of lvw (lwh) 'to hesitate, procrastinate, hold one's self back' reads: 'His Majesty said, if thou wouldst see me healthy, hold him (the peasant) back' (lvw/lim-k.im). Cf. further B I, 541: 'when thou goest down to the sea of truth etc., thy ship will not delay' or: 'be slow' (mv tam dp.t-k); B II, 104 'be not slow without thereby being fast' (mv tym n ny-h-k). Cf. Vogelsang's observations on these Passages p. 81, 67, 222. Obviously tam is metaphesed from myh and appears to have been in use side by side with the latter. At any rate both coincide absolutely in meaning, likewise tam in all passages shows exactly the same usage. Especially noteworthy is Ps. 119, 66, first because the word there is used in contrast to 'hurry, hasten' as in the cited passage, Bauer, ii. 104, and

1 It is tempting to interpret our word in the later neo-Hebrew meaning of myh 'beak', as in Ammonopath's Book of Wisdom, xviii. 7, the finger of the scribe is represented as the 'beak' of Thoth, the God of Writing: ir br n baly gb n st 'the beak of Thoth—symbol of Thoth—is the finger of the scribe'; but as will be seen it is not the scribe that is denoted as the 'beak of Thoth' which would be less appropriate, but the finger of the scribe, however strange this simile may appear to be. It should be mentioned that in modern Hebrew literature, hieroglyphic writing is called גנבים גנעים 'script of the beaks' owing to the presence of many bird-figures.

1 Cf. Ember, AZ 51, 110, No. 91. The Arabic root للس which he cites also belongs here. I assume that للس 'to hold back' from an action, e.g. from departure, and the reflex. form للس لل 'hesitate, to hold oneself back', probably belongs to myh (or tam), which presumably passed from the Egyptian to Arabic through the Coptic. The explanation of Arab lexicographers that it is an onomatopoeic derivation from the cry mah! mah! for stopping beasts of burden can hardly be right.

6. ʾניִכוֹר Abomination

This word for 'abomination, abhorrence', occurs with reference to Egypt and in connexion with sacrificial and ritual matters or food (cf. above p. 75), and is a denominative formation from the Egyptian ʾw-b (zaw) the usual word for 'pure, holy, or purification', as verb for 'purify oneself' (Er.-Gr. 34.), or in caus. ʾw-b to 'purify' (Er.-Gr. 155). It is very common in hieratic religious language with reference to sacrifices, priests, libations, and food for the dead and all sorts of other things appertaining to the cult of the dead and sacrificial ritual.

That in Hebrew this word should present a meaning contrary to that of its Egyptian original should cause no surprise since that which was for the Egyptians pure and holy, was for the Hebrews impure and abhorrent, as vice versa the sacrifices of the Hebrews appeared to the Egyptians as an abomination (Ex. 8, 23).

Thus the derivation of ʾניִכָּו from zaw (Ges.-Buld. s.v.) is proved to be perfectly correct, and consequently, the verb zaw Deut. 7, 26, 23, 8 etc. is not the root of יִכְו, but is a denominative derivation from the latter, a secondary formation which is substantiated by many parallels.

7. ʾבֹּלֵל Unleavened Bread

This is a word which cannot be explained from any Semitic root and is undoubtedly an Egyptian loan-word ʾמִלְּט or ʾמִלְּטָה, (n.n. fem.) for a sort of bread or cake, and in extended meaning also for food, just as לָכוֹת is both bread and food, e.g. Pr. 88 b: 'two silt-o-loaves'; Pr. 291 a 'they are the robbers of his foods (ʾמִלְּטָה)'.

The description given in Ex. 12, 39 of the

1 This word was in such general use from the oldest periods of Egyptian literature down to the very latest that illustrative examples are hardly necessary. In the texts of the 18th dynasty, the abbreviated or metathesized form ʾw or ʾnb (Er.-Gr. 24) also occurs. For Coptic cf. Sp. WB 166 ʾφαί (S) ʾφαί (B) ʾφαί (F).

2 Especially in neo-Hebrew is this the case, e.g. יָנוּל from יָנוּל (nul); יָנוּל from יָנוּל (yul). Whether יָנוּל from Nehum 2, 4 is connected therewith is doubtful. I presume that in Lament. 2, 1 ʾנָב is in the preterite, like the succeeding verbs and that it is derived from the very root ʾנָב 'to abhor' as is יָנוּל. In Phoenician יָנוּל first occurs in the fourth (7) century B.C., cf. T槟b מְלָט (Melch, Liddel, Nordern, Epi.) 417, 6: יָנוּל יָנוּל כ יָנוּל יָנוּל.

3 It is followed by the customary determinatives for bread, cake, alternatively corn and food in general and seems to be here identical with ʾמִלְּט. Whether in ʾמִלְּט or ʾמִלְּט "evening meal" (with the determinative for night, darkness, Er.-Gr. 71) time, evening, or
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The expression occurs in the Pentateuch only Ex. 13, 18, and otherwise in Jos. 1, 14, 12, and Judges 7, 11, and is often taken to denote readiness for war and war equipment (cf. Ges.-Buhl, s.v.). The fact that it is spoken of the Israelites who went out of Egypt, further that it no longer occurs in later Biblical writings, and finally that all attempts to explain it from Semitic stems have utterly failed, largely supports the suggestion that it is of foreign origin. As a matter of fact we have here an Egyptian loan word hmi denoting a weapon, a sort of lance or harpoon. In the Herods-Myth, Horus is depicted fighting against the hippopotamus with a hmi which looks like a lance or long spear. This is, in my opinion, just the

food, bread is the prime element, is difficult to decide. In Pyr. 716 b min.1 is determined as food and must mean the ‘evening meal’, as it is anti-thetic to Pws-()[5] ‘morning meal’.

1 This kind is not the only one which has been preserved from the oldest times in modern Egypt. In the markets of old Cairo as well as in the country, one can see to-day many other kinds and forms of bread, pancakes, and cakes like those which are depicted on the old Egyptian reliefs and which can be seen also in mummies. In Museum. 3

The fact that the ḫwḥw were otherwise also baked on the fin, as e.g. in the sacrificial service, as well as the circumstance that they were sometimes baked or kneaded with oil (Lev. 2, 4, 7, 12, etc.); or that Abraham regaled his guests therewith (Gen. 18, 3) did not detract from their description as ‘bread of poverty’. Moreover these were of white flour (ḥwḥw) and there were two kinds, namely, ḫwḥw ḫḥw and ḫwḥw ṭṭṭṭ, the nature of which we shall more fully describe when dealing with meat offerings. 3

It is true that in Num. 32, 17 also the same word seems to lurk in עִדְּכָה (cf. Ges.-Buhl, s.v.), especially having regard to Jos. 1, 14, 12, 13. Cf. LXX and the Vulgate.

4 Naß, Textes relatifs au mythe d'Horus, iii: ‘A harpoon sticks in its neck, a hmi (lance) eats its flesh’ (hmi `m-1-tluj-fj). Cf. therewith Deut. 32, 44. As in the fight with such an animal, its attacks on the boat were the most dangerous, the hmi-lances must have been fairly long.
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weapon that is meant here. As in Ex. 14, 8 it is emphasized here also that the Hebrews in leaving Egypt went out proudly and triumphantly having troops armed with lances, a well disciplined host. That in Egypt there were troops armed with lances is shown on various Egyptian bas-reliefs (e.g. Erman-Ranke, Abb. 272, p. 652), and such troops would have formed the advance section at the head of the army. It is now clear why Joshua 1, 14, 4, 12: Judges 7, 11, speaking of shock troops should designate them ṣwḥw. It should be remembered that in ancient warfare thrust weapons played the most prominent role and it is for this reason that they symbolize in the Bible the valour and fighting spirit of the warriors. 2

E. 그 글

Ex. 7, 28 ṣwḥw is designated as a vessel used in Egypt, and in 12, 24 as a container for dough which the Hebrews carried on their shoulders when going out of Egypt. Finally in the last passage of the Pentateuch in which it occurs, Deut. 28, 17, it is mentioned together with ṣp with ‘basket’. All this shows that ṣwḥw is a specifically Egyptian vessel used for dough, for bread or food, and hence makes it very probable that the word ṣwḥw also is of Egyptian origin. As a matter of fact in Egyptian ḫḥw denoted a kind of box or sack for corn, flour, or bread. 3 Now it is well-known that the Egyptian ḫḥw was in older script also written ḫ, so that the Egyptians at a certain period pronounced our ḫḥw; when the Hebrews formed ṣwḥw from ḫḥw they took it over in the pronunciation ṣwḥw as they heard it in their own days from the Egyptians. 3 It should be noted that ṣwḥw only occurs in the Pentateuch, the first time only in relation with Egypt (Ex. 7, 28 and 12, 24) and the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, and then in Deut. 28, 17 in connexion with ṣp which is also the Egyptian word ṣwḥw for ‘basket’, with

1 Whether ḥwḥw a Sam. 2, 23, 3, 27, 4, 6, 20, 10 can be connected therewith is merely conjectural. The interpretation that ḥwḥw denoted the portion of the body or the side where the weapon was borne, like Ḧwḥw from ḥwḥw ‘hip’, for ‘men armed at the hip’ is not very probable for the reason that in a Sam. 20, 10 ḥwḥw rather indicates the abdomen. Cf. Ges.-Buhl, s.v.

2 Cf. e.g. Pap. Westcar, iii, 4 (= Lit. 76) ‘then they laid their heads on the corinthis (p ḫḥw)’. Likewise Pap. Kolter, 1, 3. Judging by the determinative hieroglyphic for ‘hide’ it must have been of leather. It served also as corn measure, e.g. Stela of Puzeritiw, I, 4, 12, 24. 22: ‘two sacks (ḫḥw) of spelt’. It may have been used earlier for other things, cf. Griffith, Fear. of Silet, fourth contract of Hepa (under Season III).

3 To the examples cited by Erman, Gramm., § 112: hmi = hmi ‘ear (of corn)’ firm = hmi ‘to be hot’, we may add also ẖḥw and ḫḥw ‘storm’; ḫḥw and ḫḥw ‘adorn’; ḫḥw and ḫḥw ‘shave’, from which the Arabic Ḧwḥw ‘to shave’ (also ḧḥw ‘barbed’ = ḫḥw) is to be derived. The suggestion of Er.-Gr. 135 that Hebrew ṣwḥh is identical with ḫḥw is merely conjectural.
the difference that whereas נָכוֹן served for the storing and carrying of fruit (cf. above p. 8, n. 3) נָכוּף was employed as a box or sack for bread, corn, etc.

10. וַיַּלְךָ

Ex. 14, 17 reads ‘and towards the morning the sea returned מַעֵרָה’ usually conceived as ‘to its strength’, though the context would lead one to expect מַעֵרָה the meaning of ‘sea-bed’, as many have indeed suggested without, however, being able to substantiate it. Now we find in Egyptian the word ḫtn, ṭtn (meye) meaning ‘soil, ground’, extended to ‘earth, dust, dirt’, exactly corresponding to its usage in the Coptic ḫn (meye) (É.-Gr. 9, Spieg. WR p. 30). It was very familiar especially in the texts of the New Kingdom, thus e.g. Israel-Stela, l. 6: ‘Their water bottles were dashed (literally ḫtn ‘beaten’) to the ground (Ῥ ḫtn); further Urkh. iv. 840, 1 probably of pillars which were placed on the ground (ἵστορ), and Pap. d’Orb. viii. 7 f. (= Lit. 205): “His hand lay on his head and it (head) was smeared (eaw) with ḫtn’ i.e. dust or dirt in sign of mourning. Especially frequent is ṭtn, ḫn (meye) from ḫtn) for soil, also earth, dirt, slime, in Demotic texts (cf. Spiegelberg, Petabatic, Gloss. No. 44). A very noteworthy passage where ṭtn is used for earth or mud taken from soil inundated by the Nile is Pap. Heidelberg 723, Sethe-Partsch, Urkh. 9, i. 18 f., p. 156 and Trans., p. 190: ‘and we will place around the girdle-wall of ṭtn’ i.e. Nile earth, mud. As even to-day fencing of gardens and fields in Egypt is made of clay and Nile mud, and as, moreover, ṭtn is here used in the same sense as ḫtn in the New Kingdom, Nile soil must actually have been meant in this passage, and as a matter of fact it relates to the mud which remains on the soil after the retreat of the Nile floods. Although the passage quoted is from a late document, it is on the one hand very characteristic for the stability of Egyptian conditions through the ages, and on the other hand substantiates the continuos use of ḫtn, ṭtn in one and the same meaning.1

All these facts make it clear that מַעֵרָה means the sliny soil left by the retreat of the Sea of Reeds which, after the passage of the Israelites, was again covered by the water. Hence מַעֵרָה may mean ‘flood’ is pure conjecture and less appropriate here.2

1 For ḫtn we find also ṭtn (Sethe, Verb. Glossar u.v.). Nevertheless ḫtn is undoubtedly more genuine. The Coptic form ḫn (meye) is nearer to the Hebrew מַעֵרָה than the hieroglyphic. Thus we have here another illustration of the fact that Hebrew transmitted an Egyptian loan-word in a pronunciation similar to the Coptic form. Here also, as in the case of מַעֵרָה – Coptic σςπ, the Hebrew seems to reproduce the old common pronunciation of this word in Egyptian still preserved in the 1500-years-younger Coptic.

2 The citation of the word מַעֵרָה (120) ‘inundation, flood’, e.g. Dumm. Tempelinschr. 81, 12
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convoy is not that the sea became high and stormy again, as the storm had been continuing the whole time, but that on the contrary, it now once more returned to its normal position, i.e. מַעֵרָה to its bed.1

FINAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE IOSEPH AND EXODUS NARRATIVES

All our findings so far have sufficiently shown how closely both language and style of the Joseph and Exodus stories follow the Egyptian. Nevertheless the material used for comparative purposes in this portion of the Pentateuch is still far from being exhausted. In addition to what has already been discussed, further materials are available but have been omitted here, chiefly because we think it more appropriate to deal with them elsewhere synchronically classified in special groups. Thus our section, with the exclusion of Jacob’s blessing (Gen. 49, 1–27) which has not yet been treated by us (cf. above, p. 3 n.), comprises:

1. Egyptian loanwords like the following: בְּרֵאשִׁית Gen. 42, 4 etc.; בְּרֵאשִׁית 50, 15; בְּרֵאשִׁית 4, 2 etc.; יָנַיָּה דָּרוֹן 7, 27 ff.; יָנַיָּה 9, 9 ff.; יָנַיָּה 9, 21; יָנַי 12, 11 ff.; יָנַי 12, 15 etc.; יָנַי 13, 16.

2. Expressions only to be explained out of life and conditions in Egypt and consequently to be regarded as Egyptianisms as: יְהוָה Gen. 47, 44; יָנַי and יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 50, 2; יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 1, 10; יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 1, 11; יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 5, 4; and other expressions modelled on Egyptian like יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 47, 6 and יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 14, 4 ff. or יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 13, 21 ff.

3. Phrases like יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 47, 26 etc. etc., also יָנַי 40, 7, 41, 9 etc. or יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 39, 11; יְהוָה יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 2, 2 or idioms like יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית, יָנַי יָנַי, יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית, as well as many formal courtesy phrases in which our section is particularly rich.

4. Metaphorical expressions in which portions of the body are used as e.g. יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 41, 8; יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 45, 26; יָנַי בְּרֵאשִׁית 11, 8.

5. Words contained in our section which were also current as Semitic loanwords in Egyptian, particularly in the New Kingdom, the time of Israel's

(As Griffith’s appendix to Pap. Kahun, ii, 12), ‘the flood is strong (ˉאָמְרָה) the land of Horus’ it is untranslatable on phonetical grounds.1

After this part of my book was printed, my attention was drawn to H. J. Heyes, Biblical and Egyptian, 1904. I should also like to mention Sir F. Petrie, Egypt and Israel, 1921; A. Mallon, Les Hébreux en Égypte, 1921 and G. A. Frank-Knight, Nile and Jordan, 1921. In all of them many features of the Joseph and Exodus narratives are explained in the light of Egyptian conceptions and customs, though from a more general than linguistic point of view.)
sojourn in Egypt, such as: מִדְבַּר Gen. 41:48; מִדְבַּר 41:43; פֶּרֶכְר 43:28; מִדְבַּר 45:19 ff.; מִדְבַּר Ex. 4:34.

6. Personal names in the lists of Jacob's descendants some of which have been recognized as Egyptian, such as: מָרָא and מָרָא שֵׁם or supposed to be of Egyptian origin, like מַכְסֶה, and finally other names which are to be derived from the Egyptian like מַרְאָא, מַר or מַרְאָא.

7. A series of stylistic, syntactic, and grammatical peculiarities modelled on Egyptian, as well as a number of prepositions and particles borrowed from or modelled on Egyptian, like: מִת, מִת, מִת, מִת, מִת, מִת, etc.

All these will be treated later in conjunction with other cognate linguistic materials from other portions of the Pentateuch, according to philological and thematic points of view, in special groups and categories.

We now proceed to turn to other portions of the Pentateuch. Though the preceding analysis of the Joseph and Exodus narratives has established a strong relationship with the Egyptian environment and Egyptian local colour, Egyptian influence is by no means restricted to the portions relating to the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, although it is here obviously most intensive and most clearly detected for reasons already stated. Even a cursory perusal of the foregoing will show that much the same could be said of similar materials contained in other portions of the Pentateuch. For apart from expressions and phrases restricted to the Joseph and Exodus narratives or used in a quite specific meaning only ascertainable by comparison with Egyptian, some of the expressions and phrases already dealt with, and many others not yet considered, are equally current in the rest of the Pentateuch. It will therefore, now be our task to show that the sphere of Egyptian influence extends far beyond the Exodus and Joseph narratives.

Before, however, we undertake to treat the portions following the Joseph and Exodus narratives, it is important to consider first the portion of the Pentateuch relating to the time prior to the sojourn of Israel in Egypt. This is not because we wish henceforth to follow the order of sequence in the Pentateuch, but because this course is determined by historical considerations of linguistic development and we therefore deem it necessary to investigate the question how that part of Genesis stands in regard to Egyptian, and to what extent Egyptian influence can be detected therein.
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The Relation of the Language in the Genesis Stories to Akkadian

In this part we deal with two sections of Genesis marked by differences of milieu and furthermore distinguished by some features of linguistic character.

1. The stories of primeval times beginning with the Creation and ending with the Tower of Babel which are introduced to pave the way for the genealogical history of the patriarchs in Ur.

2. Narratives of the patriarchs starting with Abraham's emigration from Ur, continuing with events occurring for the most part in a Canaanite environment and closing with the settlement in Egypt.

Of these two sections we proceed first to deal with the stories of primeval times, subjecting their language to special investigation. They are of great interest because their origin is derived from a milieu very far away from Egypt revealing unmistakable relations with the Babylonian home of the patriarchs. The numerous parallels to these stories contained in several cuneiform versions, partly composed in Sumerian, but mainly and more extensively in Akkadian, which according to their varying literary form have been assigned to various periods between the twenty-second and eighth centuries B.C., leave hardly any doubt as to the Sumero-Akkadian origin of the Genesis stories. It will, therefore, be our task to establish whether also in this portion of the Pentateuch the language contains Egyptian elements, to what extent they appear, and what proportion quantitatively

1 We would draw attention to the fact that, as already observed in the Introduction, 'Babylonian' is to be taken as a geographical, 'Akkadian' as a philological designation. Therefore 'Babylonian' would comprise all the myths whether in Assyro-Babylonian or in the Sumerian language, whereas 'Akkadian' would cover only those in the Assyro-Babylonian language. It is very essential for the understanding of the following discussion to keep this distinction in mind.

2 This is not the place to consider the hypothesis propounded by A. T. Clay, according to which the Sumero-Akkadian creation and flood myths themselves may have taken their origin from early Semitic or Aramaic sources. (Cf. The Origin of Biblical Traditions, New Haven, 1923). This much only may be said, that in our view the stories occurring in Genesis undoubtedly contain Akkadian words, which point to a Babylonian mediation.

This would not be affected even in the event of Clay's contentions being perhaps later substantiated by new archaeological discoveries.
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they bear to the Akkadian linguistic elements which are naturally to be expected in these stories.

Before this is done, however, a clear and correct picture of the actual relations between the Genesis stories and the Babylonian myths ought to be given, and for the purpose of getting a still better idea of those relations it might have been convenient even to reproduce here the full texts of the Akkadian and possibly also Sumerian versions in so far as they relate to the same matters as are treated in Genesis. Nevertheless, we believe that we can dispense with all this, as all the Akkadian and Sumerian texts are readily accessible to everyone in various publications and many translations. Just as little does it appear necessary to enter into a detailed analysis of each of these myths, as this has been repeatedly done both by supporters as well as by opponents of the Biblical Assyriological hypothesis. We can therefore, immediately enter upon our real task in undertaking a linguistic comparison of the Biblical and Akkadian texts in detail, paying special attention to those passages in which on both sides a more or less close coincidence in content and similarity in form may be discerned.  

Thus by comparing the Hebrew and Akkadian texts on purely linguistic lines it will be easy to establish how they are related to one another linguistically, and to decide whether such findings would at all justify the allegation of a thorough-going literary dependence of Hebrew upon Akkadian. Furthermore it will be possible to determine whether in the parallel passages other influences, quite foreign to Assyro-Babylonian, may not have been brought

CHAPTER I
LINGUISTIC ANALOGIES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE AKKADIAN TEXTS AND THE GENESIS STORIES

I. The Creation Story

In the Creation story, Gen. 1, 2, and in the story of the Flood, Gen. 7, 11, 8, 2 is undoubtedly Akkadian, being the same word and having the same meaning as *tāmtum* in the corresponding myths, as will be shown later (p. 127 f). As this is the only word which is peculiar to Akkadian and Hebrew to the exclusion of all other Semitic languages, it must, therefore, have been borrowed from Akkadian by the Hebrew. The following words however, are admittedly common to Semitic languages generally but are of special interest inasmuch as they are used in our texts in Hebrew and Akkadian in the same sense. Thus in Akkadian *šamē u iršītu* is analogous to the Hebrew יָם יְשָׁרִּים ‘heaven and earth’, fairly frequently, e.g. Rog. p. 57, 2, l. 9 (from below) : *šar šamē u iršītum* ‘King of heaven and earth’; Rog. p. 52, l. 14 from below (= F 2 1) : *šamū bānu iršītum*, *iršītum bānu nārim* ‘the heavens created the earth, the earth created the rivers’; I. Recto l. 12 : ‘when they *yparšamē u iršītum* fixed the pillars, the foundations [or design (?)] of the heaven and the earth’; ibid. Recto l. 24 *išriš šamē u iršītu* ‘bound heaven and earth together’. In the whole of the longest and most complete creation myth *Enuma eššīl* (= A), besides the word kākkāhīt = ‘stars, constellations = Hebrew סְלָלָה and šaṭṭy ‘signs’ = Hebrew סְלָלָה there is only the word *dištu* or *dištu* ‘plants, lush growth’ (Del. HWB. p. 229) which is identical with סְלָלָה ‘grass, herbage’ and as verb סְלָלָה ‘to grow, to spring forth’, which is characteristic of the first chapter of Genesis (1, 11 f.) Strangely enough *dištu* does not occur in this concrete but only in a metaphorical meaning in the creation myth, Rog. p. 17, l. 2 f. b. and p. 21, l. 14 (= A Tablet III, 28 and 86) ; *šem *tāmāt melamme ullašit clothed them (the dragons) with wantoness’ (?) etc. Mention may be made also of *urkiš = Hebrew יָוָה* ‘green’, e.g. Rog. p. 38, l. 15 f. b. (= A. vii, 2) *mazaši urkiši* ‘who caused the green to spring forth’ and Rog. p. 49, l. 7 f. b. (= D. l. 26) *urkiš širī* ‘green of the field’. Also *mazaši* occurs as causative of *qat* in the same sense as יָוָה *qatt* Gen. 1, 12 in an analogous connexion at the creation of the plants. Also the word *širī* ‘stream’ is equivalent to *nāru* common in Akkadian, e.g. Rog. p. 60, l. 13 f. b. (= H. 1 J) and l. 5 f. b. (= l. 10) *nāru *rābittu* ‘great stream’, *nāru širī* ‘mighty stream’; further Rog. p. 52, l. 13 f. b. (= F L 3) plural *nāriti* ‘streams’. It should further be observed that *hāmi mini*, Rog. p. 109, l. 24 possibly represents the expression frequently recurring in the Genesis story *nāřeq* ‘after its kind’; this is, however, not quite certain.

For all other things related in the Creation Genesis story and in the Seven Tablets of *Enuma eššīl* as well as in the other Akkadian Creation myths, the Akkadian uses quite different words and expressions from the Hebrew. The fact that some of these Akkadian words and expressions are used in Hebrew but precisely do not occur in the Genesis story, is really not a very convincing proof of the alleged strong literary, or of a linguistic, dependence of the Genesis stories on the Akkadian. Because if such a close dependence actually existed, one would expect just this class of words and expressions, so frequent in all Akkadian creation and flood stories, to be preferentially and in a much higher degree represented in the Genesis stories. Still more ought this to have been the case with words and expressions which are common to both Akkadian and Hebrew and actually occur in other books of the Bible and even in Genesis itself, to the exclusion of the creation and flood stories. It is the more surprising that in their place such words and expressions are used here which are not employed in Akkadian at all and are even completely alien to the spirit of that language. Furthermore it is possible to establish the fact that in some cases one and the same word used in Genesis and in Akkadian reveals in Hebrew a different suance of usage, representing either a more advanced phase in the development of its meaning, or a different kind of metaphorical usage altogether.

We would draw attention here to another remarkable phenomenon of great significance for investigations into the relations between Akkadian and Hebrew as a whole. When we read the Akkadian myths in the original, from the oldest versions of the sixteenth century B.C. down to the latest versions of Assurbanipal's time in the eighth century B.C., and more especially when we read the text of the flood myths, which is closest of all to the corresponding Biblical story, we acquire the impression, that from a purely philological standpoint, their language is by far more akin to the Aramaic dialect of the late Biblical books and to the language of post-Biblical and Talmudic literature, than to Biblical Hebrew, including Ezekiel which betrays many Akkadian influences.

As we shall see later the linguistic differences referred to are to be noted also in the legal portions of the Pentateuch which, according to general
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Akkadian. Even the same expression 'fowl of heaven' does not read נָעַר as in the Akkadian texts נָעָר lāmē (e.g., Rog., p. 109, l. 23 (= L. l. 1)) also plural נָעָרִים lāmēmē (cf. Del. H.W.B. p. 122), but always נָעָר מְלָאכָה (1).

The expression for animals in the first chapter of Genesis is שׁוֹעֵר 'the living ones of the earth'; in the second chapter etc. שׁוֹעֵר מְלָאכָה 'the living ones of the field'; but the Akkadian equivalents are the expressions לָכָה נָעָרִים (in the singular 'images [holders] of a life-breath of the field' [cf. Del. H.W.B. p. 659 b and 476 a] מִשְׁמַר 'beast of the field' [ibid. 168 a] or מַעֲנִית נָעָרִים (ibid. 86 a) 'animals, game of the field', Rog., p. 51, l. 26 f. (= E. l. 3 f. and Rog., p. 104, l. 24 (= P. l. 9). Occasionally מַעֲנִית נָעָרִים is added also לָכָה 'Hebrew מְלָאכָה e.g. מַעֲנִית נָעָרִים מֵאָלֶחֶמֶא 'wild beasts of the desert and of the mountain of all kinds' (Del. ibid. 86 a). As will be seen these expressions are altogether different from those in Hebrew. Even מַעֲנִית does not mean succintly 'the living' like מְלָאכָה and is usually combined with לָכָה; מַעֲנִית really means 'steppe, desert' (Del. ibid. 557 b, cf. therence Arabic 'نمص', and likewise לָכָה means 'mountain', not 'field' as מְלָאכָה in Hebrew. For creaping animals the Hebrew has מְלָאכָה which is probably related to נָעָר מַעֲנִית 'swarm of men and animals' Rog., p. 48, l. 140 and p. 50, l. 17 (= D. l. 5 and 35), also Rog., p. 51, l. 2 f. (= E. l. 4, 6, 7, and 10). But, as will be seen, the Hebrew מְלָאכָה is not equivalent to the Akkadian form נָעָר מַעֲנִית, a form which first appears in neo-Hebrew in מַעֲנִית for 'insignificant, old, decrepit persons'. On the other hand נָעָר מַעֲנִית, as far as I can see, is never used in Akkadian exclusively for creaping animals, but applies to everything that lives and moves, whether in the water or on the earth, whether man or beast (Del. H.W.B. 469).2

For 'nose' we have נַחֲר, but never the equivalent Akkadian נַחֲרָה (Rog., p. 54, l. 3 f. b. = G. 1, recto l. 38) which only crops up as late as in Job

---

1 It is this phrase which has become stereotyped everywhere in the Bible, with the single exception of Ps. 8, 9, where יָפֶנָה יָפֶנָה is used instead.

2 In many later poetic passages the archaic meaning of 'mountains' may still lurk in יָפֶנָה. 'Field' is a more restricted sense and shows an advanced stage in the development of meaning. On יָפֶנָה and יָפֶנָה cf. below, p. 136.

3 נִמְשָׁר is erroneously derived from נָמַשׁ (Levy, Nuhrer, W.B., and other dictionaries), with which it has nothing in common. An explanation given by Rabbi Jochanan, Babylon Mar. 219, that it refers to old men who move on crutches is, therefore, quite correct, and indicates exactly what class of people was understood thereby. In Talmud Jesus. Pes 208 there is no inconsistency as Levy thinks: just because they move with difficulty, they are the last. Possibly in Akkadian also נָמַשׁ על, Rog., p. 51, l. 9 f. b. (= E. l. 6) 'the moving creatures of the town' refer to the same class of people in contradistinction to נָמַשׁ לְפִי for 'the moving creatures of the field', i.e. 'swarms' which applies to all animals.
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41. 12 in HEB. For 'serpent' Gen. 3:1 fl. has הָעֵשָׁן, but not one of the
many Akkadian designations of this reptile, still less any mythical
name of a serpent.1

Although the antithesis of מַשָּׂא and מַשָּׂא 'to lift up' and 'to bring down'
is usual in the Bible and these roots are common for 'high' and 'low',
nevertheless here and elsewhere for 'above' and 'below' we have מַשָּׂא and
מַשָּׂא, not מַשָּׂא and מַשָּׂא, as would be the case in the adaptation of מַשָּׂא and מַשָּׂא in
the Akkadian texts, thus e.g. Rog. p. 3, I. 12 f. b.
(= A. I. 1 f.) at the beginning of Enuma elii: 'When above (elii) the heaven
had not yet been named and below (lašklu) the earth had yet no name';
and further, Rog. p. 56, II. 3 and 4 (= G. 1 verso II. 24 and 26): elātu apat 'that
which is over the ocean'; šipṭu aššurā udānīn 'below I established the
places'. In the Akkadian texts šakkadu (doubtless of Semitic origin)
=Hebrew מַשָּׂא is by far more common for 'head, crown' than is
the common Semitic רְשֵׁע =מַשָּׂא, and is also invariably used in these myths,
e.g. Rog. p. 54, I. 6 f. b. (= G. 1 recto I. 35) iltuši šakkadu 'firmly fixed the
head'. It is true that מַשָּׂא occurs in the Pentateuch, Gen. 49, 26; Deut.
28, 35, 33, 16, 26 and elsewhere but precisely not here.

For the general idea of 'create' the Akkadian creation texts have: 1) epētu or ebedtu 'to do', e.g. of the creation of man Rog. p. 107, I. 13 f. b.
(= M. Col. viii. 3) ša inā irti elīma 'who created man'; of gods Rog.,
p. 48, I. 4 f. b. (= D. I. 18): ilāti (ušu) annušku mišāšari tpsu 'the Annušku
(gods) he likewise created'. Cf. also J. recto I. 16 fl.: minā inīni parallel
to l. 20: minā i nīni 'what shall we create?'; 2) haddu = Hebrew מָצָא (?) 'to
build' is the more usual word for 'create, produce, form', thus Rog.,
p. 49, II. 2 fl. (= D. II. 18-39). The following lines are accurate according
to the text, not according to Rog.: of the earth I. 18; of man II. 20, 21; of
animals I. 22; of plants I. 25; of herbs I. 26; of rivers I. 23, just
as it is used of the building of cities v. 39, and of the making of bricks I. 36.
Cf. also Rog., p. 36, I. 4 f. b. (= A. vi. 17) of men: ilāti-imā anāmu 'I will
create a man'; Rog. p. 39, I. 4 (= A. vii. 29): ilāti amlāti 'who created
mankind', and several others. Similarly bānu is also used as a god of
Creator, e.g. Rog. p. 38, I. 8 f. b. (= A. vii. 9): ilītu bānu tēlištēlimu 'God
Tutu the Creator of their renewal'. Now מָצָא is only once used and this
of the creation of woman Gen. 2, 22; otherwise מָצָא 'to do, to make' is

1 Cf. KAT. 903 f. and later in reference to the serpent in Paradise.
2 For the creation of heaven potēšu is also used, e.g. Rog., p. 57, I. 7 f. b.: potēšu šamā (ūšu), 'Creator of the heaven of (the god) Anu, and of the netherworld'. This
word also implied 'to build', e.g. temples, and was used for the creation of man (Del.
HWD.).

AKKADIAN TEXTS AND THE GENESIS STORIES generally used, וּרְצָנִים of the creatures, and וּרְצָנִים specifically of man. Thus we see that the Hebrew did not take over the Akkadian term בָּא, nor is it
a trace of epētu or ebedtu 'to do' to be found, although in neo-Hebrew it
is quite common in the form הָעֵשָׁן to designate something which can
cannot be done, i.e. 'possible' or 'impossible', e.g. הָעֵשָׁן 'it is my do', i.e.
it is feasible for me, or הָעֵשָׁן 'it is not my do', i.e. it is not feasible for me.
Not even in a passage like Gen. 1, 6 where almost the same words are used
as in the Akkadian creation story Rog. 36, I. 5 f. b. (= A. vi. 7) in which
Marduk is represented as saying: 'I will place man, I will make man' did
the Hebrew use מָצָא the equivalent of the Akkadian בָּא. Just as little does
the Hebrew make use of the other Akkadian expression šamānu, characteristic
for the formation of man from clay. This is derived from the meaning
'pinching off' of loam or clay, e.g. Rog., p. 45, I. 13 f. b. (= B. I. 25): the
god Ea in the primeval waters (ina apat) pinned off a piece of clay (ibrusa
bīsammu), in order to create the gods of the building and metal arts'. For
this Gen. has וּרְצָנִים derived from the meaning of shaping clay vessels on the
potter's wheel.1 It is only later in Job 33, 6 that the expression מָצָא = šamānu
occurs for the creation of man.2 Although מָצָא = šamānu is indigenous in Hebrew, it is lacking in Genesis and the man is here created from the
רְצָנִים of the earth (הָעֵשָׁן). On the other hand the same Akkadian word
epētu is not used in connexion with the creation of man in the myths though
it is employed in reference to the heaping up of soil and slime to create the
earth, Rog. p. 49, I. 15 f. b. (= D. I. 18). This discrepancy can be carried
further by pointing to the fact that other Akkadian words for 'create' are
not used in the Genesis stories, e.g. kušu = Hebrew מָצָא which is used of
the creation of the heaven e.g. Rog. 39, I. 1 f. b. (= A. vii. 16): ša kušnu
am ilāti šamā elīti 'who hath created for the gods the shining heaven',
an expression which however occurs later in the Bible, e.g. Is. 45, 18:
אֶלְמָה מְשָׁלְתָה יְהֹוָה, Prov. 3, 19: כָּלְקָלָם יַעֲשֵׂה יְהֹוָה, or Ps. 119, 90 of the
earth: Ps. 8, 4 of the stars.

Another striking illustration of these discrepancies is the fact that in the
Genesis narratives and the Akkadian myths words are to be found which
elsewhere are used identically, only not here; thus e.g. מָצָא is used in Hebrew,
like the Akkadian šamānu, in the sense of equal. Now in Gen. 1, 6 it is not
used in this sense but in that of 'rule' whereas Rog. 38, I. 3 f. b.
(= A. vii. 14) it is used in the meaning of 'equal': 'None among the gods

1 Cf. below p. 133 on the origin of this idea.
2 As we shall see later, the fact that לְצָנִים, shaping of clay vessels, is applied in Gen. to the
creation of man from clay, and not מָצָא = šamānu, as in Job, is of very great significance for
the determination of the environment from which the use of מָצָא is to be explained.
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shall be equal to him (umainštu)", exactly as "yô" is used elsewhere in the Bible. The same is the case in Rog. 32.10 (= A.v. 144): "As a mighty building after his likeness (plan) he erected Esharra", etkhalu tamâništu uku elarrâ; and Rog. ibid. 1.5 f. b. (= A.v. 22): "stars after their (the gods') likeness (tamânišu) he set as signs of the Zodiac", in both cases like the Hebrew שמים. Another very instructive example is afforded by Gen. 1.14 as parallel to the Akk. I verso 11 f., namely: "and stars of the heaven (akhabù ùlám) that remain eternally unalterable day and night (ura u miša) in order to establish (lukâlim) the feasts of the gods (isinni šálim)". Although here the same is almost literally said as in Gen 1.14 yet in Hebrew all the words for the corresponding expressions are different. For stars of the heaven we do not find šâmû but têšû, nor šálim ṣar for day and night but ṣâliš bâd; and for feasts we have šâlimû, which is derived from a quite different conception than isinni. It should be added that ušâliš to establish, to set up" used especially of buildings, occurs in the Bible but only in Aramic as יאש. (Exra 4.12.5, 6 f.

Although in Akkadian šalûm is as common as ָיִשׁ in Hebrew we find no conception of 'likeness', as in Hebrew, formed from this root. Though it has been assumed by some Assyriologists and widely accepted in Old Testament circles that 'likeness' is expressed by šűkûru, mašîru, or mašûru (KAT), p. 506, nevertheless this is merely a very doubtful supposition as these words have been otherwise interpreted by other Assyriologists (Ibid. nn. 2 and 4). It should further be emphasized that even on the assumption that šurûru means 'likeness', it is used neither of man nor of a god, as in Hebrew, and only of certain creatures (the Eabani and the Engidu) and the many manikins and elves who were conceived in human shape.1 The absence of šâlim in the above-mentioned passage is all the more remarkable as in the Akkadian stories of the creation it recurs repeatedly in the sense of 'figure, image', e.g. Rog. p. 57.1.5 f. b. (= G. 2.1.7) šûšî šâlim (ilî) aššûr. "He made the figure of the (god) Ashûr"; the same also Rog. p. 58.1.7 f. b. and 59.1.6 f. b. (= J. recto, l. 6 and verso l. 10).2 Neither is 'tamâliša'1 the common word for 'likeness' employed as we have just seen, nor is it said that men or gods were formed in the tamâliša, the likeness of the Divine Creator. It may, therefore, be very much doubted whether the idea of the creation of man in the likeness of God was at all known to Babylonian mythology.

1 For "šûšî "bitumen" cf. Del. WB. 348 a. KAT. 557 f. and Akk. Fremdew. p. 60. That in the cited passage Gilg. XI. 6 f. bitumen was intended for the pitching of the ship, both within and without, cannot in spite of KAT. 548, n. 2, be doubted.

2 The passage Emmu 1.6, Rog. p. 3. šûšî la kâšûra is interpreted by Winckler (A. p. 120) as 'bamboo'; by Del. WB. 203 a and Rog. loc. cit. as 'field, fields'; on the other hand by Zimmerm. Akk. Fremdew. p. 53 as a species of tree, assuming that it is the equivalent of "šûšî". But Meissner, Seuteus Ideogr. 149 ff., shows it is the Sumerian gi-par, and means a species of cane or some part of it. Cf. also Streek, Vorderas. Bibl. vii. 289, n. 13, "kind of tree or shrub (้)" and the passages cited therein.

Akkadian Texts and the Genesis Stories

2. The Flood-story

The Babylonian parallels to the Biblical story of the flood are more extensive and comprehensive than in the case of the story of the creation. Apart from the eleven Tablets of the Gilgames Epic, where the story is most completely preserved, there are several fragments in various versions, even from a still earlier period, a circumstance which points to the fact that a flood story had been widely known in Babylon from earliest times, and that like many others it was altered, extended, condensed or abridged by authors and scribes at will. The relations between the Biblical and Babylonian flood stories are much more tangible and numerous than in the creation story. The similarity in the order of the events, in the formulation of many details, as well as in the style of narration, is so palpable that there can be no doubt as to an original connexion between the two. But in spite of the greater intrinsic similarity, a comparison here of the linguistic elements, also shows that with the exception of a few expressions which are of Akkadian origin, the words and phrases in the Akkadian and the Hebrew are completely distinct, and even words of the same root in both languages are employed in diverse meanings in the parallel passages in the Hebrew and Akkadian versions.

The most conspicuous word of Akkadian origin in the flood-story, is the same as in the story of the creation, viz. čuču šinnim tâmûtu (êmálu), only it is used in the flood story in the concrete meaning of sea, just as is tâmûtu everywhere in all versions of the Akkadian flood-stories (cf. above p. 156).

Of undoubted Akkadian origin also yô (Gen. 6.14) = šûšûru, also šûšûru 'bitumen' with which also Utušûkûm pitched his ship 'within and without', Gilg. XI. 11.9 f. Rog. p. 93 (= K. p. 87). Likewise Akkadian is šûšûru (Gen. 6.14) = šûšûru, šûšûru a kind of tree, or reed. Even should it mean perhaps 'grove' or 'thicket of reeds', the primary meaning must be 'reed', or some kind of tree because šûšûru is accompanied by yô and thus literally coincides with "yô yô."

Of words represented in Akkadian, and also common to Hebrew and

1 Cf. also Del. WB. 203 a. The meaning 'likeness' or 'in the image of' can hardly be upheld in a single one of the passages cited.

2 yô 'idol' as in the Akk. šalûm occurs only in the later Biblical writings. The same also applies to šûšûru - Akk. šalûmû - 'darkness, gloom'.
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other Semitic languages may be mentioned ʼêl for Gen. 7, 4 (also 2, 2) = meṣṭru, ʼämra e.g. Rog., 105, l. 13 f. b. (= M. Col. i. 4) which alternates with ʾâl, Gen. 7, 1a, 8, 2 for rain ; likewise ʾâl, Gen. 6, 21 for food = Akkad. akalu, akalu 'bread, food' which, though also generally Semitic, is more frequent and characteristic in Akkadian for 'food'.

These few expressions are the main linguistic remnants pointing to the Babylonian origin of the story. In all other cases differences between the Hebrew and Akkadian are as clear as in the Creation narrative. Even at the first glance, it is astonishing that in a narrative originating from Babylonia, the most important object in the whole story, the Ark, is not designated by any of the Akkadian words for ship, not even by ᵖʾāṣpu where the ship of the Babylonian Noah, Ur-napšikintu, is invariably designated and which also appears in later Hebrew as ʾēl, but by ʾâl, which is an Egyptian loanword (cf. below). Moreover, as we shall see later, ʾâl is often etymologically akin to Akkadian ʾāšu 'to sweep away with a flood', is based on a conception quite different from that of the regular expression for the Babylonian flood, ʾāḫubu, as this means 'rain, cloudburst', whereas ʾâl means 'inundation'. Even in passages where in the Hebrew and Akkadian the same events are described in almost the same words, the mode of expression is quite different. Thus, we cite only a few examples, Gen. 8, 7 reads: 'and he sent forth a raven which went, ʾāšu ʾāšu going out and coming back', i.e. to and fro (an expression of direction); in the parallel passage, Gilg., xi, 35a, Rog., p. 97 (K. p. 91) it is said of the dove ʾāšu summuṭu tītramma 'it went now and again' (an expression of time); the same also Gilg., xi, 37a of the swallow: ʾāšu sinuṭu tītrama.

For Gen. 8, 9: 'and the dove found no ʾâl naṣu rest for the sole of her foot', we find in Akkadian of the dove, Gilg., xi, 36, and of the swallow, iii, 38:

1 Cf. e.g. Gilg., xi, l. 23, Rog., p. 97 (= K. p. 85) to Us-Napšiktum: ʾāšu bīni ᵖʾāṣpu also in other Akkadian texts ʾāṣpu is the usual word for the ship, thus e.g. Rog., l. 2, 9 and 11 b. (= L. 6, 13 and 15); ᵖʾāṣpu 'dove of the ship'; matiṭu ᵖʾāṣpu uʿ₂ bīniṭu 'build a big ship!'. Only occasionally do we find another word for it, e.g. Gilg. xi, 36 ᵖʾāṣpu 'great house, palace', ʾāṣpu hypothetically for ship, or Rog., l. 100 l. 18 (= M. 1, 7) ᵖʾāṣpu rāhctu aššu ᵖʾāṣpu 'build a big ship!'

2 The derivation of ᵖʾāṣpu from ᵖʾēṣbu 'ship of the diving', i.e. 'diving boat', Jensen Z.A. iv, 273 f., KAT., p. 390, n. 1; and Zimmerm. Akk. Fremdt., p. 42, must be rejected on phonetic grounds alone as ᵖʾēṣbu is from ʾēṣbu 'to sink' and under no circumstances can it be associated with ᵖʾāṣpu but, in addition, in making such a derivation they overlook the fact that in an 'foundering' of a ship, cf. Del. Wb., p. 298 b.
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'As a place for sitting (mānasu) was not there (ipalīnum) it returned issar'ha); literally: 'it turned around', the same word as the Aramaic ʾāšu, which occurs in later Hebrew, but not in the Bible. For the 'interior' of the ship, the Akkadian has ᵖʾāṣpu ʾēlīpu 'heart of the ship', e.g. Gilg. XI, iv, 28, Rog., p. 100 (= K. p. 93), whereas the Hebrew reads simply ṣāḥer, though elsewhere in the Pentateuch ʾāšu 'heart' is used metaphorically of the interior exactly as in Akkadian, e.g. Ex. 15, 8. For ṣāḥer Gen. 7, 11, 8, 2 'water fountains' Rog., p. 54 the last line (= G. i) recto l. 40 has namabu, which corresponds to the Hebrew ṣāḥer from ṣāḥar 'to spring forth', which occurs later, e.g. Is. 35, 7; Eccl. 12, 6, but not precisely here. For 'earth, dust' we do not find ᵖʾēṣbu-Hebrew ʾāšu, but ᵖʾēṣbu-ʾāšu, e.g. Gilg. XI, iii, 9. Rog., p. 96 (= K. p. 89) 'the past has become mud' (ʾīṭtīṭ), i.e. nought. In Gen. 1, 1 ʾēškē ʾēlīpu the word ʾēlīpu is the Akkadian ēṭīṭu, but here it means 'generation' (cf. Gen. 6, 9) and only later is it used in the abstract meaning 'eternally, for ever' as in the Akkadian, e.g. Gilg. XI, iv, 3. Rog., p. 98 (= K. p. 92): 'Of these days will I think, nor will I forget them anā āṭūtī for ever', or Rog., p. 56 l. 3 f. b. (= G. 1 l. 38): anā ᵖʾēṣbu ᵖʾēṣbu 'I know for ever', and many others. As we shall see later our text renders 'for ever' by ᵖʾāṣpu, in the same as vers. 16 and elsewhere.

3. The remaining Genesis stories and Akkadian

With regard to the remaining Genesis stories the Babylonian myths do not present, as alleged, direct parallels but merely isolated features and elements from myths of a heterogeneous character, which both in content and conception have very little in common with the Hebrew stories.

The same is the case with the Sumerian paradise myth of Dilmum (Nippur 4561) and that of Adapa, who as the son of a god only received wisdom (nimkina) but not, like Adam, eternal life from his divine father when he was placed upon earth, in order to supply the sanctuary of the great god Ea in Eridu.

1 In Gilg. xi, xii, 50, Rog., p. 91 (= K. p. 91) it is said of the raven that it saw ᵖʾēṣbu laḥu which is translated by Winckler, Rogers and others by 'diminution of the water'. It is true it might mean drying up (from ᵖʾēṣbu to 'dry up'), but here something concrete is decidedly expected; because it can hardly be said of a raven that it saw 'a diminution' or 'drying up' of water. I therefore think that in ᵖʾēṣbu a word applied to the Arabic ᵖʾēṣbu 'ground, soil' which would give excellent sense: the raven saw the 'bottom of the water'. It should be expressly pointed out that ᵖʾēṣbu is still used in Iraq for bottom of water, similarly like ᵖʾēṣbu 'bed of the sea'.
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with everything necessary in 'bread and water', all features of which there is no trace in the creation of Adam. The only feature reminiscent of the Paradise story is the 'food of life', through the enjoyment of which a man may obtain eternal life on earth. The fundamental ideas, however, are in stark contrast to those of the Paradise story, as the following will suffice to prove: Whilst Adam is conceived as completely naïve and ignorant of God's designs, Adapa, as has already been objected by Landeradorfer (loc. cit.) and others, is represented as perfectly wise (akkadsya), nay even as super-clever (atra haši), initiated into all the secrets of the gods.1 While further, Adam is barred access to the 'fruit of the tree of life' only after his fall, to deprive him of eternal life, in order to prevent sin from being perpetuated, in the Adapa myth the highest god of heaven, Anu, confers eternal life upon Adapa just for the purpose of enabling him to wreak evil perpetually against his father.2 But quite apart from this striking dissimilarity, also from the purely linguistic point of view, there is no sort of agreement discernible between these two stories. Thus—to mention only the chief points nearest to the Genesis narrative—eternal life is rendered by napītu dārittu (Table I, p. 4; Rog., p. 69), which are related to the words uṣu and ūn common in Hebrew, though they are used in a different sense, namely, napītu for 'life' and dārittu for 'eternal', not as in the Hebrew pāru for 'soul' and ūn for 'generation'. The Akkadian expression 'food of life' is rendered by akāl balātī (Table II, l. 66 f.; Rog., p. 75 f.) in antithesis to akāl lu ašīt 'food of death' (Table II, l. 29, Rog., p. 74), whereas in Genesis the expression is uṣu ūn 'tree of life', not ūn uṣu if it had followed the Akkadian. Likewise the other expression lammu balātī 'herb of life' which is repeatedly mentioned as a magic herb (cf. KAT., p. 544), is neither intrinsically nor linguistically comparable with uṣu ūn 'fruit of the tree of life'. The word lammu is identical with the Hebrew nē 'spice' and was used in Akkadian for 'herb' and also 'medicine', e.g. lammu la alalā 'herb of birth' (KAT., p. 564), similar to the Hebrew pāru for spice and sweet-smelling herbs, e.g. Ex. 30, 34 and elsewhere, but was never used for

1 As will be shown elsewhere the 'first man', Job 15, 7 and the 'perfected man', Ezek. 28, 12 and 15, which have been used by Gunet, Schöpfung und Chaos, p. 148, and others to establish a relationship between Adapa and Adam, do not refer to Adam at all! Both in Paradise story in Genesis, and particularly by Ezekiel is their alien character felt and the whole hypothesis of an identification of Adam with Adapa falls to the ground.

2 This is in my view the true relation of Anu to Adapa, and the conversion of the original punishment of Adapa into a reward which, however, is conceived as a punishment of Ea because he created a man with god-like virtues. A different view is taken by Zimmerm KAT., p. 521, because the demeanour of Anu was not quite clear to him.
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3 Still less has the tree of life to do with the other wonder herb which 'converts the aged into a youth (lit. ippākō amētu) stolen from Ut-napisīt during his sleep by the serpent (Gilib. XI, 298 ff.; KB. vi. p. 252 and KAT., p. 578).

Besides the words mentioned, which are common to the Akkadian and Hebrew, there are others of possible though uncertain Akkadian origin which have been retained in the Genesis stories. Thus, e.g. ippākō Gen. 2, 12 may be identical with Akkadian budūti = bedellium, bīdūlu, a translucent sweet-smelling resin of a tree indigenous to Arabia and Babylonia (Gez.-Buhl. s.v.), but the question arises whether it is genuinely Akkadian, or whether both Hebrew and Akkadian derived it from another language. From the description of the course of the River Pitōn one is inclined to see in the word a term for resin, indigenous to the southern borders of Egypt. That it actually must have meant a sort of gum is obvious from Num. 11, 7, where the appearance of the mānna is compared with ippākō referring to the compact and translucent mass of resin. It seems clear that the narrator was citing, for the purposes of comparison, a product typical of the mānna region and, as we have seen, Arabia is actually among the countries where this resin is indigenous. Nevertheless we cannot ignore the fact that the oldest mention of ūn on record is in Akkadian, and hence the possibility cannot summarily be rejected that it may have reached the Hebrews in the pre-Egyptian epoch, and that it thus represents a survival of the Babylonian period from which many a word and expression was retained by the patriarchs.

The same might also be the case with ūn Gen. 2, 12 and elsewhere, which is assumed to be identical with the Akkadian lāmsu, the name of a green precious stone ('malachite' Jensen Z.D. x, p. 368, KB. vi. 1, p. 452). It is possible in this case also that for this stone which had a different name in Egyptian, the Hebrews retained its Akkadian name from the period of the patriarchs. It is furthermore by no means certain whether malachite or another green stone, like emerald, was meant. We are on somewhat

4 Cf. KAT., p. 543, n. 1, where lammu is identified as the prototype of ḫrēm for 'medication' and 'poison' in Arabic (from the Syriac) just as ḫrēm stands for 'roots' and 'herbs' in Hebrew. Whether the Egyptian ḫrēm 'herb' was originally akin to lammu is not certain, but possible. In any case it seems to me certain that ḫrēm harks back to lammu, whereas the Egyptian ḫrēm was borrowed by Hebrew in the form of ḫrēm, which is used exactly as in Egyptian for 'green-stuff', especially for 'leeks'. In both these words, viz. Akkadian lammu and Egyptian ḫrēm we have a further example of two words which sound alike in Akkadian and Egyptian, and possibly also originally akin, being borrowed by the Hebrew in two different forms, whereby in each case the nuance of meaning constitutes a distinct indication of the language from which it was borrowed.
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surer ground in the case of הָבָרְיָל הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה Hori. Gen. 4, 22; Deut. 8, 9 etc.,
which was indigenous to Babylonia (cf. Akk. Farnak and KAT, 6,8), and
thereby together with its name may have spread to other lands and languages,
so that no reasonable objection can be taken to the assumption that in
Hebrew the Akkadian name was retained from patriarchal times.1 On
the other hand it is of interest that in this same passage cited, Gen. 4, 22,
the worker in metal is called מָדָּה and not מַדָּה which is identical with the
Akkadian ummanu 'artisan', though it occurs later in Song of Songs 7, 2.

Attention may further be drawn to מַדָּה which occurs very frequently,
especially in the Pentateuch and more particularly in the Genesis stories;
it is undoubtedly from the Akkadian מַדָּה 'much, many, amount, quantity',
which, as in Hebrew, is used adverbially for 'very', e.g. Enuma i, 19, Rog.
p. 4 (= A. p. 113): gutur madis 'very strong'; Enuma vii d (following
Lücke 46-47) l. 7, Rog. p. 41 (= A. p. 127): ia ina itiki madis iru 'who is
very exalted among the gods'. The same is also the case with מַדָּה 'book'
Gen. 5, 1, etc. which appears to have had its origin in the Akkadian šipru,
lāpuru,2 and must belong to those words which at a very early date passed
from the Akkadian into other Semitic languages.

4. What is the origin of the elements foreign to Akkadian in the
Genesis stories?

We refrain from continuing the foregoing analysis as we believe the
essential points have been sufficiently elucidated by the examples we have
cited.

The examination we have made of the Genesis stories and their
comparison with the Akkadian texts has, on the one hand, provided
proof of the actual presence of linguistic reminiscences from Akkadian, but on
the other hand has revealed the striking fact that apart from these reminiscences the
language of the Genesis stories betrays an extremely limited relationship with the language of the Akkadian texts. For apart from a word

1 As Zimmerern, KAT, p. 648, n. 5, correctly observes, it does not follow that these and
similar words have their ultimate origin in Babylonian; nevertheless I think that on cultural
historical grounds it may be assumed that the Hebrew obtained them from the Babylonian,
and retained them in the Canaanite dialects which they subsequently adopted.

2 Cf. Del. W.B., p. 86 b. It should be observed that whereas מַדָּה has a Hebrew form, the
neo-Hebrew מַדָּה reveals the Akkadian form ummanu, which points to a later adoption
disregarding the earlier existence of this word in the Bible.

W.B., p. 668. Also in Egyptian we findḥb 'sending' used for 'letter'. The initial form
formula of a letter usually runs: ḫb pr r d.1 ḫb 'a letter is this to be made known that, etc.' Cf.
e.g. Möller, Hierat. Lenzthliche III, 7, 14.
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like מַדָּה which is certainly not of Semitic origin, and as we have said, most
probably entered the Genesis stories from the Akkadian, apart also from
words and expressions which, like מַדָּה = akkabbi, מַדָּה = iritu are commonly
Semitic and, therefore, naturally used in Hebrew quite independently of the
Akkadian, there are in the Genesis stories very few phrases of the style
and mode of speech of the Babylonian myths. Hence, the repeated attempts
to establish a thorough-going linguistic dependence of these stories
on Akkadian, and even on the older Sumerian, must be regarded, in view of
the above conclusions, as in general completely beside the mark, and,
in particular cases (where a similarity exists) as highly exaggerated.
Were the Hebrew author really so dependent upon the Akkadian models as the
Assyriological thesis pretends, he would certainly have been inclined to
adopt those elements, which, as we have just shown, are typical of the
Akkadian texts; moreover he would not have deviated from his alleged
models, particularly in those parallel passages where the usage and the spirit
of the Hebrew language would not have barred him from following the
Akkadian phraseology, so akin to the Hebrew.

Our conclusion gains in value and significance from the very circumstance that the protagonists of the Assyriological thesis go so far as to speak of a
literal translation from the Akkadian or Sumerian, merely on the ground that they have been able to detect in some passages a certain coincidence
which can, however, be much more naturally explained by the similarity of the
subject-matter of the narratives. Such allegations are controverted by the simple fact that a linguistic agreement is absent not only from
passages of general similarity but even from those few where originally an
intrinsic relation must really have existed between the Genesis stories and the
Akkadian myths. If we furthermore add the fact, admitted by the
Assyriologists themselves, that as a whole, the differences between the
Genesis stories and the Akkadian myths are very numerous and profound,
we are confronted with the remarkable phenomenon that Biblical narratives
though going back to a Babylonian origin, nevertheless betray extraordinary
divergences from the Babylonian myths both in their linguistic usage and subject
matter. Nay more: the divergent elements are by far the most
numerous, predominant, and striking. And these elements betray conceptions and features altogether alien to the Babylonian myths and are
linguistically incommensurate with the usage and spirit of the Akkadian
texts. We are not referring here to those features which owing to a
monothestic purge have been modified and set in place of polytheistic
conceptions, but to those which do not strictly conform to the monothestic
view, and which are so strongly anthropomorphic in their mode of
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expression that they must rather be taken to be reminiscences of the original Babylonian version, a fact which makes the nature of these divergences the more striking.

In substantiation of this statement we mention some of the most conspicuous and typical features of the Genesis stories which are missing in the Babylonian myths. Thus they lack the conception of the emergence of light out of the chaotic primeval waters; the 'breathing of the spirit of God* over the waters (Gen. 1, 2); the creation of man in the image of God according to the first version (Gen. 1, 27), his creation from *red earth* (Gen. 2, 7) according to the second version (cf. below, p. 143); the breathing of the breath of life through the nostrils (ibid.); the creation of a woman from a portion of the body of man (Gen. 2, 22); and almost all the characteristic features of the Paradise story. In the flood story, though it betrays particularly striking points of contact with the Babylonian myth, nevertheless, the name of Noah's Ark, part of the material, and the building technique are not Babylonian, despite the fact that ship-building was very active on the Euphrates and Tigris, and possessed a rich terminology of its own. From a purely linguistic point of view, also, we find that many of the most characteristic expressions in the Genesis stories are missing in Akkadian e.g. 'breath of life'; or 'wind of life' for soul; Gen. 2, 7, 6, 22 etc.; 'living soul' 1, 20 etc.; 'likeness of God' 1, 27 etc.; as designation of man; or expressions like '/pay of generations' 2, 4, 5, 1 etc.; 'device, disposition' 6, 8, 22; 'rainbow' 9, 13 ff. As we shall see, these expressions and others are coined from conceptions absolutely alien to the Babylonian mind.

Now the question arises: how are these and other remarkable intrinsic and linguistic differences to be explained? How is it that Biblical stories which are so closely related to Babylonian, yet betray features and elements so alien thereto?

The solution of these questions would prove easy if it were possible to derive those features in the Genesis stories which differ from the Babylonian in both respects, in subject-matter and language, from one and the same milieu, from one and the same sphere of influence, and thus establish a common background for the ideas and the terms used to express them. In other words, to put it bluntly, if it were possible to determine an Egyptian origin of these differing elements both as to conception and mode of expression we could decisively conclude that we have before us elements newly introduced in the Genesis stories in place of the original Babylonian elements, and that this process can only have operated in Egyptian surroundings. Further if that be so, we must conclude that this can have
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occurred only in a period, when, still under an active living and most intimate Egyptian influence, the tendency naturally developed to adapt old narratives to the conceptions of the new environment and to invest them with a new linguistic garb, whereof the framework would remain the same, but the content would be composed of fresh materials in a new form.

That this was actually the case we undertook to show in the following exposition. It will be seen how profoundly the Genesis stories were permeated by Egyptian conceptions in the newly modified form in which they have come down to us, and how thoroughly they are dominated also by the spirit of the Egyptian language. That in this connexion, the linguistic interest is predominant, will be understood from the whole arrangement of our work, nevertheless thematic features also will be discussed in so far as they contribute to the elucidation of the nature, origin, and significance of the Egyptian elements. We wish only to observe in this connexion that though in accordance with the whole plan of our work first importance is to be attached to linguistic considerations, it will nevertheless be necessary to discuss many other relations of the Genesis stories to the Egyptian mind and thought in so far as these will contribute to the elucidation of the nature, origin, and significance of the Egyptian elements.
CHAPTER II

THE EGYPTIAN ELEMENTS IN THE CREATION STORY

1. נֶעְרָאָב denoting primeval time

The word נֶעְרָאָב, with which the creation story begins, is found on closer examination to be a close adaptation to the Egyptian expression τυπος for earliest time, ‘primeval time’. Just as נֶעְרָאָב is formed from נֶעָר = ‘head’, so also is τυπος formed from τυπός = ‘head’. The most important result of this literal coincidence lies in the fact that through τυπος the real meaning of נֶעְרָאָב becomes at once clear to us; it is not to be taken in the sense of ‘in the beginning’ meaning that heaven and earth were the first things created, an interpretation which obviously clashes with the subsequent enumeration of created things, but it is a general term expressing a relation to time and means: in the earliest beginning, in the days of yore, in primeval time.

In connexion it is of great importance to emphasize that not only generally in Egyptian literature, but particularly in all those passages which speak of the creation or the coming into being of the first things, reference is made with extraordinary frequency to the former days, the primeval time, to the beginning of all time. In all these cases the word on which this conception is based is τυπός ‘head’, exactly like Hebr. נֶעָר in נֶעְרָאָב, and this not only in τυπος, but also in the far more frequent and usual expression for primeval time, the beginning of all time σπ. τυπος (or τη), literally: the point of time lying at the head. Thus we read in Leid. Amon-Hymns II. AZ. 42, p. 20, v. 1.1: ‘the water and the earth therein (were already) in the primeval time (σπ. τυπος)’; ibid. (p. 30, xii, l. 7.e.) to Amon: ‘Thou wert at first when nothing yet was, and the earth was not without thee in the primeval time (σπ. τυπος)’; ibid. p. 32, xiv, l. 11, of his ‘first coming into being in the primeval time (σπ. τυπος), Amon who arose in the beginning and none knows his (secret) countenance (ἴσις)’; Urk. iv. 146, l. 9: The gods of the first primeval time (σπ. τυπος), the designers of heaven, of earth, and the glorious land (το-δίλος i.e. the nether world)’; ibid. 95, Osiris is designated as ‘the great god of primeval time (σπ. τυπος)’ and Pah, in Harris 44, 4 as: ‘the great god of the primeval time (σπ. τυπος)’. We find that besides the Gods, this expression is also used of other primeval things to designate their primordial nature, thus e.g. Ledrain Mon. Ég. T. 38, l. 7 (= AOT. p. 231) Luxor is spoken of as the ‘holy city of Amon-Re, the seat of his heart (i.e. his favourite seat) since primeval time (τιτ ἱμ. σπ. τυπος)’.

In the first verse of Genesis, therefore, heaven and earth are not spoken of as the first things created, but the reference is to the primeval time in which they were created. Moreover, the verse does not deal with heaven and earth as individual creations, but merely indicates generally that their creation took place in primeval time. The text accordingly would properly read: ‘In primeval time God created heaven and earth’, and is intended as a heading for the whole story of creation, which is then described in its individual phases. The creation-story proper begins with the second verse.

By eliminating the conception ‘in the beginning’ from נֶעְרָאָב we at once get rid of the contradiction, to which objection has always been raised, viz. that the second verse speaks of the chaos when nothing yet existed, despite the statement made in the preceding verse that heaven and earth had already been created. By taking the first verse as a heading, it now appears perfectly natural for the story to commence with the chaos and go on to give a description of the process of creation. Moreover as we shall presently see, heaven and earth, in the first stage of their creation, were not conceived as separate formations, but in consonance with the description of the chaos in the second verse, as combined together, the separation only following on the second and third day.

2. The Dual form ﷐ for Heaven

The word נֶעְרָאָב for heaven occurs only in the dual form. This is all the more remarkable as the stem ﷐ or ﷐ is the basic root from which the conception ‘heaven’ is formed in all Semitic languages, yet it is only in Hebrew that ‘heaven’ is used in the dual form. The fact that in the Amarna Tablets 211, 17 and 204, 16, the plural forms tamūma and tamūma

1 The somewhat ambiguous σπ. τυπος is usually translated by the ‘first time’. By this vague expression the Egyptians sought to convey the uncertainty about the exact time of an event: ‘once, at the very beginning, at an early time’, which is best reproduced in Hebrew by נֶעְרָאָב.

2 The opinion maintained by some grammarians that ﷐ is a specific and not a dual form is due only to the embarrassment to explain it as a dual. The same is also the case with similar unexplained dual formations like ﷐ and especially local names which will be dealt with elsewhere.
are cited as Canaanite glosses is sufficient indication that the dual form was unknown even in Canaanite out of which Hebrew was developed. The peculiar dual form šēw can, therefore, be rightly regarded as a genuine creation of the Hebrew language. Though no dual or plural conception is any longer felt in its use for 'heaven' yet it is ab origine; šēw could not have received a dual form unless a duality of heavens had been the underlying conception.¹

Now such a conception was quite familiar to the Egyptians, and accordingly they spoke of p.ty 'two heavens' the ordinary dual form from p.ty 'heaven'. This is based on their belief in the existence of two worlds: the earth for the living and the nether world for the dead. As the nether world in their view was equipped in exactly the same fashion as the earth, hence a heaven was stretched over it also; so there were two heavens, one over the earth and the other over the world of the dead. The Egyptians were so much imbued with this idea that the sun even was thought to traverse both heavens, and it was thus that they explained the alternation of day and night: in the day the sun proceeded from east to west across the heavens to illumine the earth, and in the evening it sank on the western horizon where the netherworld began, in order to give light to the dead throughout the night. They imagined the sun as a bark in which the Sun-god Re, drawn from one horizon to another, crossed the heavens, so they spoke of two sun barks, of the 'morning bark' (mḥ.t or mḥ.t.t) and the 'evening bark' (ḥet or ḥet.t). In the morning bark Re was steered from the east as far as the western mountain-wall, where he quitted the morning bark and went on board the other in order to begin his journey through the netherworld 'there where he gave light for the great god Osiris, the eternal ruler'; there where the dead greeted him 'in their caves' where their 'eyes open again' at the sight of him and their 'heart leaps' as soon as they behold him because he again 'gives breath in their nostrils' (Nav. Torh. 15 8 ii. 16 ff.). Thus he journeyed through the netherworld the whole night through till the next morning when he left it and appeared again on the eastern mountain-wall, once more to mount the morning bark for the day journey (cf. Erman, Relig. p. 11 ff.).²

¹ In the creation-story of Genesis, there is nowhere the slightest trace of the existence of two heavens, one above and one below the water; it is merely said that the primal water, before the creation of the 'expansion' (ȳp.n) as heaven, consisted of an upper and lower stratum of water, a conception which is the very opposite to what is maintained by some commentators. As we shall presently show, the creation of the 'expansion' actually seeks to eliminate the conception of two heavens.

² A function in both heavens was assigned also to the moon (n̄m = n̄m), as representative of the Sun-god Re, who said to it on its appointment as luminary: 'I cause thee to pervade

Such conceptions appear again and again in religious texts and books of the dead in which the dead are represented as following the course of the sun by day and night and journeying along with it across the upper eastern heaven stretched over the earth, as well as the lower western heaven which extends over the netherworld conceived as in the west. Thus e.g. in the Hymn of the Sun-god îz 38, 27 (= Lit. 303 and Roed. Uruk, p. 49), it is said that he is 'the beautiful sun (îm) with brilliant light which banishes the twilight, the great hawk—the falcon which pervades the two heavens (p.ty in the dual), that journeys over the nether heaven, long and broad though it be, and never sleeps on the journey (i.e. during the night)'; 

Mar. Abyd. 1 pl. 7, 62 l. (= Records, iii. § 270): 'I give thee the lifetime of his two heavens (šēw n p.ty-fy);' further Pyr. 406 (= Roed. Uruk, p. 193) of the dead king: 'He has wandered entirely through the two heavens (p.ty); he has journeyed through the two shore-lands'.¹

The formation of šēw as dual can therefore only be explained as an adaptation to the Egyptian dual: in this word is still reflected the original conception of the two heavens which the Hebrews, in coining the dual term, took over from their neighbours during their sojourn in Egypt. This verification helps us to understand the motive governing the idea of creating an 'expansion' (ȳp.n) and further explains why 'Gen. 1, 8 it is expressly said šēw ȳp.n šēw ȳp.n viz. that the 'expansion' which was conceived as a unit, was given the name šēw. It is clear that a dual form like šēw must have been somewhat inconvenient for the author of a monotheistic narrative of creation, because a conception of two heavens necessarily promised the existence of a netherworld for the dead, besides the world for the living. Nevertheless he was concerned to exorcise all the original polytheistic elements and features connected with the word šēw which was already so deeply rooted in popular speech that it could not be abandoned, and to stout the old conception of a system of two worlds and two heavens by the new teaching. This he achieved by explaining the creation of heaven as ȳp.n a single 'expansion' so that it should be understood that there was only one heaven which served as the division between the lower and upper masses of the primeval waters, before the earth was yet in 

(îb-h) the two heavens (p.ty) with thy glory and thy light', Himmitkhah, Sethos I, pl. D, l. 7 (= Uruk. Roed. 148).

¹ By šēw-n, literally 'the two-shore-lands', are meant the earth and the netherworld, as the river which flows through Egypt was conceived as a continuation of the river in the netherworld, on the assumption that it was a 'two-shore-land' like Egypt. Particularly in cosmological passages and in the literature of the dead, Egypt is represented as if it were 'the whole world'; many ideas and expressions are applied now to Egypt, now to the netherworld, just as in our case šēw-n is applied both to Egypt and the netherworld.
existence. The emphasis laid on the fact that this 'expansion' was called by God רכְבָּא was intended to deprive this word of its original literal meaning 'two heavens', and to make it clear that רכְבָּא was to be taken as a merely conventional designation for the one and only heaven. As it was only after the creation of this single heaven that the earth was separated out of the waters, the idea of the existence of two heavens is eliminated altogether from the outset.

On the same ground it may be explained why the creation of light as well as the demarcation of day and night as two time-units are represented as having preceded the creation of heaven and earth, because in the converse case ground might have been given for the belief that the division of time into day and night was a consequence of the existence of two worlds in order that alternately it might be light in the day for the living in one world, and at night for the dead in the other. It is also possible that the author deliberately placed the words 'in primeval time God created heaven and earth' as a caption at the head of his creation-story to emphasize that the universe consisted only of heaven and earth, thus controverting from the outset the conception of the Egyptians, who, in all their myths referring to the origin of all things, expressly mention the nether world (דָּוְט) as an integral part of the universe, side by side with the heaven (אָלֶל) and the earth (ט). And not only in such myths, but also in others are nether world, heaven, and earth represented as being the three integral parts of the universe. Nay more, the nether world was for the Egyptians by far the most important of the three, because it was the world of the gods and designated for the dead as an eternal dwelling place for 'millions of years' and 'thousands of jubilees and generations'. This invisible, mysterious world was indeed for him a quite real and vivid one; it was filled 'with all good and glorious things of heaven and earth'; a second heaven was expanded over it, and the sun shone upon it during the night with even greater brilliance than by day, until it again appeared next morning to the living on earth to give them 'another day'. In the monothestic creation such a world of the dead could not exist, and, therefore, it was intentionally emphasized in the heading of the entire creation-narrative that God created only one heaven and one earth.

As a further consequence of this conception may be regarded the fact

3. The primeval deep רכְבָּא: 1

As already observed above, רכְבָּא has long since been recognized as an Akkadian loanword. Nevertheless it appears to us necessary to investigate whether the more or less unanimous interpretation given by Assyriologists is at all tenable, and if not, what is the real meaning of רכְבָּא, and what place it consequently occupies in the Genesis story of creation.

Assyriologists and almost all of the modern Biblical critics still take it for granted that רכְבָּא is identical with תִּימָט, the name of the dragon of darkness which Marduk slew in bitter conflict, before the creation of the world. 2 The positiveness with which this assumption is put forward, and the stubbornness with which it is maintained, are based on no intrinsic or philosophically well-founded facts; since besides the similarity of sound of רכְבָּא and תִּימָט, no other proofs for such an identification can be put forward. 3 This whole view is rather due to mythologizing tendencies which, employing all possible and impossible kinds of combinations, seek

1 In similar manner, the original plural meaning of רכְבָּא faded away through its constant use for the one God, so that it eventually became a simple singular. This will be dealt with more fully elsewhere, in discussing the names and attributes of God.
2 In the Babylonian myths also the nether world is mentioned together with heaven and earth; but not with such insistence, because the nether world did not assume anything like the same importance among the Assyrians and Babylonians as among the Egyptians.
3 The argument that רכְבָּא must be identical with תִּימָט because like the latter it is feminine, is untenable, for the simple reason that in our particular passage the gender of רכְבָּא is not apparent, and further because, there are examples of its being used in the masculine as a poetical expression for sea. The question whether תִּימָט and תִּדְנֵע are related at all, is not a matter to be discussed here.
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as a ‘heaping up’ of mud, and also describes the creation of man, animals, rivers, plants, woods, cities, and temples, proves that tātmu is used simply for the primeval water filling the chaos before creation, exactly like ʾawwān. The passages quoted show that tātmu apart from its purely philological aspect also intrinsically expresses the same idea as ʾawwān, as the conception of a primal ocean in Genesis and the Babylonian myths is one and the same. It must also be emphatically pointed out that whereas tātmu is used in the sense of sea for primeval water in the various creation myths, tātmu in the very same texts never stands like tātmu for primeval water or sea, but exclusively for the dragon as the personification of darkness.1

We see that all indications implicitly point to the identification of ʾawwān with tātmu in the common meaning of ‘ocean, sea’ in primeval time, i.e. ‘primal deep’. Hence ʾawwān is not the mythological tātmu but the cosmological tātmu, and it is not the myth of the fight of Marduk against tātmu which is the real parallel to Gen. 1, 2, but rather those passages in which the original chaotic condition of the world is represented as the primal deep tātmu. This conception, however, being not specifically Babylonian, but as we have seen, belonging inter alia also to Egypt, it results that the only indication of a real relationship between Gen. 1, 2 and Babylonian, consists precisely in the use of the word ʾawwān identical with tātmu. The two terms ʾawwān and tātmu are so closely connected that if any confirmation were required of the fact that by ʾawwān nothing else is to be understood than ‘primal deep’ (an interpretation which indeed had always been maintained long before the Babylonian tātmu myth was discovered), no better and more striking proof could be found than the use of tātmu in the Babylonian creation-myths.

Whilst in the creation-story of Genesis ʾawwān is to be understood as the primeval ocean, the chaotic primeval waters in immemorial time, the same word ʾawwān in the flood-story, Gen. 7, 11, and 2, is to be taken concretely in the

1 This differentiation is, even in non-mythological Akkadian texts, a thorough one, thus inter alia it is also in the building inscription Rag. p. 38 E. (J.), where reference is made to the fight against tātmu, e.g. p. 56, 1, 6 f.b., and p. 59, 1, 5 f.b. (— J. recto 6 and verso 10): ‘The picture of (the God) Ashur when he goes on ʾabī tātmu into the tātmu in order to fight with it. Cf. also at the close of the same text. The supposition (p. 59, n. 1) that tātmu means the primeval ocean is disposed of by p. 60, 1, under the line, where the ‘taming of the tātmu’ is referred to: ʾaš di (ba) ʾašur tātmu šikummu ‘before (God) had tamed the tātmu’ and where tātmu can only be understood as the monster and not the primeval water. That tātmu is indeed conceived as a fish-dragon is to be discerned from the description in Rag. p. 33, last line (— A. iv, 1, 137 E.), as well as from p. 54, 1, 7 f.b. (— G. 1, recto 1, 38) where it is conquered by the taming off of ‘its nose’ (niṣṣiratu), wherein palpably the idea of angling played a part. Here too reference is made only to the water which flowed from the incised body of the tātmu, and not to the personification of the sea as tātmu.

This meaning of tātmu results directly from the fact that it alternates with the other quite common word ʾapāš (also ʾapāš) for sea or oceans, which was likewise applied to the primeval water, primeval ocean, e.g. Rag. p. 55, 1, 13 f.b. (— G. 1, 1, 9): ʾapāš ratubatu ‘mighty ocean’; p. 56, 1, under the line (— G. 1, 1, 24): ʾes-šu ʾapāš ‘what there is on the ocean’; p. 45, 1, under the line (— B. 1, 24): ʾepaʾ apāš šubatu ‘he who created the ocean for his seat’; also in the following line ʾepaš stands for primeval ocean: p. 60, 1, 6 f.b. (— B. 1, 24): ʾapāš tātmu gurattū ‘the growth flourished in the ocean’; in Rag. translates: whose hand developed in the ocean; cf. however, Del. HBB, p. 307 b. The stem šamāmu ‘to grow, flourish’, which is probably akin to Aramaic šenāb (Zimmern, Akkad. Fremdw., p. 70), is perhaps related also to Arabic ʾisr ‘to be high’.
meaning of ‘sea’, or ‘ocean’. Here וננה shows the same usage as תָּמִית or תָּמן, which, in the Akkadian flood-stories does not refer as in the creation myth to the primeval water but simply means ‘sea, ocean’, e.g. Rog., p. 96, l. 8 (text) (= K. iii, 14): ki mār ritn umallā tāništam ‘as fish-spawn fills the sea’ and a few lines further (K. iii, 22): inuḫ tāništ ‘the sea became calm’ and iii, 29: while I gazed at the sea (תָּמן) etc. In all these cases it is used like ṣǒmr ṣe, ocean, e.g. Rog., p. 91, l. 9 f. b. (= K. i, 29) and p. 92, l. 3 (text) (= I. 38).

It is interesting to note that the development in the use of וננה follows the conception that out of the primeval ocean the world ocean was created. After the chaotic primeval deep had been shatted by the penetration of light and divided by the ‘expansion’ ṣr̄ into upper and lower masses of water, all the lower masses flowed together to form an ocean round the earth which had emerged from them, and for this ocean the same name וננה was retained as had been applied to the primal deep from which it was separated. In this connexion it is noteworthy that in this process of development from primal ocean to world ocean, the Hebrew followed the Akkadian תָּמוּת only linguistically; for intrinsically the Babylonian conception of the origin of the world ocean and the earth is radically different from that of the Hebrew.

In view of the mythologizing tendencies referred to above it is necessary to point out that the meaning of the word וננה is quite unaffected by the question whether the origin of the flood-narrative is mythological, or whether we have to do with an actual event which assumed a legendary character. For us the sole consideration is what the narrator meant by וננה, and as to this there can be no doubt that it signified for him nothing but a real sea, just as real for him as was the flood which inundated the world. Just as little does the expression וננה גֵּזְנֵי mean Gen. 7, 11 point to anything mythological: by the explicit definition of וננה as גֵּזְנֵי the author meant to convey that וננה meant here the ‘big sea’, i.e. the world-ocean conceived as around and under the earth. This must have appeared necessary to him, because וננה for an internal sea, even for a lake, must already have been in use and present to his mind, a meaning which actually occurs in the Pentateuch, viz. Deut. 8, 7, where וננה mentioned after brooks and springs, can only refer to the lakes of the Land viz.: the Dead Sea, the Lake of Kinnereth and the Lake of Mereom. Similarly in Ex. 15, 5 וננה refers to the Sea of Reeds, but here it is used hyperbolically in the plural, in the same way as אָרֶץ is used for ‘sea’ in poetical passages.1

4. The ‘hovering’ of the spirit of God and the creation of light

It is generally accepted that דַּבָּרָה אָדָם. Gen. 1, 2 is to be regarded as a metaphorical expression in the sense of ‘spirit of God’. For וה therein ordinary meaning ‘wind’ would have no sense whatever, especially as the passage deals with the chaotic condition before the creation. So far this interpretation is quite in order and the abstraction of the meaning ‘spirit’ from that of ‘wind’ presents no difficulty.

The case is, however, totally different in the use of רוח with reference to the ‘spirit of God’, an expression which, as is clearly shown by Deut. 32, 11 and other passages, is used of the hovering and fluttering of the bird with outspread wings (not of brooding). Even if it be conceived as a metaphorical turn of speech in which the concrete meaning of hovering and fluttering has receded, the conception of hovering and fluttering could not have been originally applied to וה unless this was somehow connected with a winged being. What then is the background from which such an association could have emerged? As the ‘hovering’ relates to וה and this palpably designates something which is essentially connected with וה, God, we must first of all endeavour to elucidate the original conception underlying the transition from וה ‘wind’ to the meaning of ‘spirit’.

In many passages of the Pentateuch and elsewhere וה ‘wind’ stands in relation also with וה ‘life’, meaning ‘breath of life’, as in Gen. 6, 17, 7, 15 and 22, where also וה is used. Now in Egyptian נf and וה, both are ‘wind, air’, are used in conjunction with נה=life, specifically for ‘breath of life’. Here, therefore, the transition from ‘wind, air’, to ‘breathing, breath’ is the same as in וה וה, and accordingly this is a complete equivalent of the Egyptian expression נf נה or נה נ נה for ‘breath of life’ which in both languages has become a standing expression for soul, cf. e.g. (for the Egyptian) Harris 44, 7: ‘The breath of life (נf or נה נ נה) for all men’ is under Psh; 78, 15: ‘I saved every man from his distress and gave him breath (תָּמִית נf or נה).’ See also Er.-Gr., p. 80 נf ‘wind, discussion of the poetical portions of the Pentateuch we shall deal at greater length with the use of וב in the most important biblical passages.

1 It may be observed that, as we shall show on another occasion, the word נה has nothing whatever to do with דַּבָּר or רוח as is maintained by Assyriologists. In the
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fluttering and hovering of the soul, and thus in ḫn and ḫn, we have metaphorical expressions derived from the original concrete conception of the soul as a flying being—expressions which, however, only became more abstract in so far as the tendency grew more marked to weaken the quite primitive Egyptian conception of the ‘soul of God’, the prototype of ḫn ḫn, and gradually to eliminate it from the monotheistic range of thought.

Now that Egyptian has furnished us with the elements which explain the ‘hovering of the soul of God’, the Egyptian conception of the emergence of light from chaos provides us with the background which renders it possible to understand the description given in our passage of the creation of light. It confirms our view of ḫn ḫn and makes clear other features of this creation episode. From time immemorial the Egyptians believed that the chaotic primal deep was the God Nun (mwh) and Re who went forth from him as the sun was his soul (bī). For our study of ḫn ḫn the fact is of extraordinary significance that already in the earliest religious literature of the Egyptians, the conception was widespread that when the Sun-God Re emerged from the primal deep Nun he took the form of a bird, namely a goose, and that as a goose he flew over the primal deep spreading light by fluttering his wings. This is clearly brought out in the religious Songs of Thebes in which the creation is referred to, and where Amon-Re is praised as the first god coming forth from Nun, ‘who was the first when nothing yet was’. There Amon-Re is called ‘the great cackler’ because by his ‘cackling’ on his flight as a goose over the primal deep, Nun, he broke the silence of the primordial world.

Generally the conception that in primordial time light emerged from the chaotic waters precisely before the creation of heaven and all other things,

4 In the same way also other gods were represented as ‘souls’ (hmt) of primordial gods, being conceived as their emanations; thus e.g. Kheam as the soul of the Air-god Shu (hē); the god Am (mwh) as the soul of the god Hēh (bī — eternity?), and the night as the soul of ḫn (bī — darkness), cf. Hitmimlekh, Rosed. Usk., p. 149.
5 Cf. Erman, the Leiden Amon-Hymnus, Sitzb. d. Berlin. Akad., 1923, XL, p. 71. O. 90, sect. 4 and note thereon, as to the origin of this conception. In the same hymns p. 66, E. 600 sect. 2 and also elsewhere (cf. n. 4), light (hē) is designated as ‘the soul’ of Re or Amon-Re in his quality as Sun-god. Cf. also Lit., p. 301. Although this papyrus emanates from the period of Rameses II, the hymn dates from an earlier period, in any case from that period when the ‘religious revolution’ under Amenophis IV had not yet fallen into oblivion (Lit. 295). It should further be mentioned that the role of Re was transferred also to Horus who like Re was conceived as the first Sun-god, but in the figure of a falcon (not of a goose) going up from the Nun (bī nmn m mwh), Texts, Nav. 71, 1. Also of Osiris on another occasion it is said that he was ‘the great god who went forth from the Nun (nfr wr pr m mwh)’, Leiden Amon-Hymn. X. 11.
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is typically Egyptian, and is exactly how the process of the creation of light before heaven and earth is set forth in Genesis. It appears from the oldest to the latest periods of Egyptian literature in various versions. Thus e.g. in the Apophis Book (= Nesi-Ansnu Ed. Budge) 26, 11 ff. (= Roed. Urk. p. 108) the Sun-God is represented having emerged from the primal deep, Nun, as Khepre (hpr, also hprn) i.e. in the form of the morning sun as it first appeared in primordial time, when the heaven had not been and the earth had not been. 1

It is in this and similar ideas that some of those sources lie from which the description given in Gen. 1, 2-3 of the chaos and light was drawn. We now understand why the hovering of the נון הונ appears as a phenomenon immediately precedent to the creation of light: here instead of the primal god Re, or Khepre, flying and fluttering with his wings over the chaotic Nun in order to spread light, appears the 'spirit of God' נון הונ hovering over the primal deep נון in order to utter the flat: נון הונ 'let there be light'.

5. נון הונ

Having obtained a clear picture of the conception the author had formed of the chaotic primeval state of the world, we will attempt the explanation of the somewhat enigmatic expressions נון הונ. In Gen. 1, 2 we learn that the chaos in the primeval period there described was antecedent to the creation of heaven (בֵּית הָאָרֶץ v. 6) and earth (מכָרֶה v. 10). There was only a primeval deep (נון) which filled all space (forนำר here cannot mean anything else). As appears from v. 6, in this נון were contained the upper and lower water masses i.e. the heavenly and earthly waters. If now we are to understand by נון the primeval deep in its entirety, we may suppose the two successive expressions נון and נון to represent the two parts of this primeval deep namely, the earthy and heavenly water masses. Starting from this assumption first of all in regard to נון, we find that the Egyptians denoted the heavenly waters with the word הון which in sound can well correspond to a Semitic נון or נון as the transcription of the Egyptian ɪ or ḫ by נ is quite regular. The identity of sound in both words would thus lead us to regard נון as the equivalent of the Egyptian word הון in the meaning of heavenly or upper waters. 2 If this be correct, one would expect to find in

1 Cf. Erman, Relg. p. 32 f. and p. 10 f. Although this magic book is of the 14th century B.C., it contains numerous allusions to ideas which were spread throughout Egypt in much earlier times. Hence it represents a later treatment of older materials taken from the ancient creation-texts and concocted by the author into a book of magic. Cf. Roed. Urk. p. 99.
2 Actually הון frequently occurs in the literature of the dead for the ocean of heaven, e.g.

6. נון הונ

an expression, corresponding to the earthly or lower waters. As a matter of fact this leads us to compare נון with the Egyptian tꜣ 'earth' which in sound likewise completely corresponds to a Semitic נון or נון exactly denoting the earthly i.e. lower waters. 3 In נון הונ we would actually have both parts of the primal deep נון, an interpretation which from all points of view intrinsically, linguistically, and also phonetically, is unobjectionable. 4

The expression נון הונ for this chaotic state was later employed for the characterization of a confused, forlorn jumble, as e.g. Jer. 14, 25, for something negligible, non-existent, as 1 Sam. 12, 21; Is. 59, 4 etc. etc.

That נון in this sense occurs more frequently than נון is palpably to be explained from its position as the first of the two expressions. Whether the original meaning was ever felt remains an open question, even in such passages as Deut. 32, 10 and Job. 26, 2. 5 This is, however, beside the point;

Nav. Text. 85, 96 (= Roed. Urk., p. 266), of the dead man : 'I go on my feet, &c.; when I traverse the ocean of heaven (byss)'. Cf. also Rod. Urk., p. 222, 1. 18. Here the original meaning of bys 'one' is lost; bys means simply 'the heavenly waters'. 1

1 In the ending of both words may still lurk the as of the masculine plural ending of tꜣ (תָּא) and bys (בּיאס) the 'earthly and heavenly waters', as in such cases the plural is the rule in Egyptian, e.g. ḫep 'wine', ḫmn 'water', which latter was indeed understood as a collective for 'waters' (Erman, Gram. § 201). Many examples, even from Semitic languages can be adduced which show that some borrowed words have been taken over with the plural ending. As an interesting example in Egyptian itself the Semitic loanword شيخ 'sheik', or 'sheik' was said to have been territorially limited: originally it was taken over in the Semitic plural form 장, but treated in Egyptian as a singular and then provided with Egyptian gender and plural endings, thus 장 (also 장) 'herds' and 장 (or 장) 'horses', where the Egyptian plural ending 장 is added to the Semitic plural ending 장.

2 A surprising coincidence is displayed by the vocalization of the first syllable of נון and نون the Coptic ɪ (S. or ɪ) for the Egyptian tꜣ 'earth' (Spiegel. WR. p. 140; in old Coptic in ṭню ṭню = ṭню ṭню 'the whole earth', likewise in ḫən (S.A.), ḫən (B.) 'earthquake'. Although no far-reaching conclusions can be drawn from such instances (cf. above p. 50, n. 1), it is at any rate of importance, because it increases the number of Egyptian words which show identical vocalization both in Hebrew and in Coptic. From ḫ by the Coptic has however retained only the form ḫ (Spiegel. WR. p. 14), in the compound word מַידָּּאָּה (S.) מַידָּּאָּה (B.) 'voice of heaven', i.e. thunder - Egyptian ḫen-ḥen (cf. above p. 59, note 4). It remains therefore undecided whether there was not also another form, possibly ḫen.

The last quoted passage suffices to demonstrate that the conception of נון as 'desert' - Arabic 장 is untenable. In Job 6, 18 and Is. 24, 10 the reference is also not to 'desert' or 'deserted city' (Gen.-Buhl. s.v.), but to 'void' and 'chaos' respectively. Purely as a matter of suggestion I would remark that in Is. 54, 11 the original meaning of מַידָּּאָּה seems still to be reflected: 장 is the extreme limit of the world once more fallen into chaos, and 장 מַידָּּאָּה are the destructive missiles from heaven likewise collapsed into chaos. The Prophet depicts hyperbolically the devastation of the chaotic city as destruction surpassing all possible human imagination.
the only important thing for us is to have ascertained the Egyptian origin of ăw ăw and established its meaning as the two parts of the primeval deep ăw. ăw.

6. Fish and birds

A very striking feature of Gen. 1, 20, noted already by the earliest commentators, is that the birds, like the fishes, were produced from the water, and not as all the other animals, 1, 24, from the earth. The whole mode of expression in Gen. 1, 20 and 21 leaves no doubt on the point, although here the birds are reckoned as earth-animals though not so clearly as in Gen. 2, 19. Now this conception is typically Egyptian. For the birds, which intensely engaged the interest of an Egyptian, nested in the swamps and bushes of the banks of the Nile and in the neighbourhood of other waters, as these are the only places in the over-heated, sun-bathed Nil valley which provide shade and protection. From the swamps and reed clumps, he first saw the birds fly up; it was between the papyrus rushes and the tall, tangled, and twisted plants that he discovered the first nests, and it was there that he observed the baby birds creeping out of their eggs. It was this circumstance which made him conceive the idea that there lay the cradle whence the birds came into being. The marsh birds were for him the first winged creatures, the primordial birds, so to speak, and this led him to generalize and see the origin of all birds in the swamps and slime of marshlands, streams, and waters. Indeed it even seems that ăp, the usual expression for bird from the oldest times (very frequent in Pr.), originally denoted the wild duck or goose, so typical of the Nile swamps; thus we find that the name of this bird which was considered to be the prototype of all birds became a generic designation, and indeed, was in all periods employed as collective for 'fowl', just as ăw is in Hebrew.

Now the idea of a common origin of birds as water creatures and fishes becomes quite comprehensible. This line of thought finds expression in the fact that in Egyptian literature, birds and fishes are always mentioned together, especially in hymns to the gods and other poetical texts in which reference is made to the origin of the existence and to the rulership of the

1 On the differing version Gen. 2, 19 (cf. below p. 143). On the discrepancy between this version and Gen. 1, 20-6 we propose to dilate more fully elsewhere.

2 In the oldest religious literature of the Egyptians, the goose appears already quite distinctly as the first living being. The idea is that the first god Be ăr ăp as a goose from the egg which lay on the mud-hill in the primal water Nokh. Cf. Erman, Leit. Amun-Hermopolis, p. 70 and 78, also above, p. 137.

3 Cf. Vogelsang, p. 72 on Bauer B. 61. This is also the case in Coptic with the same word ăpēr 'duck, goose' = ăp which is used of fowl. Cf. Spiegelh. WB., p. 178. AG. WB., i, p. 9 s.v. ăp.
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but exclusively as a designation for men, as indeed it has always been generally understood.

As far as the expression נַחַל הָעָבָד, so peculiar to the creation-narrative, is concerned, its real meaning can only be exactly determined in connexion with a thorough investigation of all the ideas and terms relating to the soul, which will be undertaken elsewhere. 1 Here only this can be said, that נַחַל הָעָבָד is a close adaptation of בָּרָךְ (or abbreviated בְּךָ) ‘living soul’, which in Egyptian has a quite specific meaning, and plays an important role in the destinies and metamorphoses of the dead in the other world. Cf. e.g. Pyr. 1098 2 of the dead king: who is described as a ‘living soul’ (בָּרָךְ); Tesh. W. 1, 2: 11 of the dead going out of the nether world during the day as ‘living souls’ (בָּרָךְ); Hymn to Osiris, Pap. Ani 2, 30 f. (vol. i, p. 131). May he (Osiris) grant that I journey northwards to Buaisir as a living soul (בָּרָךְ; Urk. iv, 414, 14 and 415, 5 of the dead man that he ‘may go out as a living soul (בָּרָךְ)’.

Still more remarkable is it that the whole phrase נַחַל הָעָבָד and ‘he became a living soul’ Gen. 2, 7 literally corresponds to the Egyptian hrpr m b’ b’ to ‘become a living soul’ which in the texts for the dead is actually a standing expression for the metamorphosis of the dead from a lifeless body to a living being, e.g. Tesh. the heading of chap. 85, vol. II, p. 192 ‘Chapter of becoming a living soul (hrpr.m b’ b’); Urk. iv, 113 of the dead: ‘Thou wilt be interred in the earth in the rock-tomb of the west in order that thou mayest become a living soul (hrpr.m b’ b’), whereby the resurrection of the dead body by the return of the soul (b) is meant, so that the dead man may take food and drink to continue his existence as a living being. Similarly also in Urk. iv, 147/6, where the same wishes for the dead are expressed, viz. ‘to be buried in the rock-tomb of the west in order to become a living soul (hrpr.m b’ b’).’

It is obvious that נַחַל הָעָבָד is employed in a general sense, and that it could

---

1 See also Seheli, Verbool, Globosar e.v.; also by causative of יִפְגֶּשׁ ‘let fly’, both very frequent in Pyr. Cf. Spellen Pyr., Globosar, no. 768 f.
2 Cf. also 3pp ‘serpent’ (Er.-Gr. 23), probably referring to the ‘flying serpent’. Cf. also יִפְגֶּשׁ ‘serpent, W. B.; p. 69 and 179, also II, p. 182 and 3pp, p. 167.
3 Although it is used for small cattle, the fact that the ‘living one’ is applied to an animal is quite sufficient to establish a link between the Egyptian and Hebrew ideas in this connexion.
4 Whether the Arabic כּוֹדִים means ‘living one’ is a question which has nothing to do with the Aramaic כּוֹדִים.
5 Cf. also כּוֹדִים and plural כּוֹדִים as in ‘living ones of the town’ for ‘citizens’, e.g. Inser. Mat., p. 38, 41, 51, 1 f.
not be used in the sense purely in reference to an other-worldly, but only to the earthly life. It is applied to the living being from the moment when it is endowed with a נפש, by the entry of the breath of life (כרע נפש), down to the moment when the soul leaves it. נפש נפש is in short 'a living individual'.

8. בנו בורא יד אלהים א民办.

The phrase succeeding almost every new creation: 'and God saw that it was good', Gen. 1, 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31, which only occurs in this creation narrative, was a typical expression in the intercourse among Egyptian artisans and art workers. Thus we find a man working with an axe at the stern of a ship saying: 'I will cut round its stern (phwy-f); I will see that it is good (tw $ r mš nfr)'; another says: 'I am making a splendid work (trv-y hš.t lhp); you will see that it is good (tw-fn $ r mš nfr)'; another, working at the foundry, says similarly: 'you will see that it is good' (Ermian, Reden, Rufe, etc., p. 42). In another passage ibid. p. 40, where a workman, enjoined to do his job right as far as he can, exclaims: 'I will do it so that thou wilt praise it and see that it is good.' It is very instructive to compare expressions, interjections, and phrases that were current among artisans and common people, with similar expressions in the Hebrew, especially in texts of like content. Interjections like: 'to be well made, make it well!', very good!, it is good!, let it be good!, very good!' were in these circles as common as הָפַץ 'good, well' and נפש נפש 'very good, well' in the Hebrew, in order to announce the good execution of a job or to hold it in prospect. Thus, 'it will be good (usm nfr)', ibid. p. 44, is the answer of a workman; whilst carving a stone vessel, the craftsman says: 'this jug is very good (tww hm pn nfr wr.d)'; another, working at a necklace, says: 'it is very good (tw-f nfr wr.yt)', ibid., p. 45; or: 'this barley is very good, mate! (tw it pn nfr wr.t nt hm-y)'; ibid., p. 22; 'this is very good (tw mw nfr wr.d)'). Likewise often in conjunction with 'doing' trv-y as in Gen. 1, 31, etc. loc. cit. p. 7: 'I am doing it well, mate! (trv-y nfr nt hm-y)'; p. 43: 'it is good when you do ... (nfr ir-fn ...)', etc.

1 In both cases, in שָׁמֵד and ח, we have retained the usual translation 'soul', although it sometimes is quite certainly wrong for שָׁמֵד, as will be shown elsewhere, cf. above p. 130 n. 2.

2 This is the mutilated text to be completed.

3 It should be here expressly pointed out that the Hebrew שָׁמֵד shows exactly a usage like the Egyptian nfr for 'good' and 'beautiful'. In general I incline to render nfr by 'good' rather than by 'beautiful', except in cases where the reference is to the appearance and the sense demands 'beautiful'.
CHAPTER III


1. The Creation of Man in the Image of God

According to Gen. 1, 26 f., the man and his consort were created in the image (σῶμα) and likeness (μορφή) of God. This idea is entirely in keeping with Egyptian conceptions. First they entertained it with regard to the creation of gods, and then that of kings who were conceived as emanations, nay, as the corporeal offspring of the gods, and then applied, by certain schools generally to the creation of man. It was a dominating factor in Egyptian thought throughout and can be traced back to the earliest times. This idea is illustrated in various concrete and metaphorical expressions, not merely in the myths of the Gods, in hymns to gods and kings, but also in popular tales, books of wisdom, and other writings. At the creation of the first gods, followed by that of the first man, it is expressly stated that they were all made in the image of the god creating them, the name and nature of whom varied according to different theological schools and tendencies. So deeply-rooted was this idea that the primordial nature of Amon as the first god-creator could not be better characterized by the Egyptians, than by making him create his own shape, his own image, so that it could not be said of him, as of other gods, that he was created in the image of a god. Thus we read Erman, Leid. Amonhymnus, L. 100: ‘Amon

The characteristic differences between the first and second Chapter of Genesis, notably with regard to the creation of man, will be more fully discussed elsewhere. Here we deal with the Egyptian relations to both versions simultaneously, because Egyptian influences are equally apparent in both. Incidentally, however, we draw attention here to the Egyptian background out of which some differences revealed in both versions of the creation of man in the first and the second chapter can be derived.

The most instructive and oldest example is furnished in Erman, Ein Denkmal memphitis. Theolog. Studien, d. Berl. Ak. 1911, p. 916 ff. Cf. also Erman, Religion on this remarkable document.

For ‘image or primal image’ of a god there were many expressions, the individual meaning of which is difficult to determine, thus e.g. μῦρα, ῥόα, τυ, Erman, Leid. Amonhymnus, p. 70 ff., L. Sec. 100; M. Sec. 40; O. Sec. 90. For ‘primal form’ or ‘primal image’ ῥόα also ῥό από (– first form) was used O. Sec. 90 and 41; Q. Sec. 200 and 3. Besides these there are other expressions contained in the passages we shall presently quote in connection with ‘image, likeness’ of a god, such as: μῦρα ‘image’, μύρα ‘likeness’ from μῦρα ‘to resemble’; τυ ‘effigy (also statue)’; μῆνυμεν from μῆνυμι originally ‘to bear’, then ‘to create, to shape’ (also of metals); ταιν λείατρος seems to be still more closely

who arose in the beginning and no man knows his form (μῆνυμεν) no god arose before him and no other god was with him to tell him his form (τυ); there was no mother before him to give him his name; there was no father before him to engender him so as to say to him ‘that is I!’ viz. ‘he is as I am, he is in my image’.

More often was it said of the living and dead king; e.g. Urk. iv. 14, 15 of King Amosis that he was ‘like Re, his heir exulting in joy; the image (μῆνυμεν) of Re which he (Re) created’; Urk. iv. 244, 5 the gods say to Amon of the Queen Hatsheput, ‘she is thy daughter in thine image, thy mighty seed’ and 275, 4 ff. she is described as ‘the daughter of Re, beloved of the gods, superlative image (τυ ο᾽) of Amon’; the ‘image (τυ ο᾽) of Amon on earth’; the ‘image (μῦρα) of Amon-Re to eternity’; his living monument (μῆνυμεν) on earth. Mar. Karn. pl. 11, 13, song of victory to Thothmosis III (= Lit. 256) Re says to the king: ‘I showed them (to the enemies) thy majesty as the lord of the rays (i.e. as the sun), thou didst shine as my image (μῆνυμεν) before their countenance’; likewise Urk. iv. 362, 4 of the Queen: ‘she is the seed of Re, to create for himself a brilliant seed on earth as his living image’ for the weal of men; Kahun Stela (= Erman-Ranke, p. 83) to King Ramesses II: ‘for thou art Re in thy body, and Khépêr in his true likeness; thou art the living image on earth of thy father Atum of Heliopolis’; Anat. II, 4, song in praise of the town of Rameses, it is said to Rameses II: ‘Thou, O king, that art formed by the gods, etc., thou, the likeness of the bull of Heliopolis (ταῦτα τοῦ θεοῦ), where ‘bull’ is applied to the god as a symbol of strength and courage; Pjy. 407 of the dead king who appears as god-king in heaven, that he was the ‘divine image’, the ‘image of images’, i.e. the truest of all divine images.

Of still more importance for us, however, and most nearly related to the creation-story in the first chapter of Genesis, is the teaching of Merikare, according to which all men are created in the image of the gods who issued from Re, as it is said Pap. Petersb. 1116 A, Recto 132 (= Lit. 83) of men: ‘They are his (Re's) images (μῆνυμεν) that issued from his limbs (κοιναὶ).’

connected with the conception of ‘likeness’; it was applied to kings of whom it was vaunted that they were created in the likeness of Thoth (cf. Erman, ibid. p. 20, n. 3). The same also applies to μῦρα, μῆνυμεν (A.G. W.B. ii. 30 ff.) ‘likeness’ from μῆνυμι = like.

As Sehe remarks ad loc. (translation p. 8, n. 12), the original meaning of μῆνυμεν is ‘tou’ (from μῆνυμι) ‘to bear’). On account of other ideas to be discussed later, it is important to bear in mind that in the creation of gods and men the same expression μῆνυμεν was employed for ‘bearing’ and for ‘shaping and creating’; cf. e.g. Memph. Thol. p. 541: μῆνυμεν ταύτα he created (or shaped) the gods.

This idea is also expressed in royal names, e.g. in Tutankhamen = ταῦτα ὑπό τοὺς ‘a living image is Amon’ or, as I think, ‘the living image of Amon.’

This is to be understood in the light of the Egyptian theology, according to which the first men were children of the first gods. Cf. below, p. 13.
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This whole idea of ‘image and likeness’ nowhere assumed so much significance or was so widespread as in Egypt. Side by side with the visible world, there existed for the Egyptians an invisible world, in which the souls of gods and men wandered about, not only in their own bodies, but also in doubles in their image or likeness. The images of the god could at any time be entered and thus animated by their soul (hout), and as every god had several souls (houta) he had at his disposal also several images into which at choice or whim now one, now another, of his souls entered, so that all these images as special representations of the god could simultaneously be present in different places.1

Similarly every man had a corporeal double in his own image which existed as a shadow by his side, and which only after death assumed its true significance. For just as the soul (hout) could return to the body of the deceased, which for this reason it was sought to preserve as a mummy, it could also enter his double as often as it pleased in order that the deceased might wander at will in this world of the living as well as in the nether world, or might journey in the sun-bark of Re across the heavens from one horizon to another.2

We do not propose now to enter fully upon an analysis and discussion of the differences in the first and second chapters of Genesis, reserving it for another occasion. But so much may be said now: The whole conception of the creation of the first man and his wife in the image of God as set forth in the first Chapter of Genesis could hardly have originated in any other than an Egyptian milieu.3 It has certainly a quite different meaning in the monotheistic presentation. For despite its anthropomorphic background,

1 This is the way in which the conception of the omnipresence of God found its primitive expression. Nothing can better illustrate the thoroughly polytheistic mind of the Egyptian and the sensualistic anthropomorphic conception he had of his gods, than the idea that every god not only had several souls, but also several bodies in his likeness as so to render possible his simultaneous presence in different places.

2 The idea of being ‘the image or in the likeness of’ was so widespread that phrases such as ‘likeness of the father’ or ‘image of his father’ were used in the meaning of ‘his corporeal son’ Thus e.g. Pope. Bulaq. 4, pl. 16. 1: ‘Get thee a wife while thou (the text has: he) art young that she may provide thee with a son as “thy likeness”’. I.e. whilst thou art still strong so that she may remain faithful to thee and her child may be the child of thine own body.

3 That such a conception could hardly occur in a Babylonian creation-myth has already been observed above (p. 112 f.). But even assuming that the interpretation of the word serek is right, which is more than questionable, it would represent a quite isolated conception which has not been generally accepted. On the other hand the Egyptian influence of the idea of likeness on our passage can hardly be doubted, not only because this idea was remarkably wide-spread in Egypt, but also because the closest Egyptian conceptions with the creation-story of Genesis are so abundant and so palpable.

it has been shorn of the sensualistic and polytheistic features of Egyptian theology and, in deliberate contrast to the Egyptian conception (according to which there were many creator-gods and thus several different ‘images’), in our passage only the first human pair is created in the image of God as there is only one God. But later, even this more elevated and advanced conception did not seem to fit into the teaching of a pure monotheism, as the danger still subsisted that man would be exalted also in his corporeal substance as divine. Hence it appeared necessary to correct or to amplify this conception of the creation of man by another one set forth in the second chapter, in order to prevent the possible assumption of a corporeal connexion between man and God in the sense of the Egyptian theology, as we shall see later.

2. The designation of the First Man as €om and the ‘Red Land’

The name of the first man €om is brought into connexion with ‘pop’ in Gen. 2:7. That €om means ‘the red’ i.e. ‘the red land’ cannot be doubted. Now, this expression as an appellation for land is to be found in no other Semitic language. This leads to the supposition that €om is an exclusively Hebrew mintage, and the question arises on what conception it was based. It is true that nowadays in Palestine the soil is classified by the Arabs according to various colours, thus: ‘ard hamra or samla ‘red earth’; ‘ard samra or kahla ‘black or grey earth’; ‘ard baṣa ‘white earth’; ‘ard safra ‘yellow earth’ etc. But all these designations are simply applied to different kinds of soil according to its colour, each being used for the sowing of a particular seed or fruit (cf. inter alia Canaan, ZDMG. 1916, p. 165). Nowhere, however, is any of these expressions used appellatively for ‘land, earth’ like €om, not even hamra ‘the red’, although red soil is most noticeable in Palestine. Even assuming, in view of the stability of all conditions in the Orient, that in ancient Canaan likewise, the various species of soil were similarly differentiated according to colour, it is not known that any land as a whole, or a complex of lands, or the whole earth was ever called by a word denoting a colour like Hebr. €om.

Now, if we refer to Egyptian, we find that dir.t ‘the red’ (fem. of dir) is used to designate a foreign, or sterile land, in contrast to kmt ‘the black’ (fem. of km) used as a name for Egypt because there, the only fertile and cultivated land is the black, muddy soil inundated by the Nile. Indeed dir.t became the name for deserts, for remote countries or parts only inhabited by nomads. This use of dir.t and kmt was very widespread, and a few examples may suffice to illustrate their antithetic character.
is, puffed up', which meaning was then extended to 'breath'. As we have already shown, the expression מִי Gen. 1, 2, reveals the same extension of meaning from 'wind' to 'soul as the Egyptian nv and ב from 'wind' to 'breath' (Er.-Gr. 80 and 268). The same also applies to מְט 'breath' since in מ and ב the idea of 'blowing' in' and 'breathing' is present, as appears from the use of ב for the 'blowing of the wind'.

But the Egyptian mode of thought is not merely confined to the word מ, but pervades the whole passage both linguistically and intrinsically. For just as in Hebrew it is said that the breath of life is 'blown into the nostrils' (יִפְרוּ), so also according to the Egyptian conception, the breath of life was introduced through the nostrils into the body. The usual expression for giving life is יד or יפנע n 'to give the breath of life', this being an abbreviation of the original and extended version: יפנע 'to give breath into the nostrils'; here fnu is a dual the same as the Hebrew דעש though it also occurs in the sing. fnn 'nose' as in Hebrew מ (cf. Isaiah 2, 22). This expression is extraordinarily frequent in Egyptian literature, especially in the hymns to the gods and odes to the kings, where it is said that it is they who 'give breath and life in the nostrils' (or the nose), e.g. Harris, 44, 6: 'He is Ptah who gives the breath of life to every nose יפנע n' Ode to Sesostris III, Griffith Pap. Kah., pl. iii, 14 (= Lit. 337): 'He is our shepherd who knows how to blow in breath' (mfl, caus. of fn); Victory Ode to Merenptah 14 (274): 'Breath enters the nostrils ('חנפנע nfnw) at the sight of him'; Ebr. iv, 15, 3 (of the king): 'who gives breath in the nostrils of women' יפנע n fnw nfnw kmw)'; Merikare Pap. Petersb. 1116, A, recto 132 (= Lit. 83): 'God made the air that their nostrils may live' ('חנפנע n fnw nfnw); Lit. 304, of Osiris: 'Thou pourest forth (lit. spittet) the air that is in thy throat into the nostrils of men'; Lit. 301 of Amon: 'He bloweth breath into every nose';

3. The Breath of Life breathed into the Nostrils

The process of animating the body of Adam is described Gen. 2, 7 by the words יִפְרוּ n עָנָן n עָנָן. The expression עָנָן for 'breath' is derived from עָנָן 'to blow, puff', and therefore meant originally something 'blown

1 The application of מְט 'the red', to desert may perhaps be so explained that the Egyptians primarily applied it to the neighbouring Asiatic lands, especially Palestine and Syria, because they were struck by the red colour of their soil, which was in marked contrast to that of Egypt; and it was only later that this term was extended to all foreign lands. For the same reason the Egyptians may have called the sandy desert מצ 'the white' on account of its white colour. Of course it is also possible that מְט may have taken its origin from the reddish colour of the desert between the Nile and the Red Sea in Egypt itself.
4. The Creation of the Beasts of the Field and the Birds of Heaven from Red Land and their animation by Adam

Gen. 2, 19 tells us that the animals were formed from red land by God and brought to Adam to give them names. It should be first of all observed that here the gods of the field and birds of heaven are referred to, there being no mention whatever of water creatures; secondly that the

1 Cf. Lament. 4, 20 where the king the 'anointed of God' is described as אֲמִשָּׁם 'breath for our noses'.

2 For the breathing-in of the soul through the nose, the Egyptian also used the onomatopoetic expression קק, cf. Erman, Land. Aiman-Hymen, E. Sec. 606, 2, n. 6.

3 Cf. inter alia Wiedemann, Das alte Agypten, pl. 8, p. 72 and Dodge, The gods of the Egyptians, 1, 25 and ii, 24.
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singular ב is used in a distributive, not collective sense, and thus applies to every one of the animals and birds; further that ב וְיָקָר הבּוֹם and the following בּוֹם וְיָקָר הבּוֹם do apply to two different though mutually dependent factors: the first sentence indicates the giving of names to the animals and birds by Adam in the words: 'to see what he would call them'; and in the second sentence we are told that the animals and birds were brought before Adam to see which of them would be designated by him as הבּוֹם 'living soul'. Despite all the objections of modern commentators הבּוֹם undoubtedly belongs to the original text, nay, it is indeed the kernel of the whole. What is meant is this: All the beasts of the field and the birds of heaven were shaped from red land and brought as lifeless figures to Adam to see which one he would designate as הבּוֹם 'a living soul' i.e. 'a living being' implying that only by such designation would they receive the power and capability of life. Thus it was left to Adam's choice and determination which were to be endowed with life; and the animation of these was to result automatically from their designation by him as 'living soul'.

The statement in the second chapter that it was God Himself Who shaped 'all the beasts of the field and all the birds of heaven' from red land shows the author dissented from the naturalistic conception set forth in the first chapter, according to which the animals were simply created by God's fiat, emerging as living beings from the earth or water. In the case of water-creatures however—and this explains why no mention is made of them here—he could still let the view prevail that they were produced out of the water as this was in accordance with the prevalent naive observation, but not in the case of the other animals, the reproduction and increase of which was mostly effectuated, as in the case of man, by actual birth. For this reason he believed that these animals had to originate in the same way, and to be created from the same material, as man.

Having disposed of this difficulty, it did not appear to him to be appropriate that animals which, compared with man, were creatures of a much lower grade, should receive the same 'breath of life', and still less that it should be breathed into them by God himself as in the case of man. Our author, therefore, conceived the act of their animation as having been carried out not by God Himself but through Adam at His behest and this by Adam's pronunciation of the words הבּוֹם through which they were to be destined for life. In this way, Adam was given the power only to assign life to the animal figures at his choice, but not, however, to breathe life into them; this power was vested in the formula הבּוֹם 'living soul', which had to be pronounced by him so that an animal figure could become a living creature.
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The passage which thus means: 'and whatsoever animal Adam will call a "living soul" that shall be its name', i.e., it shall receive the name "living soul" and thereby become a living creature. The words "living soul" do not relate to the selection of individual names for animals, like lion, horse, eagle, sparrow etc., but imply that by an animal being called "a living soul" its animal should directly follow upon the receipt of this name. Any animal form to which Adam would say: 'Be thou called living soul' became ipso facto alive.

The difference of procedure in the animation of man and of animals is conveyed quite clearly by the different manner of expression: Whereas in the case of the animals, it is stated Gen. 2, 19 that it was only through Adam that they received the qualification of "living soul" the words used with reference to Adam, 2, 7 are: 'and God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and Adam became a living soul', i.e., through God Himself.

As to the giving of individual names (lion, horse etc.) to the animals, it only followed after the conferment of life upon them, as it is said 2, 20 "he named all the beasts of the field and all the birds of heaven" and Adam gave names to all cattle and to the birds of heaven and to all beasts of the field. This was essential, for name and being belonged together, and the mere act of creation did not suffice to give a creature the character of an individual being; only that being which had a name could be felt as having a real individual existence. This conception was by no means an isolated one but was common to many other peoples so that 'to give names' and 'to come into being' were practically identical in meaning. So for instance in Akkadian it was said of things not yet created, that they had no names yet, e.g., at the beginning of the creation-myth Enuma elis, p. 3, 1 1 b 1: "When, above the heaven had not yet been named (la nabi lamana), and, below, the earth had not yet been called by name (tuma la sakrata)" and further ll. 7-8: 'When of the gods none had yet been created and no name had yet been called (tuma la zukrata)'; i.e. and there was not yet any living thing.

If the Hebrew agrees in this particular conception both with Akkadian and Egyptian, the use of יארו "to call out" in conjunction with מכנמ in the meaning of giving a name seems rather to coincide with the Akkadian

The Akkadian mode of expression can, therefore, only serve in comparison with the following verse 20, and also as parallel to the idea emerging from our passage.

usage of nabi 'to call' which together with sumu 'name' means 'to give a name'. (For the original meaning of nabi 'to call out' see Del. Wb. 441 and Mus.-Amm. 650). The same applies to zukaru sumu Del. Wb. 224 f. Mus.-Amm. 279 f. On the other hand the Egyptian in this case used gid m or r spoken to, saying 'to follow' by name in the meaning of 'giving a name to', e.g. Leiden K 8: 'Weser-Haat (szr h.t) to whom was said gid n-f'; i.e., he was called, 'Haat-Yay (br.t-lay)'; Brugsch, Oase, p. 80: 'Shep-n-Desdes (ip-n-fid) was said (gid r) to the wine of the oasis' i.e. the wine was so called; King Amasis and the sailor (Spiegelbg. Demot. Stud., part 7) L 14: 'a sailor-boy to whom was said (mtncw m gid m-f) Her-sa (br.v)'

But we find that also in the Egyptian creation-myths the conceptions of devising, announcing, making or creating a name, and of calling into being are identical, e.g., Memph. Theol. p. 938 it is said of Ptah-Atum 'who devised or proclaimed the names of all things, (mr f r h.t nhd)'; i.e., who created all things; further Urk. v. 10, 2 of Re the primal creator who had created himself and the eight other gods forming together the 'corporation of the Nine' (ipht-f): 'who created his names (mswn mr-m) as lord of the Ennead'. On this a later glossator of the New Kingdom comments: 'What does this mean?' And his answer is: 'That is Re, who created the names of his limbs; this means that the gods arose who are in his company.' In 'creating the names of his limbs' reference is made to the creation from his body of the eight gods. It is now clear that the expressions 'created his name' or 'created the names of his limbs' simply means that he created himself and his co-divinities.

In addition to the foregoing observations, attention should be drawn to a very fine distinction made in Gen. 2, 19, 20, whereas 2, 19 only speaks of the two groups ysr ym ym the beasts of the field and birds of heaven', in 2, 20 at the allotment of names to the animals by Adam, the 'domestic animals' ym ym are added as an individual species. The differentiation between ym and ym, could only occur after the animation of the clay figures through Adam when the separation of the domestic animals from the whole animal contingent became possible and their naming could be proceeded with.

A similar meaning is also contained in the name of a god tr n-f' fsf (Rec. 4, 28, 2) 'He who made his own name', i.e., he who created himself.
5. The Creation of Woman from Adam's Rib

In all known creation-stories whether of the Babylonians or of any other neighbours of Israel, one seeks in vain for the background of the idea that a human being was created from a part of the body of another. This is, however, furnished in one of the older Egyptian myths, the elements of which go back to the middle of the third millennium B.C., even before the city of Memphis had been raised to the dignity of the capital of the Empire under the 6th dynasty (Memph. Theol. p. 924), and even to a still earlier date. In this myth, which, as will be shown on another occasion, generally contains many very important points of likeness to the Genesis creation story, Pah-Atem as primordial god and creator of the gods is described as having created from his members 'the eight great gods', who together with him formed the so-called 'Ennead (pl. Û). According to this myth, Thoth, the God of Wisdom and Writing, was created from his heart, the Royal God Horus from his tongue (loc. cit. p. 937 and 940) and the remaining gods from his teeth, hands, nose, and other members (p. 938). The idea that the first gods, who were conceived by the Egyptians as the ancestors of mankind, originated from parts of the body of the primal creator, asserted itself throughout the entire Egyptian theogony in the various theological schools as a veritable dogma. The only difference was that according to the dominance of one or another priestly caste, now one, now another of the 'great' gods (Re, Amon Pah, Atum) was designated as the primal creator of the gods. Only in a milieu where such conceptions were rife could the author of the Genesis creation-story have hit upon the idea of bringing the mother of mankind into existence from a part of Adam's body. The Egyptian myth provides us also with the key to the solution of the question why that part had to be a rib. This was not because, as is often assumed, the extraction of a rib would not vitally affect the structure of a human body, but for another very profound reason viz. that the woman might not originate from any member from which the Egyptian gods had been created, nor from any other member performing an important function, as there is little doubt that the selection of the above-mentioned members for the creation of the eight gods was determined by their particular functions. 1

6. The use of 'qā' for 'to create'

It is very noteworthy that in the creation of man and animals from red earth in the second chapter, 'qā' is employed as a technical term in verses 7, 8 and 9, whereas in the first chapter 'qā' verses 25 and 26, or ḫām verse 27, is used. When we consider that 'qā' means potter, e.g. 2 Sam. 17, 28; Ex. 29, 46; 40, 25; Jer. 18, 2 ff. 19, 11; Ps. 2, 9; 23 and that likewise the Egyptian applied the expression ḫām, to pottery work, and also to the creation of man, we arrive at a complete coincidence of 'qā' and ḫām. But the coincidence is not confined to the use of these words; the whole idea is reflected in the Egyptian conception, according to which the god Khnum shaped the child in the womb, as a vessel on the potter's wheel, and he or Heket (hē-hī), the goddess of the midwives, breathed into it the breath of life. For this reason Khnum was actually called the potter (’hām-w), thus e.g. Urk. iv. 223, where Khnum is represented as shaping the body of the Queen Hatshepsut and her double (hē) on the potter's wheel, and he is called to speak to the Queen: 'These are the words of Khnum, the potter (hām-w); I created thee, etc.' (cf. also 225, 2 and in Seth's translation, p. 153, n. 3) further Admon. 2, 4: 'There are no more women and no children are conceived any more; no longer does Khnum shape (a hām-n), i.e. he creates no more men owing to the bad conditions in the country (cf. also 5, 7). Occasionally the shaping and creation of a human being outside the womb is attributed to Khnum, e.g. Pap. d'Orb. ix. 6–8 (= Lit. 156), in the story of the two brothers, where we are told that the gods felt sympathy with the lonely Bata (bā-tā), whereupon the text goes on: 'Then Re-Harakhte said to Khnum: shape (or create) for Bata a wife (hē hē-hī wān n t šlm.t n b-t-t) that he may not dwell alone (tms-s [not tm-h] hēm wān). So Khnum made for him

2 As to the interpretation of the name ḫām and qā, Gen. 2, 22, 3, 20, see below in the chapter on symbolic and anecdotal name-interpretations.
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taneously, in that both man and wife are created together.1 In the second chapter (verse 7), the Pahh-Khnum conception is represented; here the first man is formed from red earth as a lifeless figure and then made רנה 'a living soul' by the breathing of the breath of life into his nostrils (cf. above 140 f.). Only in the creation of woman (verses 22-23) is once more a feature from the Pth-atum theogony adopted. She is created not from the earth but from a part of Adam's body. But also here the author deviates from the Egyptian polytheistic conception in giving an ethical interpretation to the creation of woman: she was to be bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh in order to be one with him.

By a comparison of these two parallel conceptions in Egyptian and the first two chapters of Genesis, the links between the two differing versions of the creation of man are established, and the motives indicated above (p. 137 f.), which actuated the modification of the first theory by the second, are now more clearly brought out. As a further result, it follows of necessity that the composition of the first chapter is of an earlier date than the second. The conception given in the second chapter, if perhaps not a complete abrogation, at least represents a correction of the first conception in a more thorough-going and purer monotheistic spirit. In the first place the creation of Adam from earth was to avoid any possibility of deducing from the first version as to man being made in the image of God a corporeal identity with God; on the other hand the divine origin of the breath of life is strongly emphasized, a feature which is completely lacking in the first chapter. Finally in the creation of woman from the man's body, a compromise between the two Egyptian conceptions. Nevertheless it is, as we have shown, interpreted in a higher sense as the moral basis of a union between man and woman.

1 Gen. 1, 27 נְניָּהוּ means therefore, that they were created separate. This dissimulates the whole conception of the first human pair having been of an androgynous character, which is also represented in Midrash Berith Rabba 8, and which is doubtless derived through Greek influence.

---

1 The expression ‘that he may not dwell alone’ is very striking as a parallel to Gen. 2, 18. Though it may be explained by the similar subject-matter in both cases which deal with the creation of a wife for the solitary man, the same mode of expression is nevertheless very remarkable. On the other hand, the difference should be noted in the expression for ‘help meet ְֵּֽהֶלֶת ְֵֽהֶלֶתְּ הַּיּוֹקְרְהִים’ of Genesis, Gen. 2, 18, 20 literally, ‘a help in front of him’, and in Egyptian ṭr ṭr t, literally ‘a companion of dwelling’.

2 See e.g. Budge, The Gods, ii, 501, plate showing Pth forming the egg on the potter’s wheel.

3 Parallel with the Hebrew expression לְנַנַנְתָּ in the first chapter of Genesis, the Egyptian ṭr ‘to do, make’ in the sense of ‘create’ is used, thus of man, e.g. Himmelsbuch, pl. A, 1, f. 1, Sethos I. (the god Nun) ṭr ṭr t ‘who made men and is king of mankind (nwn ṭr ṭr t)’; of heavens, ibid. l. 55; ṭr ṭr t ‘I am he who made the heavens’. In Harris 44, 4 ṭr = ṭr for the creation of men is differentiated from ṭr = ṭr ṭr for the creation of the gods: ‘(Pth) who formed men (ḥrr ṭr t) and made the gods (ḥrr ṭr ṭr).’ Also ḫn (ḥmn) for ‘to form’ was used, originally meaning ‘to beat flat’, and ṭr ‘to form’ originally ‘to bear’, thus e.g. ḫn. Inscr. Berd. Mea., ii, 55 (= Roeder, Uth., p. 54); ḫmn ṭr ṭr t ‘who created the gods and made men’; Harris 3, 2 ff.: ṭr ṭr t ḫmn ṭr ṭr t ‘who made what is, and created that which exists’; Sonnenhymnus, Rec., l. 70-2, plate, (after p. 88) l. 8 ff.: ‘Hail to thee, sun of the day (ḥmn ḫmn) who created all men (ḥmn ḫmn)’ and l. 10: ḫmn ṭr t ‘who created the soil’. Cf. יִשְׁמֹה יִשְׁמֹה ‘to stretch the earth’ originally ‘to beat flat’; Is. 40, 5, 44, 4; Ps. 136, 6.
CHAPTER IV
THE EGYPTIAN ELEMENTS IN THE PARADISE STORY
AND THE FALL OF MAN

From Gen. 3, 23 according to which Adam was exiled from the Garden of Eden in order to till the ‘red earth’ ה-ren, from which he was taken, the contrast between the Garden of Eden, as a land of fertility, and the ‘red earth’ ר-ren as arid untilled land emerges with the greatest distinctiveness. Now, as in no other land was the contrast between the fertile black earth (k.m.), irrigated by a river, like the Garden of Eden, and the untilled bare ‘red earth’ (d.l.), so continuously and consistently emphasized as in Egypt, the question arises whether the author, in writing the Paradise story, did not have in mind conditions which are characteristic of Egypt. We therefore attempt to derive from the description of Eden, and the garden planted therein, indications which justify such an assumption, and then to disclose the elements which actually reveal the Egyptian background for the conditions and events described in the Paradise story.

1. The Egyptian origin of ה-ren

The first important clue is the statement that Eden was not watered by rain, Gen. 2, 5, but by a river, 2, 10, and as we shall show later by one river. These are conditions which apply in much greater measure to Egypt than to Mesopotamia, where the origin of the Paradise story is sought, especially as Mesopotamia has a quite abundant rainfall so that its irrigation is not exclusively dependent upon its rivers. It is noteworthy that in Egyptian poetry, it is emphasized that Egypt alone is privileged to enjoy all divine blessings, that unlike all foreign countries it is not dependent on rain, but is watered by the very river that comes from the nether world, continually bestowing upon it all the blessings of heaven and all the blessings of earth (cf. Sun-Hymn of Ekhmun, I. 22). This contrast between Egypt and other lands dependent on rain for their fertilization, was in the mind of our author in contrasting Eden, exuberantly fertilized by river-water, and the dry and barren ‘red earth’ longing for rain. (He is thoroughly dominated by the conception that during the sojourn of Adam in Eden there was no need for rain at all.

EGYPTIAN ELEMENTS ETC.

Our view is best illustrated by the employment of the word ה-ren in verse 6, where the irrigation of the rainless earth is described. It is true this word is interpreted by many modern commentators as identical with the Akkadian, idd ‘flood’, and the occurrence of this word is even advanced by them as a conclusive proof that the author could only have thought of the flooding in the Mesopotamian plain by the Tigris and Euphrates. But if such a phenomenon really was in the author’s mind, it is much more plausible to assume that he had Egypt in mind because of the very argument advanced that the ה-ren was to replace the absent rain, and Egypt is the only country that is irrigated by inundation, and not by rain. Quite apart from this purely logical argument ה-ren cannot possibly refer to a flood, because a flood does not, as the text has it, ‘go forth ר-ren from the earth’, but from a water or a river, and moreover it would only have ‘watered’ the adjacent portions, and not, as it is said, ר-ren ר-ren ‘the whole face of the earth’. Thus the interpretation of ה-ren as ‘flood’ must on these grounds alone be dismissed. If we now revert to the old interpretation of ה-ren as mist, cloud, dew, we find that it is completely confirmed by Egyptian, as ה-ren turns out to be nothing else than the Egyptian idd.t = n.3.n. or n.3.n. ‘dew’ (Er.-Gr. 6, Copitc es.t.e (5) w.t (B)), thus e.g. Urk. iv, 217, 10, where idd.t is the dew which the gods let fall from heaven. See also Urk. iv, 615, 15; Ebers Karpert. 77, 21; Nav. Text. 15, A, 4, 7; Urk. iv, 385 for water.

Our passage is now perfectly clear: ה-ren yields exactly the conception of mist which ‘goes forth out of the earth’, is dissolved in dew and ‘waters the whole face of the earth’. It is very characteristic of tropical countries that in the non-rainy season the dew in the morning often falls so heavily


This has still been maintained quite recently by Greismann, Paradisage, Harnack-Festgabe, 1921, p. 42.

2 In Pfr. 751 idd.t may mean ‘arise’ so that idd.t might possibly mean ‘that which arises’ which would be very suitable for dew just as 752 ה-ren in our passage. Figuratively idd.t n.t is used as parallel to idd.t n.t ‘sweet of God’ in the sense of pleasant odour. It is also used figuratively of the strength emanating from a god or a king, thus e.g. Urk. iv, 221, 3 f. the queen says to the king who appears to her in their cannibal relation as a god: ‘Thou hast filled my majesty with thy splendid (shn), thy dew (idd.t) is in all my limbs’ i.e. ‘fragrance, sweet odour’; Amonhymen, Lssen. ÄZ, 42, 15, 1 f.: ‘The incense-trees drop myrrh, the scent of thy dew penetrates thy nostrils’; also Edfu, pl. 101, 56: ‘his (the god’s) nostrils are refreshed with his (the king’s) dew (idd.t, m.t-f, or t. t-s-f, in idd.t-s-f)’ and Edfu, pl. 101, 15: of the king for whom incense is burnt: ‘The dew of thy limbs is offered to thee as burning incense (k.p w.t idd.t 8 t-s-f)’. Cf. also Pap. Bula, 17, p. 2, 1, 4, where Amun-Re is called the ‘great in fragrance’. It may be observed that owing to the very early confounding of idd.t with idd.t ‘fragrance, sweet odour’ (Pbr. 365, 456, etc.). It cannot always be determined which of these two words is employed in passages where it means ‘sweet’ or ‘strength’.
flourishing place with exuberant vegetation, extended from the meaning of ‘to be fat and luxurious’.

All this leads us to discern in the word for oasis in contrast to the Garden of Eden (Gen. 2, 8) clearly premises that Eden designates a particular kind of spot with special characteristics in which the garden was planted. Accordingly, means merely that the garden was planted in an oasis, an ideal spot for a flourishing garden of unusual luxuriance, and a conception admirably adapted to Egyptian conditions. Indeed no more suitable meaning could be established for γεωργία and no more appropriate expression could have been selected for oasis. The proper rendering of γεωργία is an oasis-garden. The whole description of γεωργία thereupon sounds quite natural, giving a graphic, plastic picture of the luxuriant splendour and attractiveness of such a spot. In the midst of an oasis lived by a great river stood the Garden of God filled with all kinds of delightful plants and wonderful trees rich with fruit ‘pleasant to the sight and good for food.’

This interpretation of γεωργία is supported by the fact that in the times of

1 Fat soil is fruitful and fertile. cf. inter alia Gen. 27, 39; Num. 13, 20; fat pastures Ez. 35, 14; 1 Chr. 4, 20; fat foods in addition to Gen. 49, 20 also Neh. 8, 10.

2 The Egyptian expression for oasis is ḫtw (Ex-Gn. 35) which through the Coptic υφάσμα also passed into Arabic in ḫṭūr, ḫṭūr and by transmutation of ḫ into  is into Greek (see Spiegel, WB, 175). It is a very ancient word in Egyptian, though its etymological origin is uncertain. As a mere guess we presume it may be derived from a root  related to and by extension to ‘to bloom, flourish, blossom’, e.g. Pyr. 411 b, 1556 a. But it is more likely in that it has the meaning of ‘to be fat’ may look as in ḫṭūr. The latter supposition may find support in the mode of writing ḫṭū with  which is used as determinative in words for ‘fat’ as noun or adj., thus in ḫṭū, ḫṭū, ḫṭū (cf. Ex-Gn. 135, 120, 233). It is obvious that a determinative can also serve as an etymological clue, even though it is employed in words of several meanings. Sethra suggests that ḫṭū ‘oasis’ originally meant a valley, being associated with ‘calabron’, as the same determinative is used for this word (Ex-Gn. 35, 46). This interpretation is however very questionable and is due more to Sethra’s association with the Gnostic ‘Talhessel’, which was hardly an Egyptian conception of an oasis, since not every oasis is a valley, and not every valley is so closely surrounded by mountains as a Talhessel. By the way it may be observed that ḫṭū (later form ḫṭū) was originally used only in Egyptian-Arabic whereas it penetrated to other Arabic dialects. That it is also current in Central Arabia and Negēd is due to the campaigns of Ibrahim Pasha against the Wahhabites (1813-18). The genuine Arabic expressions current for an oasis or a fruitful, irrigated neighbourhood are  or  or  or  or .

3 It is not clear why it is said ḫṭū without any particular determination. It simply means ‘in an oasis’ that did not need to be specifically located. The interpretation of ḫṭū as ‘Garden of joy, of pleasure’ (LXX.  ḫṭū  ḫṭū) arose only on the ground of later eschatological conceptions. In Biblical times, the Garden of Eden had not yet acquired the position and importance given to it in latter-day Judaism. Even Ezekiel as we shall presently see had still the clear feeling that the Garden of Eden was also familiar to the Egyptians.
the Prophets it was still clearly felt that יָם meant an oasis. This is not only apparent from the passage already cited, Is. 51, 3 but more particularly from passages like Ez. 36, 33 and Joel 2, 3, where יָם is the Garden of Eden is contrasted with devastated places and wildernesses. Ezekiel has in mind the picture of a wonderful oasis emerging out of a desert. He vividly depicts the great contrast between the infinite enjoyment of an oasis with all its delights, and the unutterable desolation produced by the dreary sight of a lonely, endless, sun-baked waste. It is evident that in those days, as we have said, the word יָם must have still retained its plastic meaning of ‘oasis’, and the conception still lingered that the ‘Garden of God’ lay in an oasis.  

Apart from the etymological and intrinsic reasons adduced our view is also supported grammatically by Ez. 28, 13. Here the construction of יָם and יָם has always presented difficulties, because יָם taken as in status constructus did not yield any meaning. So much so that many interpreters were driven to regard יָם as in apposition to יָם, viz. ‘Eden, the Garden of God’. Now it becomes perfectly evident that the construction is quite in order, יָם properly being in status constructus with יָם, the phrase meaning simply: the oasis of the Garden of God. In the same way all difficulties are removed from Ez. 31, 9—here the prophet, speaking of all the trees of Eden’ means simply all the trees of the oasis’ which were in the Garden of God’ יָם יָם. This can only be understood when יָם is conceived as an oasis, alluding to the rich and precious ‘oasis trees which were in the Garden of God’.  

But Ezekiel furnishes us with still more important evidence inasmuch as we learn from him that he actually thought that the ‘Garden of God’ was situated in an Egyptian oasis. In his declaration against Pharaoh, 31, 1 ff., he contrasts ‘all the trees of Eden that were in the Garden of God’ with the mighty cedars of Lebanon. The whole description shows that in Eden and its flourishing trees in the ‘Garden of God’ he sees a picture of the luxury and riches of an Egyptian king, whereas the mighty cedar of incomparable beauty on the heights of Lebanon, is for him the incorporation of the might and greatness of the Assyrian king. He assigns to Eden and its garden even a minor position compared with Lebanon and its cedars, in the same way as he dismisses the Egyptian king as insignificant over against the Assyrian world-conqueror. Moreover in verse 8 he expressly emphasizes that in the ‘Garden of God’ there were no cedars which could top

the cedars of Lebanon, that its cypress did not even equal the boughs of the cedar, nor the plane trees its branches! This can only be said of Egypt where no cedars grow, but where the cypresses and plane trees are the glory and joy of the fertile areas. The prophet means to say that Eden with its garden, in Egypt, is in no way comparable with the cedar forest in Lebanon. If it is in God’s power to fell the giant cedars, under the sauds of which all the ‘trees of the field’ grew, under whose boughs all the beasts of the field brought forth their young, under whose shadow great nations dwelt, how then could Pharaoh, whose stoutest trees were merely cypresses and planes, dare to array himself against the Almighty as most puissant and invincible?  

It is true that the connexion with the Paradise story is palpable, but equally palpable is the connexion of the Garden of Eden with Egypt and Pharaoh, as is also the fact that the prophet conceived this garden in an יָם, in an oasis.  

It should further be considered that in 31, 16 and 18, Ezekiel sees ‘in the trees of Eden’ the Egyptian rulers wallowing in the netherworld whom he causes to-hurtle with Pharaoh into the προσωπικον. All this is only conceivable if it is assumed that Egypt, the classical land of oases, was for the prophet the home of the יָם the oasis in which ‘the Garden of God’ stood. Now also we can understand why for him יָם ‘the oasis’, יָם is ‘the Garden of God’, יָם the Egyptian nether world and Pharaoh were so naturally and so closely connected.  

The same idea must have been present to the author of Gen. 13. For him the connexion of the ‘Garden of God’ with Egypt (v. 10) was so evident that he mentioned יָם and יָם γνωστον together as one and the same representing them as the ideal, almost proverbial picture of richest forescence and greatest fertility. By placing יָם γνωστον ‘like the land of 1 יָם γֵּנֹא the lower one’ is a literal reproduction of the Egyptian expression br.τ. which cannot have any other meaning than ‘the lower one’, for the word of the dead, originally br.τ. the lower one of god’. Also the expression יָם יָם γֵּנֹא is very current in Egyptian particularly with regard to the cedarwood of Lebanon, and notably in building inscriptions in which the founders of temples and builders of palaces and ships emphasized with special pride that they had employed ‘the best cedars of the terrace’, as Lebanon was called, see e.g. Amarna I, Amarna II, 24, 6, l. 30 f.; ‘A ship . . . of new cedarwood from the best of the terrace.’ Similarly Thutmose III, L.D. Text iii, 7; ‘Doom (7) of new cedarwood from the best of the terrace’. These and similar Egyptianisms in Ezekiel had doubtless long before him obtained currency in Hebrew literature, being used without even their origin being known. See also above p. 86, n. 1.  

The connexion between the Paradise story and the elegy on the King of Tyre in Eden, Ez. 28, 11 ff., as well as other reminiscences of the Paradise story in the Bible will be fully discussed elsewhere. It should, however, be here observed that Ez. 28, 11 ff. has very marked Egyptian colouring.
EGYPTIAN ELEMENTS IN THE PARADISE STORY

Egypt * in apposition to *גarden of God*’, their connexion is still more emphatically denoted.1

Of great significance for the present investigation is the fact that the Egyptians actually had in the world of the gods a place which they called *kem[n]tr* ‘Garden of God’ (Pyr. 1112), where it is said (of Re): ‘Behold, he (the king) has come in order to live and to enjoy. He has purified himself (khem) with figs (dib) and wine that are in the Garden of God (kem ntr).’2 The expression *kem ntr* is perfectly identical with *גarden* and *קem* curiously enough even sounds like *ג*. All indications distinctly point to an orientation of the Paradise story towards Egypt. We now propose to pursue this clue in order to determine the situation of the Paradise more closely.

3. The Location of Paradise

In all attempts to find a solution to the question: ‘Where lay Paradise?’, the greatest difficulty has always been the assumption that the rivers Pithon of Haufla and Gihon of Kish, as well as the Mesopotamian

1. The right place of the words *ינָה כֹּס לְאַנְט* ‘until Zoro’ is after *הָרָעֹל הָרָעֹל נַעֲסָן* and the whole follows *דָּוִיד* as an explanatory note which can quite well have emanated from the narrator himself, as he in any case knew after the destruction of these towns. The passage thus reads: ‘And Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was a well-watered land like the Garden of God, like the land of Egypt—before that God had destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah as far as Zoro’. That Zoro was actually the boundary of the destroyed territory is expressly stated in Gen. 19, 20 ff., and it is quite natural that the narrator should also have referred to this same fact. Herewith disappear all the difficulties raised against the text, and the reading or perhaps emendation *יָצָה* for *וַיִּזְכֹּּב* offered by the Piqë is shown to be erroneous and completely meaningless. As to *the land of Egypt* in our passage the narrator most probably thought of the delta because this was the widest fertile stretch on the Nile, most accessible to the foreigners settled in Egypt, and best known by the Asiatic neighbours.

2. The word *kem* (NG) and in later writing *kam* (GM) (Er.-Gr. 174) is generally identified with Semitic *דְּוֹר* ‘vineyard’ (cf. Erman, Gramm., § 103; Seeth., Fehr., § 227). As, however, the old form during the Old and Middle Kingdoms is *kem*, it might be compared with the Sumerian-akkadian *gim, șim, gamin tum ‘field, garden’ with which the Hebrew *ג* is identical (cf. Landes, Sem., Sprachtum im AT, p. 41), *kem* could be explained as a later form of *kum*, especially as *kem* seems to point more to ‘garden’ than to ‘vineyard’, as can be seen from the use of *kem* or later: *kam*, for ‘gardener’. Whether it is genuinely Egyptian or whether it was borrowed very early from Akkadian or another Semitic language, is an open question. On the other hand it would not be impossible to consider *kam* and *kem* as different stems, so that the old *kem* might be related with *ר* and the later *kam* borrowed from *דָּוֹר*. This could be supported by the fact that *kam* only appears for vineyard after the New Kingdom, at a time when Semitic words in particularly large numbers found their way into Egypt. But whatever may be the origin of *kum* or *kem*, for us it is as any rate of importance that the Egyptians had a garden in the nether world and that they called this garden *kem ntr* ‘Garden of God’.

AND THE FALL OF MAN

rivers Tigris and Euphrates, flowed *through Paradise itself*, and in any case belonged to Paradise. This made it impossible to obtain a clear idea of the geographical situation of Paradise, whatever view was taken of the names of the two first rivers and wherever they were localized, because in no case could the confluence of all these four streams in one place be explained. On the one hand assert could not be given to Mesopotamia being the home of Paradise as the other two rivers flow through lands which are far removed from Mesopotamia, namely Kish, which in the Bible means exclusively Nubia or Ethiopia, and Haufla, which according to Gen. 10, 6, 7 lay near Kish, but according to 10, 29 somewhere in Arabia; nor, on the other hand, is it possible to take Egypt, Ethiopia or Arabia as the home of Paradise, because then the two streams of Mesopotamia would not fit in.

We do not propose to enter here into a discussion on the various attempts made to arrive at a solution, which differ very widely in their results, nor into the many complicated and confusing questions arising from them.4 We prefer to go straight to the point and examine first whether on the basis of the text itself it is correct to regard all the four rivers as flowing through Paradise; then to endeavour to determine the probable position of Paradise in the light of the conceptions the Egyptians had of how the earth was shaped and how it was connected with the heaven and nether world; and finally to give an explanation of the names Pithon and Gihon, and establish their identification.

At the outset, it must be pointed out that in Gen. 2, 10 ff. there is not the slightest support for the assumption that the four rivers flowed *through Paradise*; nay, it is expressly stated that ‘one river went out from Eden to water the Garden’. It was therefore exclusively this one river, having its source in Eden, i.e. in the oasis, that flowed through Paradise, and the four rivers mentioned immediately afterwards have actually nothing to do with Paradise itself. The whole passage 2, 10–14 though belonging to the story itself has so far the character of a gloss in that it does not refer to Paradise itself, but to the relation of the four rivers to this one river of Paradise. Indeed, many critics have already a clear inking that by this passage the flow of the narrative is interrupted and that accordingly it must have been inserted here from another version of the Paradise story; but in spite of all this it is connected by them with Paradise itself and they assume that the four rivers do actually belong to Paradise. In reality the verses 10–14 give no description whatever of Paradise as such,
nor is the area of the four rivers conceived as within Paradise itself. As we shall presently see, all that this passage sought to convey was that the one Paradise river gave origin to the four greatest world rivers, and that Paradise was the source of fertility and prosperity for the whole earth.

Let us repeat that this passage does not speak of the four rivers as Paradise rivers, but as wholly independent of Paradise and separated from it; let us further maintain that this passage need not necessarily emanate from another version inserted by another and later hand, but might quite well have originated from the author of our Paradise story. He diverges only for a moment from the description proper of Paradise, which he resumes in verse 15, merely in order to link the reference to the one river 'which went out of the oasis', with information as to the origin of the four rivers. In the words: 'and God took Adam and put him into the garden' (verse 15), one may indeed discern an indication of the fact that 10–14 emanates from the same author, as the manner in which he repeats the second part of verse 8 'and he put there the man whom he had formed', points to the fact that he was conscious of the interruption and by this repetition sought to resume the dropped threads. But this latter point is not of such significance that we need linger further thereon. Of far greater importance is it that by regarding verses 10–14, as subsidiary information about the four rivers and not about Paradise itself, the way is made free to investigate the position of Paradise in the light of Egyptian conceptions. The whole question now acquires a completely new aspect; the identification of Pšn and Ḡnb is thereby considerably facilitated; and consequently also the closer delimitation of Hw-lib and Kš is rendered possible.

We begin with the attempt to determine the position of Paradise and take as the starting point of our discussion the expression ḫpbl (Gen. 2, 8), whereby the position and direction of the 'garden' in the oasis are indicated. It is well known that ḫpbl literally means 'in front', and that its use for 'East' is derived from the orientation of the spectator towards the sunrise, so that everything which lies to the East is 'in front' of him, whilst ḫpbl 'the back' designates the opposite direction as everything which lies in the west is at his 'back'. The words ḫpbl ḫpbl (verse 8) 'in the oasis, at the front', can only mean 'at the eastern end of the oasis'.

1 Similarly the Egyptians also used 'in front' (ḫety) and 'behind' (ḫety) for 'southwards' or 'northwards' respectively, because they took their orientation towards the course of the Nile, upstream being southwards and downstream being northwards. That, however, ḫety 'the previous one, the earlier one' (so also ḫntr 'earlier', Er.-Gr. 129) was originally connected with the idea of 'east' will be shown elsewhere.

1 We have already observed above, p. 124 that, like the earth, the nether world also was arched over with a heaven. It was, therefore, only logical to fix the beginning of the nether world at the point where the two heavens met. Herein we may find the very origin of the idea that 'heaven' and 'nether world' with 'paradise' were identical. The western horizon was simply regarded as the point from the earth to heaven, and to the nether world with the paradise. The question whether the Egyptians did not conceive the earth as hemispheric so that heaven and earth were connected with one another as two hemispheres forming together one sphere, does not belong here and it is also very improbable. In any case they conceived the surface of the earth as hollow and not as vaulted. This is shown by the hieroglyphic sign gb t 'the horizon', the sun being represented in its course between the two extreme high-points at both ends of the earth. Accordingly they must have conceived the centre of the earth, which is the deepest point of the trough, and the zenith, which is the highest point in the vault of heaven, as the two opposing points.
QUITE CORRECT WHEN IT SAYS IN GEN. 3, 24 THAT THE CHERUBIM AND THE 'GLITTERING SWORD' WERE PLACED יד הגר 'TO THE FRONT OF THE GARDEN OF EDEN', I.E. ON THE EAST SIDE OF IT, IN ORDER TO GUARD THE WAY TO THE 'TREE OF LIFE', AS IT IS OBIOSIVE THAT THE ENTRANCE TO THE GARDEN LAY ON THE EASTERN END OF THE OASIS, ON THE BORDER BETWEEN THE 'RED EARTH' AND THE GARDEN.

4. The River of Paradise and the Four Rivers

Let us now return to the four rivers. As already stated, the text of the Paradise narrative does not say a single word which suggests that the four rivers were in Paradise, but expressly speaks of one stream only flowing through Paradise, 'to water the garden'. The four rivers thus cannot belong to the area of Paradise itself, and the words, Gen 2, 10: לא יבר עייל נèles again cannot mean that the division of this one river into four was effected within the area of Paradise itself, but something quite different.

In order to make this clear, we have to examine the actual meaning of the expressions רֵאָב and פֶלֶס. In the first place רֵאָב never means to divide, but to separate, cf. Gen 13, 9, 11, 14, 25, 34; also even when it is used of a crowd, e.g. Deut. 32, 8 קָנָה נאצְכֵי does not mean 'divided' but 'when He separated men from one another'; the same is the case Gen. 10, 5 and 32, where it can only mean that the peoples became separated off in individual units (נ. צ' v. 18 and המה v. 32), as here it is intended to emphasize their character as single integral units separated from the others.

The difference between 'separate' and 'divide' is that separation comprises division, but division does not postulate separation: further that division involves splitting into fractions, while separation is applicable to individual units. In separation there is the additional factor of actually completed spatial disjunction. Finally, passages like 2 Sam. 1, 23 and Ruth 1, 17 leave no doubt as to the meaning 'separate' for רֵאָב.

As far as הפֶלֶס 'heads' is concerned, it has been frequently pointed out that it can hardly denote 'head streams' because, on the assumption that they went forth from one river, they ought to be described rather as subsidiary or secondary rivers. Moreover, הפֶלֶס could not mean 'beginnings' in the sense of the bifurcation or diversion of the rivers, as in this case also they could not possibly be called 'heads'.

In reality הפֶלֶס is used here for 'origin' or 'source' of the rivers. As a
matter of fact this meaning has already been suggested, as in Akkadian
ref 'enî, literally 'head of the spring', denotes the source and origin of
the spring. 1 But taking רָבָּה erroneously to mean 'divide', it is not possible
to form a clear idea of how one stream could be divided into four prime
sources. For should such a division of a river into others be meant, the
latter could only be described as branches, and not original sources. This
difficulty, however, disappears on accepting the real meaning of רָבָּה as
'separate'. The meaning of רָבָּה is simply that the one stream on
leaving the garden was severed from it, i.e. that it there ceased to continue
flowing, so that no visible connexion remained between the garden and the
rest of the earth. The narrator who conceived the whole earth, נָרָבָּה, with
the exception of the oasis, נָרָבָּה, as a wilderness, so visualized the disappearance
of the stream, that, on reaching the sandy soil beyond the oasis, it gradually
vanished, being swallowed up by the earth, but that it continued its course
underground. Thereby the conception of the common origin in this one
stream of the four rivers, widely separated from one another, was rendered
possible: under the earth, far away from the spot where the Paradise river
disappeared, its waters flowed in various directions until it reached the sites
where the sources lay from which the four rivers emerged and took their
course on the surface of the earth. The narrator, in referring to נָרָבָּה, had
in mind four prime sources located in different parts of the world far removed from one another.

That is the meaning of our passage, and it could not be more clearly
expressed when correctly rendered, viz.: 2 'A river went forth from the
oasis to water the garden נָרָבָּה, נָרָבָּה, נָרָבָּה, נָרָבָּה, and thence it was
severed and became four head springs', i.e. that there was only one stream
springing from the oasis and flowing through the garden, and that this one
river, on leaving the oasis, ceased to flow on the surface, but continued its
course subterraneously, its waters supplying the sources of the four rivers.

This interpretation, based on purely philological grounds, is illustrated
in most startling fashion by the conceptions which the Egyptians had of
the origin of the Nile in the nether world, and its sources on the earth's
surface. According to these, it had its origin in a river נָרָבָּה in heaven or

1 Cf. e.g. B. Salzmaner, col. 103. 'At the spring-head of the Tigris ina rēf (nārî) enî ša
diḥlat (i.e. at the spot where it springs) I made a statue of my majesty', Del. WB. p.76b
and 605b. In exactly the same way also the Arabic لَا رَسُلُ الْمَعَالِم = لَا رَسُلُ الْمَعَالِم
'head of the spring'; لَا رَسُلُ الْمَعَالِم 'head of the river'; لَا رَسُلُ الْمَعَالِم
'head of the torrent' means the 'origin'. Similarly in the passage quoted by Del. Paradise, p. 98, rēf nārî 'head of the river', denotes
the beginning, not the point of exit of the river from another. Thus it was not a 'branch'
that was in mind but the spot where the river rises.

2 According to ancient Babylonian, and perhaps even Sumerian conception, the Euphrates
and the Tigris similarly, took their rise in the habitations of the gods, whence, through
subterranean springs, they reached the surface of the earth (cf. inter alia Albright AJS.,
15, 22 ff.). Here also, as generally in the Paradise story, it is Egyptian and not Babylonian
which furnishes us with the exact parallels for the explanation of individual features.

3 Cf. Laranzo, Diccionario, pl. 189, 3 (inter alia reproduced also by Budge, The Nile, p. 89).
Moreover in the mythological texts these fountain holes of the Nile are very often referred
to, and as early as in the Pyr. texts. With particular frequency it is emphasized that the
dead refresh themselves at the cold, clear water (ḥh. ḫw.) of the two fountain holes or that they
are purified with this holy water. According to Tob., chap. 146 it was considered a
privilege of the dead that Sim, at the thirteenth gate of the nether world, spread out her arms
to let them behold the Nile in its concealment, i.e. as it flowed from her breasts. As may
be seen there from the attached vignette, this concealed spot near Elephantine, i.e. the two
fountain holes, was in mind. Cf. inter alia Eran, Religion, p. 9; Leid., Amon Hymns,
E 600, 1; Wiedemann, Hérodot, p. 115, and das Alte Ägypten, p. 11. The two springs
of Elephantine (ḥh. ḫh.) were literally proverbial for overflowing waters, cf. e.g. L.D. iii b 61.
(= Records, iii, § 172).
came to the surface. He went even further in his wider vision: whereas moreover the Egyptians and Babylonians, from a thoroughly particularistic point of view, regarded only their river as 'heavenly', without giving any thought to the origin of the rivers of other lands, the Hebrew narrator, in conformity with his monotheistic ideas, displays a universalistic conception of the world panorama: in conscious opposition to all exclusively local polytheistic tendencies, for him all the great rivers of the world, without giving preference to any particular land, originated from the one stream of Paradise. In addition he may have been governed by the intention of demolishing the divine character given by the Babylonians to their rivers, and with which, to a much higher degree, the Egyptians invested their Nile.

5. Pišôn and Gihôn

(a) Which Rivers were meant?

In view of the foregoing suggestion that the four rivers were not within the area of Paradise, the identification of Pišôn and Gihôn, and indeed the whole question of the situation of the four rivers, became irrelevant for the location of Paradise itself. For our conception of Paradise it is a matter of indifference what rivers are meant by Pišôn and Gihôn and in what countries they should be sought, just as it is quite immaterial where the Tigris and Euphrates took their rise and in what lands they flowed. Nevertheless we propose to take up this question because it is actually in

1 A like phenomenon was actually observed in antiquity, and is especially frequent in calcareous areas in various parts of the world where large rivers are sucked into subterranean cleavages of the chalky soil and suddenly disappear from the surface, only to reappear a considerable distance away. These continuations were always regarded as distinct rivers and nowadays, even in European countries, are so considered by the local population. Similar phenomena are furnished by the rich waters of the oases which, on quitting the fertile area, gradually disappear into the sand. Likewise most of the winter brooks (tib) in the Arabian desert, which sometimes swell to considerable proportions that they resemble large rivers, run for considerable distances till they gradually dry up. It should be observed that even Greek authors had similar conceptions of a subterranean course of the Nile, notably in its upper portions where they sought in sources. They believed inter alia that the Indus was an upper reach of the Nile and connected with it subterraneously. The same was later believed by the Arabic geographers of the Niger. Even in the late Middle Ages the general opinion, following Africam, was that the Nile, on tumbling down from the Mountain of the Moon (below the Equator), penetrated beneath the earth to reappear on the surface after a considerable distance as a river! Cf. in greater detail Th. Langennais, Alte Kenotmis und Kartographie der Zentralafrik. Sorgenl. (1916), p. 43 ff., 39 f., 48 f., etc.

1 This is obvious from the fact that he did not also include the Jordan, the chief stream of the land sanctified by the God of Israel as did e.g. Ben Siras, 24, 25, who, besides the Paradise rivers, also mentioned the Jordan.

consequence of the view that we have put forward that we are in a position to approach a solution of the problem, basing ourselves purely on Biblical data.

First of all the question should be raised: what was the underlying idea of the narrator in mentioning the four rivers? Now the fact that of all the then known rivers outside Egypt only the largest and best known, the Tigris and the Euphrates, are mentioned, justifies the assumption that in his choice he had in mind the greatest world rivers then known. If, then, the reason for referring to the Tigris and the Euphrates was only because they were the largest streams of Assur and Babel, the mention of Pišôn and Gihôn would have similarly been for the reason that they were the most important in the lands of Havilâ and Kûs. Hence it must be assumed that he intentionally selected four rivers of different parts of the earth, situated at opposite ends of the world, so that in their compass the whole of the then known world would be comprised. The whole question of the four rivers is thus transferred on to new ground: they do not represent an irrigation system of Paradise, but are conceived as the I. subst. system of the whole world.

Now what rivers were meant by Pišôn and Gihôn? Starting from the foregoing standpoint and considering that the Euphrates and Tigris lay in the extreme east of the then known world, one cannot go far wrong in assuming that it was the author's aim to set against the Mesopotamian pair of rivers another pair at the opposite end of the world, viz. in the extreme west. This assumption is confirmed first of all by the statement that the

1 Even the ancients were governed by the idea that the four rivers were world streams, and sought to identify them with the rivers known in their day as the most important. Thus e.g. in Josephus's time (Antiquitates, i, § 58 f.) the Pišôn was identified with the Ganges or Indus, and the Gihôn with the Nile. In later times this idea that the Paradise rivers were world-streams, though in itself correct, was rejected because in the absence of a right understanding of Gen. 2, 10 it only made the Paradise problem more complicated. To evade this difficulty the Pišôn and Gihôn were sought in Mesopotamian rivers, and so long ago as 1706 Reland, De situs Parad., identified the Pišôn with the Phasis and the Gihôn with the Araxes in Armenia (cf. Midrasch gen. rab., § 16, 16 where the Gihôn is placed in Media). Although Reland, and after him Delitzsch and others, contrived on purely phonetic grounds to interpret Kûs as the land of the Kosseans, all attempts failed to identify Havilâ as a Mesopotamian land. A very convenient way out of all difficulties is taken by supporters of the Astral-mythological hypothesis of Genesis (like Jeness, Gunzel, Jeremias, etc.), who assume a Cosmic Paradise, and even derive the whole Paradise story from a sort of uranography, seeing in the main Paradise river the Milky Way, and detecting in the remaining rivers some other fantastic astronomical things.

2 This would also agree with the orientation of the author of the Paradise story from the extreme west to the east (Zip) and would also explain why he first mentioned the Pišôn and Gihôn in the west and then the Tigris and Euphrates in the east.
Gilbón flowed through Kūš, which in the Bible invariably denotes Nubia or Ethiopia, and which, according to the geographical conception of those days, actually lay at the extreme western end of the world. If one further considers that the two Mesopotamian rivers flow near to one another, framing, so to speak, the eastern part of the world, one may assume that similarly in the choice of the opposite pair of rivers, Pišôn and Gilbón, the idea was dominant that they, too, flowed near to one another and delimited the extreme western part of the earth. Pišôn would thus first have to be sought in the same area as Gilbón, and secondly both would have to be looked for in Egypt and its neighbourhood, so that in analogy to the Euphrates and Tigris, they would represent the two most important and best known rivers of that region.

Another very important question here arises: assuming our premises to be correct, viz., that the narrator had in mind the most important world rivers, and assuming the correctness of our view that Pišôn and Gilbón are to be sought in the area of Egypt and its neighbourhood, then it is obvious that among the four rivers one would expect to find in the very first place the greatest, and at all times most celebrated of all rivers, the Nile, and this especially with an author whose orientation was so thoroughly Egyptian. Where then is the Nile?

If we recall that according to Egyptian ideas the Fields of the Blessed, the Egyptian Paradise, were encircled by a 'stream' (ītrēs), that went forth from heaven, and in a mysterious way emerged on the earth through the two fountain holes at Elephantine (cf. above, p. 169); further, that at the beginning of the Paradise story Gen. 2, 10 reference is made to a 'stream' (ʿrū) 'that went forth from the oasis to water the garden', we must be struck by the analogy. Indeed, the more closely one examines the picture of Paradise, composed of this and other similar features, the more will one be confirmed in the view that ʿrū and ītēs are identical. There is only a difference in the conception of the stream's provenance: viz., the ītēs does not, as observed, take its source from heaven or from the nether

1 From Greek times Ethiopia was understood to be the southern portion of Egypt on the Nile up-stream between the Nubian desert and the Arabian Gulf, that is, the whole of present-day Nubia and Abyshinia, including Kordofan and Darfur. Even Homer, Od. 1, 23-4, conceived the Ethiopians as 'the farthest of men who lived divided, some towards the setting, others towards the rising of the sun'. Also Is. 18, 1 speaks of the land 'beyond the rivers of Kūš' as the most distant land of the world. Among these rivers he had in mind the Nile beyond Kūš and the Atbara, perhaps also the Blue Nile. Again in the Book of Esther 1, 1 Kūš is interpreted as Ethiopia, because in ancient times it was regarded as the extreme southern boundary of the world. Many other examples could be quoted from antiquity.
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world, which for the Egyptians was the same, but from the Paradise oasis, to feed by its subterranean course the greatest rivers of the earth. Assuming then that the Eden stream ʿrū replaces the ītrēs of the Fields of the Blessed, the identification implicitly involves the idea that the rivers which went forth from the ītrēs perforsed included the Nile; and the question only remains whether it is to be sought in Pišôn or Gilbón. Before proceeding to answer this special question however, we propose first to discuss the general question, what rivers could have been meant by Pišôn and Gilbón if it is correct that they represented the most important rivers at the western end of the earth, in other words Egypt and its adjacent territories; and secondly, whether the Egyptians regarded the whole Nile as only one river.

The possibility of the Blue or the White Nile having been meant by Pišôn and Gilbón respectively, must be summarily dismissed first of all, because they both, as we shall presently see, lie far from Kūš, and secondly because neither of them flows through a gold land. Nor can the River Atbara come into the picture because it lies far from the border of Kūš proper, and, just as little as the others goes through a gold territory, as there were no gold mines in the watershed of the Atbara and those known far below the Atbara lay in a northerly direction. If these three rivers are to be eliminated from our discussion, only the Nile proper remains to be considered and we are brought back to the narrower question as to whether the Nile is to be sought in Pišôn or Gilbón. To answer this, we must first determine how far southwards the ancient Egyptians followed the Nile, and whether the whole of the river they knew or only one portion thereof was designated by them as the river of Egypt.

From all that we can conclude from Egyptian monuments and writings, the Egyptians in the oldest period of their history did not follow the course of the Nile further than to the first cataract between Elephantine and Philae, near Assuan. At this point their dominion ceased for them, and there they saw the beginning of the world which for them was identical with their land. Of all the regions beyond they had no clear idea, and it was for this reason that they very early formed the view that the Nile took its rise at the first cataract. Thus only that portion of the Nile which started at Assuan and flowed into the Mediterranean Sea was considered by them as the river

1 Cf. above, p. 165, n. 1. In the Aton-Hymn, l. 22 the Nile (ʾtēēpy) flows from heaven to earth, and in l. 23, it comes from the nether world to Egypt. It should be noted that in the Hebrew the Paradise river is not designated by name, but is called simply ʿrū 'stream' just as the 'stream' of the 'fields of the blessed' was called ītrēs 'stream'.
of Egypt. They clung firmly to this view, even after they had gone beyond the first cataract under the 4th dynasty and had become acquainted with a considerable portion of the Nile lying to the south. So little did they recognize that that newly explored portion was the upper reach of their river, that they regarded it actually as a quite different and separate river. In this view they were confirmed by the phenomenon that the Nile at the border of the cataract south of Elephantine for a fairly long distance seems to flow in a reverse direction up-stream. This, as many think, is due to the peculiar character of the river-bed and especially the extraordinarily strong currents and rapid surging in various directions, so that it is impossible to detect the real course of the river flow. (Cf. Inter alia Ed. Meyer-Dümmichen, Gesch. d. Alt. Äg., p. 3.) That conception of the river of Egypt remained deeply-rooted among the Egyptians even in much later times, when, under the rule of Queen Hatshepsut at the end of the sixteenth century B.C., they had penetrated as far as the sixth cataract and probably beyond. Indeed, even as late as the fifth century B.C., when the regions of the Blue and White Nile above the sixth cataract had begun to be explored, and had already been recognized as the upper reaches of the Nile, and it became clear that the river of Egypt did not begin at Assuan, Egyptian theology still did not give up the old theory of the Nile beginning at Assuan and of the portion flowing south of Elephantine being a quite different river.1

Most important for us is the fact that precisely during the period of the New Kingdom, which is primarily German to our investigation, the separation of these two portions of the Nile into two different rivers was still completely maintained. This was particularly the case as Nubia or K Âš was regarded as a land much inferior to Egypt, since the Egyptian was so convinced of the holiness of his land and the divine origin of the heaven-produced Nile, that he would not tolerate placing the 'wretched K Âš (k ÂŠ Âš) or the other 'wretched lands of the Blacks (nh Âš Âš)' on a level with his own country.2

1 Cf. Herod., ii, 21 and 23—the details given him by the 'scribe to the holy treasury of Athens'. viz. 'There were two mountains with sharply pointed summits lying between the town of Syene in Thebais and Elephantine, and these mountains were called Krophi and Mophi. The sources of the Nile were deep abysses and flowed from out the middle of these mountains, and half of the water flowed towards the north, to Egypt, and the other half to the south, to Ethiopia'. The supposition that in Krophi lurks ñ Âš Âš Âš 'source of the ñ Âš Âš', i.e. Nile, and in Mophi ñ Âš Âš Âš 'water of the ñ Âš Âš' was put forward by Laart and adopted by Brugsch, Maspero and others. This seems to be the right interpretation, although Wiedemann in his commentary, ad loc. (p. 116), expresses doubt. Here ñ Âš Âš is to be taken as feminine ñ Âš Âš with lapse of the feminine ending 1 or its softening to an ñ Âš Âš, which was very common.

2 It seems that with nh Âš Âš 'blacks' the blacks of other districts also have been denoted.
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This differentiation between Egypt and Nubia was maintained even after a millennium of Egyptian domination, when Nubia had been completely penetrated by Egyptian religion, Egyptian culture, and Egyptian customs.

It is clear that from the very beginning the Egyptian held fast to the idea of the holiness of his land and his river, and that the conviction was rooted in him that the boundaries of Egypt and the source of that portion of the Nile which he regarded as the real river of Egypt lay at the first cataract. All that lay beyond was foreign, barbarian, unholy, and the stream that flowed there was also quite different from the sacred river of Egypt.

Proceeding from these facts we now enter into the discussion concerning Pih Âš and Gib Âš, restricting ourselves first to the description of their course given in the Genesis text. In the case of the Gib Âš this task is greatly simplified by the mention of K Âš, 2, 13, whereby we are left in no doubt as to its course. It is necessary, however, to fix as accurately as possible the geographical determination of K Âš and its boundaries, so as to be able to define the position and reach of the Gib Âš with all possible precision. In the case of the Pih Âš, however, the matter is not so easy, as we are in the dark concerning the land Haw Âš ì, but as an important clue is given in its description as a gold land, we have to consider, in attempting an identification of Haw Âš ì, which of the gold lands known in the middle of the second millennium B.C. could have been in mind.

(b) The Land of K Âš.

As far as the geographical delimitation of K Âš is concerned it cannot be determined according to the Biblical conception of it held in the days of the kings of Israel, about the ninth or eighth century B.C. (cf. below, p. 177 note 2), but only by the way it was understood in Egypt of the New Kingdom before the period of the Exodus, about the fourteenth or thirteenth century B.C. Only then shall we be able to fix as nearly as possible the point which the Egyptians, the rulers of K Âš, regarded at that time as its extreme thus e.g. of Pun, Erman-Rahe, 60a, n. 8. By the way, it is noteworthy that both the Egyptian words ñ Âš Âš and nh Âš Âš are still preserved in the Arabic of present-day Egypt as scurrilous words of abuse: ñ Âš Âš (û Âš) or ñ Âš Âš (û Âš) is an exclamation of deepest contempt and repulsion, generally punctuated with expectation; nh Âš Âš (û Âš) means 'Wretched! Good-for-nothing!', and in many districts, e.g. Yemen, it is used in the sense of 'Unlucky dog' for everything unfortunate. Moreover nh Âš Âš is also used as an adjective in the meaning of 'false' or 'inferior', e.g. ghâhab nh Âš Âš 'false or inferior gold'. Like others, these Egyptian borrowings passed into the Arabic vernacular of Egypt from the Coptic, and thence spread to other Arabic dialects.
southern boundary. As a matter of fact, the Egyptian monuments give us on this point adequate information, and furnish us with a graphic picture of Kūš, which was closely connected with Egypt during a history extending over two thousand years. Already under the twelfth dynasty we hear of Egyptian inroads into the territory of Wawat in Northern Nubia (Erman-Ranke, p. 595), and it is said of Sesostris I that he forced a way further south, 'to the very end of the earth', in order to obtain access to the gold lands of southern Nubia, the land of the 'wretched Kūš'. Nevertheless, he was only able to assert himself in the Wawat region, between the first and second cataracts. It was his great-grandson Sesostris III who succeeded in extending the boundary of Egyptian domination in Kūš 'much further than his fathers', viz. up to Semneh near the second cataract. Later, at the beginning of the New Kingdom, after Thutmose I had succeeded in pushing forward to the fourth cataract, carrying out the complete subjection of Kūš, and destroying the last remnants of its independence obtained during the Hyksos rule, Kūš appears as an Egyptian province, remaining from then onwards for more than five centuries completely under Egyptian rule (Erman-Ranke, p. 45); nevertheless it was not incorporated with Egypt itself, but was always represented as a separate land with its own administration, under its own governor, who bore the title 'Prince of Kūš (n [newt n kūš)', also 'Overseer of the Southern Lands' or of 'The Gold Lands'; in many cases he was of royal blood, sometimes the Crown Prince himself.

While the Egyptians maintained relations with the peoples and countries beyond the fourth cataract in order to ensure the road of the gold mines at the sixth cataract, their rule in no case extended beyond the fourth cataract. The region of Napata, the home of the later Ethiopian dynasties, about 437 miles south of Assuan, near the present Gebel Barkal, remained, even after the New Kingdom, the southernmost border of the Egyptian Domination. When, moreover, it is considered that Thutmose I took no less than two months to go from Thebes to Napata, one obtains some idea of the conception held concerning the distances between Egypt and the 'southern lands'. Indeed, on the occasion of the solemn installation of Haya as Viceroy under Tut-Ankh-Amon, it is expressly stated that his rule

1 That the Egyptians in later times pronounced ḫ as ḫūf is certain. Whether the pronunciation believed to have been current in the New Kingdom, ḫūt or ḫūt (cf. Erman-Ranke, p. 595, n. 2) reproduces the old Egyptian pronunciation is an open question.


3 Under Hatshepsut and her immediate successors, the Egyptian armies may actually have penetrated to the Blue Nile, but hardly much beyond. Cf. above, p. 174.
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extended from the town of Nekhen (the present El-Kab near Edfu) to the land of Ker, i.e. Napata (Erman-Ranke, p. 598). By all this the fact is established that during the New Kingdom Kūš proper never went beyond the fourth cataract. Even if we assume a larger Kūš in the fullest sense, i.e. including the so-called 'negro lands', it could hardly have gone, before the end of the New Kingdom, as far as the later seat of the Ethiopic kingdom in the Meroe Island, between Atbara and the sixth cataract, the present Khartoum. It is not even certain that the Egyptians followed the course of the Atbara beyond its junction with the Nile, any more than that they can have known the region of the Blue and White Nile much beyond the point of their confluence, where they fall into the Nile proper. It was only in Cretan times that their connexion as upper reaches of the Nile was recognized.1

From all this it results incontestably—and on this indeed there is little disagreement among investigators—that when, in the Egyptian of the New Kingdom, reference was made to Kūš in a general way, the Nile region between the first and the fourth cataract alone was meant. Whatever lay beyond did not belong to Kūš proper but was referred to in a more general way as 'Southern lands', 'Lands of the Blacks (nbiywy)', or 'negro lands', over which the 'Prince of Kūš', exercises a certain control, but can hardly have ruled very effectively.2

It follows that the Gihon, described in Gen. 2, 13 as 'going round the whole land of Kūš', can be no other than the Nubian Nile, i.e. that portion of the Nile which compasses the region that, as we have shown, is identical with Kūš proper. The emphasis on the 'whole land of Kūš' indicates the author's desire to determine exactly the length of the river covering the entire extent of the Kūš of his time, namely southern and northern Nubia, beginning at the first cataract. Even if one were disposed to apply 'the whole to Southern Nubia beyond the fourth cataract which then marked the southern boundary of Kūš, such an assumption must be discarded because the author was certainly more concerned to include in 'the whole land of Kūš' the region of Wawat, between the first and second cataract, than the 'southern lands' beyond the fourth cataract, as, for his purpose, the

1 It is not until Roman times that we hear of the so-called Mountain of the Moon beyond the Equator as source of the Nile. In Abraham b. Ezra's Commentary on Gen. 2, 11 the text has erroneously מְדִינָה instead of מְדִינָה.

2 Judging from Is. 18, 1 and other Biblical passages and data from later times, it was only in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. that Kūš was conceived to extend further than in the New Kingdom. By נֵבֶר the many rivers of the Atbara region, and perhaps also of that of the Blue Nile, were understood. Under the Ethiopic dynasties the whole territory from the fourth to the sixth cataract was actually under Egyptian rule.
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Now which land could the author have had in mind? To answer this question let us turn to the gold-producing lands exploited by the Egyptians. In this connexion, of the best known gold-mining districts the following three come under consideration:

1. The very rich gold mines of Nubia (nb n kfr) in the region now occupied by the Bisharin Bedouin tribes, i.e. in the desert east of Dér-er-Nil and Wadi Hâlâf, in a southern direction towards the Red Sea, roughly as far as Port Sudan. A description of this region is contained in a well inscription of Rameses II (Kubban-Stela) from which we learn, inter alia, that that district formed part of Kûs, as the 'Prince of the wretched Kûs' appears therein as intelligence and reporter (Records III par. 280).

This mining district cannot have been meant, as it belonged to Kûs, the area of the Gihön. Moreover, as far as I can ascertain, neither malachite nor emerald was found there.

2. The gold mines of Punt (punt), a land far distant from Egypt. As to its situation only vague particulars are available. It is fairly generally assumed, that it lay on the tropical shores of the Red Sea, extending from Erythrea down to Somaliland, but in all probability it is to be sought on the south-west coast of Arabia. Besides gold and copper, various sorts of other minerals and valuables, fragrant spices, and especially incense, were imported from Punt. Already in the Old Kingdom, under Cheops, Punt is mentioned as a land of incense, and is referred to again under Sahure and his descendants of the 5th and 6th dynasties (Erman-Ranke p. 602). In place after gold in the enumeration of precious metals (cf. Erman-Ranke, p. 554, n. 3 ff.). Only seldom is silver mentioned in later writings, e.g. Pap. D'Omb. (from the end of the thirteenth century, B.C.) xiv, 8 and xv, 5, before gold (by rh), but this, in my opinion, is an indication of the much earlier origin of the story.

3. Erman-Ranke, 600 and the passage cited in n. 3 from Sethi, Uth. 1; in Albright, AJSL., 39, 20.1, Erman-Ranke, 610 below, East Arabia not South Arabia is meant; in both cases, however, there is a conflict with p. 600,

4. The identification with the Somali coast is rendered impossible by the description of Punt as a land of 'steps' or 'terraces' i.e. mountainous country, which does not fit Somali, but can very well apply to Yemen and the adjoining territories towards the Indian Ocean. As I gather from Prof. J. J. Hess (Zurich), he has very weighty reasons in favour of this assumption. Of great value is the fact he has established that in Southern Arabia the best kind of incense is called 'tneh. Hence he rightly concludes that the Egyptian 'frsrs, which has been interpreted as a kind of resin or myrrh (Ap. W.S. I, 208), is identical with this 'tneh from the time when the feminine termination I was still pronounced with tums or the South Arabian tamisnr scil. 'frts' or 'frts'. Like many others, the word 'tneh has since very ancient times been indigenous in Southern Arabia, and must have been taken over by the Egyptians with the product.

5. As the port from which the journey was made to Punt, rfr, on the Red Sea, is mentioned (Erman-Ranke, p. 600), it probably lay in the district of the present Qâqîr. There the ships were built and equipped for the expeditions to Punt and the Land of God (r-nfr), thus
EAGYPTIAN ELEMENTS IN THE PARADISE STORY

the inscriptions of the Temple of Dér-el Bahari there is an extensive account of the expedition sent under Queen Hatshepsut to the 'God-land Punt', (loc. cit., p. 607 f.), wherein villages, plants, and animals, as well as scenes from the life and customs of the inhabitants of that land are depicted in vivid colours. Although Punt was very well known in Egypt, especially during the New Kingdom, when it was no longer, as previously, held to be more or less a fairy land, it cannot have been Hawílúl—nor matter which region may have been under Punt—the Somali coasts, South Arabia, West Arabia, North Arabia, or even East Arabia, because none of these lands has a river of any importance, let alone one which could compare with the Tigris or Euphrates as world river.

In this connexion we must abstain from an attempt to locate another gold land frequently mentioned as 'Land of God' (t-n-ntr) because in our view this name certainly does not refer to a particular country, but as already suggested, is a collective denomination for a whole complex of lands, or, as we think, is applied to different countries having some specific feature in common. Otherwise it would be difficult to explain why it is at one time mentioned in connexion with Punt as a distant country reached by sea, and at another, in connexion with the mountain desert between the Nile and the Red Sea, the district of the Wástí Hamámát quarries. Probably the Sinai Peninsula, too, and perhaps also a portion of North Arabia are likewise comprised under this designation. In all probability the 'Land of God' was first used to denote the eastern side of the Nile, as it was from that direction that the Sun God appeared, and later it was extended to other lands in the east. All this absolves us altogether from including the gold mines of the 'Land of God' within the scope of this investigation.

e.g. at the behest of Sanh-Ka-Re Mentuhotep. As in one passage express mention is made of Byblos ships (ibid. 601), they would have been made from Lebanon wood by Phoenician ship-builders.

1 In the description of the expedition under Rameses III to the 'land of the gods', Punt, (Pap. Harris, 77, 9 ff.), the sea is denoted as (m = (N.D.) šu md t 'the great sea of the inverted water'). Therein Erman, Ägypten, p. 679, n. 1 (and still retained Erman-Ranke, 600, n. 4, cf. above p. 179, n. 1) sees the Persian Gulf, which was conceived as a continuation of the Euphrates which the Egyptians called the 'inverted water' (Šu-šu-šu), because it flows from north to south, i.e. in the opposite direction to the Nile (cf. e.g. I.D., iii. 58 where it is said of the Euphrates (šu šu-šu) 'on which one journeys northwards when one goes upstream'). Nevertheless it is obvious that 'the great sea of the inverted water' refers to the Red Sea which also runs from north to south to enter the ocean. The Egyptians certainly became conscious of the inverted course of the Red Sea much sooner than of the distant Persian Gulf which was hardly known to them.

2 Extensive details concerning the 'land of the gods' are first given under Mentuhotep (11th dynasty). Here, too, the road to the Red Sea is indicated via Wástí Hamámát and the ancient port near Qoqer. Erman-Ranke, p. 600 and 607.

3. The gold mines of the so-called 'Arabian desert' on the Egyptian side, south-east of upper Egypt, between Assuan, Koptos (the present Kuf), and the Red Sea. According to Egyptian monuments this district was one of the richest sources of gold, and from the Redesiyû inscription of Seti I (= Records III § 170 f.) we learn that these gold mines were extraordinarily productive. This district was moreover very famous on account of the extensive Wástí Hamámát quarries, especially because it was there that the black basalt stone for the colossal statues of many kings and gods was hewn. The boundaries of these mines can be exactly determined: in the north is the ancient caravan route of Kene on the Nile to Qoqer on the Red Sea, and in the south is the line that runs in a south-easterly direction from the district of Gebel el-'Allúkí down to the Red Sea. In Pay. Turín from the tomb of Seti I we still possess a fragment of a map drawn shortly after the reign of Rameses II, on which these mining works, the approaches to the pits, and the roads leading to the Red Sea are still quite clearly recognizable.1

It was in this district that the Egyptians, especially in the New Kingdom, had the most important gold mines after Nubia. Of particular significance is the fact that of the principal Egyptian gold fields no less than three, namely Koptos, Edfu, and Ombos, are to be found in this district, and that their names appear as descriptive import-marks for gold, viz. (1) 'Gold of Koptos (nµ n qat), (2) 'Gold of Edfu' (nµ n dju), and (3) 'Gold of Ombos' (nµ n nb). Now all these three places lie on the upper Egyptian Nile, between Kene and the first cataract, and as they were the capitals of the gold mines in their district, they served as river ports for the transport of the 'gold from the mountains'.2 As a matter of fact, in an inscription of the Treasurer and Architect of Thutmose III (Mém. de la miss. fran. v, p. 208) reference is made to a 'Governor of the Gold of the hill lands of Koptos' (mr hjsuwt nh n ght), clearly indicating that Koptos was an important gold-mining centre. There is an additional feature in connexion with these gold districts which, as we shall presently see, specially deserves stressing, viz. that in many passages where reference is made to the gold mines of these districts,

1 Cf. Gardiner, Cairo Scientific Journal, viii, 1914, p. 42 f. where further literature is mentioned. As he convincingly shows, this fragment embraces the gold mines and a portion of the stone quarries near Wástí Hamámát. A reproduction is to be found in Erman-Ranke, p. 557. On the quarries cf. ibid., p. 566 ff. On the gold mines of this district cf. also Reinsier, JEA, vi. 79 ff. See also, Records iii, § 282, and see reference in Note b.

2 Cf. e.g. Med. Habu, Rameses III, Dîm., Hist. Inschr., i. 31; Pap. Harris, 12a, 7; 33a, 5 and 68b, 6 'gold of the mountains' (nµ n br ל); W. M. Müller, Egypt. Res., ii (1910), 88 f.
precisely the gold of the Arabian desert between the Nile and the Red Sea is described as the 'gold of the hill lands' (nḫ ẖf n ḫẖwš)!

For our purpose this gold land is of still deeper interest as it was very rich both in malachite and in emeralds; so much so that apart from the Sinai Peninsula, which for many centuries supplied Egypt with large quantities of malachite, it was the most productive source of this semi-precious stone. We have thus established the fact that the three products which in Gen. 2, 11 f. are described as proper to Haviw, the most valuable, gold and malachite (or emerald), certainly came from the district of the Arabian desert.

As to bdellium (ḇḏl), it is not quite certain what gum is meant, and thus the discussion of the question whether it is identical with a gum indigenous to Upper Egypt must, for the time being, be suspended until a solution is reached, as the question may perhaps be rendered possible by new discoveries. But it should be emphasized that resinous plants are to be found in large quantities on the whole stretch from Esne on the Nile to Assuan and far beyond into the Sudan. This being so there is no reason to doubt that in ancient times also it was the home of these and similar resins, of which bdellium may well have been one. In any case the description of Haviw as a land of 'gold' and malachite or emeralds fits no other 'gold-land' so admirably as this area between the Nile and the Red Sea.

From this assumption it logically follows that Phisnn can only mean that portion of the Nile which circumscribes the gold-land of Upper Egypt, and which, in contradistinction to the Egyptian Nile, which we have seen, conceived to rise at the same spot, at the first cataract, as the Nubian Nile. If it is further remembered (1) that the river (ḫw) going out of Eden is identical with the river (ḏwb) flowing round the Egyptian Paradise (see above, p. 172); (2) that the Phisnn emerges from the subterranean continuation of the ḫw, just as according to Egyptian opinion, the Egyptian Nile was a continuation of the mysterious ḫwb coming to the surface at the first cataract, it will be seen that by two different and independent ways, namely, by the identification of ḫw with ḫwb, and also by the localization of the gold-land Haviw we have succeeded in identifying Phisnn with the Egyptian Nile.

In the Phisnn and Ghishn we have thus the two portions of the Nile which in those days were regarded as two separate rivers; they were then the most important and best known in the western part of the world, just as the two other world rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates, were in the east. The description given of the course of each exactly tallies: Phisnn, the Egyptian Nile is that which 'compasseth the whole land of Haviw where there is gold'; and Ghishn, the Nubian Nile, is that which 'compasseth the whole land of Kūš.' A further point of coincidence with Egyptian data is the remark, Gen. 2, 12, qualifying the gold of Haviw as being 'good' which is confirmed by the Egyptian statement that large quantities extracted from the mines of that district were of 'good gold.' Finally, the choice of these four names (Egypicitum, said to have been obtained from the Dampalm (Hyphaene thebaica Mart.). If this is correct, ḫwb would also be assured as a product of the district we have assumed for Haviw, as the Dampalm is specially characteristic of Upper Egypt.

1 Cl. Albtire, Manual Flora of Egypt, 3, 466 in Albricht I. c. p. 31, and Third Report of the Wellcome Research Laboratories, Khartum, 1906, p. 416 ff. 2 Cl. above, p. 188 f. on the reason why a portion of Upper Egypt is mentioned to denote the course of the Phisnn. 3 Cl. above, p. 182 f. In the so-called Farnese-Stela (Brugsch, Die biblichen sieben Jahre der Hungerzeit, 1851, and Roeder, Urk., 177 ff.) we read a description of the districts lying to the east and west of Elephentane, which is remarkably reminiscent of our passage on Haviw: 'Masses (?) of mountains are in its neighbourhood on the east side with all jewels...
four rivers as the greatest in the world exactly corresponds to the geographical conception entertained in the New Kingdom in Egypt, i.e. about the time of the Hebrew-Egyptian epoch. It was just the time of the great campaigns on the one side to Libya, beyond the oases, and to the southern lands of the ‘black’ as far as the Blue Nile, and on the other side to Palestine and Syria as far as Mesopotamia. These campaigns were already initiated under Thutmose I, but were carried on most effectively and successfully under his successors, especially Seti I and his son Rameses II. In those days the Egyptians believed indeed that they had penetrated on all sides to the extreme ends of the world, as for them in the south-west it ended behind the land of Kush watered by the Nubian Nile, and in the north-east it ended in the land of the ‘two rivers’ (nfrmy), the Euphrates and Tigris.²

The author of the Paradise story, who was doubtless familiar with some reminiscences of the original Mesopotamian home of the patriarchs and had a perfectly accurate knowledge of the course of the Tigris,³ was, as we have seen, thoroughly impregnated with the geographical conceptions of his day in placing one end of the earth in the region of the Pibson and Gibon, and the other in the area of the Euphrates and Tigris.

(d) The Meaning of the Names Pibson and Gibbon.

The identification of Pibson with the Egyptian, and Gibbon with the Nubian Nile so inevitably results from the whole course of our investigations and previous stones, etc. (Stela II. 1 f. = Roed. Ubr., p. 180). In the list given of precious stones and metals from a district above Elephantine (cf. beginning of l. 15 and 16 = Ubr., p. 181) gold and malachite are mentioned and also, l. 30 f. = Ubr., p. 184, ‘Gold, silver, copper, and genuine precious stones’ from the ‘upper territory on the east bank’. It would be interesting if it could be determined whether the reference here is not to the same mines which the Genesis passage envisages. In any case it is highly interesting as a parallel.

1. Cf. inter alia Erman-Ranke, 666 f. and 615; Bredeson-Ranke, Geschichte, 236 f., 257 ff., 336, 339 f.

The fact that they often speak of nfrmy = nfrmy proves that both streams were known to them, although in their inscriptions the Euphrates only is mentioned, because it was on its banks that their battles were fought. Characteristic of the strange impression that they derived from the Euphrates is its designation as ‘the great reversed, inverted (water) of Nahr(ein)’ (st-b or nfrmy because it flows from north to south, in the reverse direction to the Nile. Cf. e.g. Ubr., iv. 613, 9 (Records, ii. § 566 and n. d) 677, 31 Er.-Gr. 55; also above, p. 180, n. 1.

2. ‘The correctness of the delineation of the course of the Tigris by nyn ydn Gen. 2, 14 is only objected to by those who would see in nyn the name of the river Allon. In reality nyn is never applied in the Bible to the town but only to the land Allon. Thus Delitzsch and others have quite correctly interpreted nyn ydn as ‘east of the land Allon’. Cf. commentaries ad loc. This indication is very strong evidence of the accurate orientation of the author, and the interpretation of nyn as referring to the town, ignoring its real meaning in the Bible, only proves the inaccurate orientation of its supporters.

AND THE FALL OF MAN

In the first place it should be pointed out that ‘nyn, which has long since been recognized as the Egyptian bw (the common form since the 18th dynasty from the older brw = Copt. eµp, Er.-Gr. 20) was not a proper name, but just as in Egyptian simply meant ‘river’. Judging by the Coptic, it would also appear that popularly in Egypt bw was not applied to the main stream exclusively, but also to its branches. For eµp denotes a branch of the Nile, whereas the main stream was called iseo (B) or eµp (S.) ‘the great stream’, derived from the Egyptian bw-5 (which in Hebrew would give nyn-kf cf. above p. 50, note 1). This explains the similar use of nyn in the Bible, for the main stream (brw) as for the branch, and of µpy for the Nile canals or branches (e.g. Ez. 30, 1a. Is. 7, 18, 19, f. 37. Ps. 78, 44, etc.). Accordingly, nyn was only the general designation of the Nile itself, as for all its branches, and this is why it could not serve in the Paradise story as a proper name for the Egyptian Nile, any more than it could have been so used in Egyptian itself. As a matter of fact the Egyptians did not use bw (or brw) but µpy, whenever they had the whole river in mind.

If we consider the grammatical form of nyn and µpy, there can be no doubt that they are Hebrew and not foreign words like ḫwn and ḫw, and the question arises whether they were not intentionally coined by the Hebrew author to replace the foreign names. But again the question arises: why did he not call the Egyptian river by its native name, as he did in the case of the two Mesopotamian rivers? What prevented him from retaining the Egyptian name µpy, which to Hebrew ears would not sound more uncommon than e.g. the Babylonian name ḫwn for the Tigris?

But the situation in this case was indeed, essentially, quite different: µpy was not the ordinary every-day profane name of the Nile, but its sacred name, and at the same time applied to the Nile God, regarded as one of the great gods of the earth, placed on an equal level with Re the highest god in Heaven, and, sometimes even placed above him, as the sun could not frustrate the earth without the aid of the Nile. Like the other great god of the earth, Nun (mem), µpy is also the ‘father of the gods’ (lt ntr. w) and like other ‘great gods’ he also is called the ‘creator of all
things; he is also the ‘creator of the good things’, i.e. food, and he is the god ‘that feeds all’ (‘ nb ‘lets live’), like Osiris. He is also the ‘Lord of the Nether world’; he is omnipresent in the nether world, in heaven, and on earth; his origin is not known, for he is ‘of hidden substance, darkness in the day’ (i.e. unseen even in brightest light). Thus ‘iby the river and ‘byy the god were so closely associated that it is a matter of difficulty to determine in every case whether ‘iby means the river or the god. But when it refers quite distinctly to the Nile, it still has a flavour of divinity. Hence ‘byy embodied most sacred conceptions and evoked in his worshipers the deepest religious feelings; the mere mention of him aroused in them adoration and awe; for him they offered and slaughtered ‘oxen and bullocks’, and for him they consigned ‘birds to the flames’, just as to all other gods of Egypt (cf. inter alia Lit. 146 ff.; Ode to the Nile; The Gods II, p. 42 ff.)

In such circumstances it was unthinkable for the monotheistic author of the Paradise story to adopt such a sacerdotal name for a river of Paradise, and determined to replace it by a genuinely Hebrew one, derived from a Hebrew root and expressing the same meaning as the Egyptian name; as a matter of fact ‘iby means ‘the stream over, the flowing over, the up-swelling’ from ‘byy ‘to inundate, to flood’; this is exactly the meaning of ‘ib in formed from ‘w to increase, to grow. ‘iby, therefore, represents an excellent and most adequate equivalent of the Egyptian ‘byy as a name for the Nile, indicates its characteristic of an up-swelling, overflowing river.1

1 Cf. ‘byy ‘inundation’ (Er. Gr., p. 105); the high state of the Nile was referred to as ‘byy ‘the ‘very great inundation’, e.g. Ukh. iv, 217 n.; also ‘byy ur eg. Rec. 50 (1860), 40, Inscription of Amenophis II, l. 6: ‘His sea is full from the great inundation ‘i.e. the high Nile (‘byy ur).’ The old orthography (Pyr. O.E.) has h by in Pyr. 102 d. Cf. Gardiner, AEl. 45 (1909), The Egyptian name of the Nile. In the Semitic transcription of Egyptian names it appears as nsw, cf. Spiegelberg, Nilsche-Festschrift, p. 99.

2 For this form cf. e.g. ‘swr from ‘sr, ‘nh from ‘nh, ‘nh from ‘nh. ‘nh is intensifying forms so that ‘nh means the ‘strong, swelling, up-growing’.

3 The designation of the Nile in the vernacular Arabic of Egypt by babr ( ) furnishes a remarkable parallel to ‘byy. It is a substantive from babru ‘to spring forth, flow, flow over’, and it is still in use, precisely among the Bedouin of the Sinai Peninsula and the Moab region in this ancient meaning. (Cf. e.g. Brunwitzler, in Matth. Petrae, vol. iii, p. 66.) It should be emphasized that in other Arabic countries, as well as in the literary language babr is only applied to the sea, e.g. babr-als-abad ‘the White Sea’ i.e. the Mediterranean; babr-els-shumr ‘the Red Sea’, etc. Only in Egypt it is used of the Nile, and probably thence applied to other large Egyptian rivers, thus e.g. babr-als-abad ‘the White Nile’, babr-els-arnam ‘the Blue Nile’, babr-els-arnam ‘the Black River’ i.e. the Arbaa, etc. It is noteworthy that in Egypt the sea is not called babr, but el-milch ‘the salty’, a designation which is very old. It must have already been used by Phoenicians or Canaanites, and perhaps also by Hebrews, as the word ‘swr lit. ‘the salty’ for ‘seaman, sailor’ (Jonah, i, 1),

AND THE FALL OF MAN

It should be noted that to spring forth, to swell up, to increase were the very expressions with which the Egyptians described the rising of the Nile. They had no idea of the origin of its rise, that it was caused by rains in the far distant mountains, and by the influx of waters from all the numerous large and small tributaries, especially from the Blue and White Nile. They believed as we have seen that the river sprang out of the deep abyss through the fountain holes at Elephantine increasing and swelling by a mysterious process (cf. above, p. 169). This can be substantiated by many passages and numerous poetic references to the rising of the Nile.2

Reverting to Gihôn, nsr, it is, as we have said, a genuine Hebrew formation like Piôn, nsw. Nevertheless in the case of Gihôn the author seems to have had no Egyptian prototype like ‘byy, as the Egyptians, so far as we know, had no special designation for this portion of the Nile, though regarded by them as a separate river. He therefore, seized upon a feature that characteristically differentiates the Nubian from the Egyptian Nile. Whereas, for reasons already stated, the Egyptian Nile was the inundator, the swelling-up (‘byy),3 the Nubian Nile presented another particularly striking phenomenon, namely the mighty cataracts with their tumbling waters, leaping billows, and rushing rapids. It was just this feature which the Hebrew author wished to bring out in coining the name Gihôn for the Nubian Nile, and he therefore selected the root nsr, nr, and formed therewith from this which means ‘the great leaper’ for the Nubian Nile.4

can only be explained by the use of a word for sea formed from ‘sw ‘salt’. It should further be observed that also the Bini Bedouin (southeast of Assuan) use blár (pl. blâres) for river and that they call the Nile nsw blár ‘the sweet river’. J. Haas, Zeitschr. f. Kolonialgespräche 9 (1918-19), p. 211. In nsw we undoubtedly have the Egyptian nfr ‘good’, and it is one of the many Egyptian words that have survived in that district. Cf. above, p. 50, n. 1.

This view was also shared by the Greeks, and as late as 1665 De la Chambre believed that the over-flowing of the Nile was to be explained by a strong fermentation of the soil caused by the great deposits of nitrates! Cf. Wiedemann, Herodotes antiquä Buch, p. 125.

4 Cf. e.g. LD. III. 217 b and the Kötibn-Stella l. i. 11 f. where it is said the water of the ‘byy rises up in the mountains to supply the springs and wells.

5 This appears plausible, as the beginning of the Nile was conceived to be at the two fountain holes of Elephantine. Thus in the Parnine-Stella of the Temple of Khnum at Elephantine I. 20 f. the rise of the Nile and the flood are represented as work of Khnum in the two sources of the Nile. Cf. Brugsch, Die bbl. sieben Jahre der Piérone, or Roeder, Uth., p. 312. At Sihale, between Aswan and Edfu, the beginning of the Nile flood was celebrated from the very earliest times.

6 Cf. TV. Judges 60, 33, ‘to break out of ambush’; in Job 38, 8 it is used of the sea when it sprang forth from the bosom of the earth; in 40, 23 it is used for the ‘leaping’ of the Jordan. As this is generally misunderstood, an exposition of the whole passage is necessary. Here the mighty power of the Nile monster is described, his imperceptibility and the confidence with which he enounces himself under the shadow of the luxuriant plants on the banks
Egyptian Elements in the Paradise Story

We have now to answer the question why Hāwâli was set in place of ṣâma‘. In explanation a religious factor can be adduced while a psychological motive and another of a literary-aesthetic character may have been at work. In describing the Garden of God, the wonderful fayyâb abode of sinless men, the monolithic author must have felt it repugnant to mention the name ᵃⁿᵃⁿ. The remembrance of Egypt filled him with abhorrence and terror. It was for him an impure land, full of idolatrous and moral abominations (ṯḥṯḥ rṯḥ). Moreover ṣâma‘, as the name of Israel’s place of servitude would by no means have been suitable to be used as an element of a story so remote from real and everyday life, and appealing so allureingly and charmingly to the naïve imagination. The intrusion of a name with such evil associations would seriously have impaired the magic spell of the story and deprived it of its whole charm. For all these reasons the author resisted using ṣâma‘ for the region watered by the Pišôn. He preferred to take the name of a district sufficient to identify the river indicated by the name Pišôn but having none of the associations mentioned. So he selected Hāwâli from the whole stretch of the Nile of Upper Egypt and added the reference to its valuable products in order to leave no doubt that it was the gold-land of Upper Egypt that he had in mind. Indeed it almost appears to me—and this I cannot refrain from mentioning—that he only had the Upper Egyptian portion of the Nile in mind, not alone on account of the motives mentioned, but also because it is only in Upper Egypt that the Nile flows as a single main stream, whereas in Lower Egypt, not far from the Upper Egyptian boundary at Fâyyûm, the Biblical Pišôn, it already begins to divide and soon branches off into many bifurcations, each one of these having been regarded by the Egyptians as a separate river, and collectively designated by the Hebrews as ᵃⁿᵃⁿ.1 If I am right, this would furnish us with a further explanation of the evasion of ṣâma‘: the author doubtless, like all the Hebrews of that epoch, must have been of the river. Carelessly he stretches himself and in comfortable quietude enjoys the air and sun in full measure. No sooner does he again crave water than he plunges with open jaws down to the river to swallow it at a gulp. And if the stream does not satisfy him, he need only cast side glances on the Jordan and this would instantly leap from its distant corner straight into his gullet. The passage thus now reads: ‘Behold, he robbeth a river and hasteth not; he trusteth that the Jordan will leap into his mouth; he snapping at his eyes’.

Even therein he would have remained fully in accord with the conception of the Egyptians, for not even the Egyptian Nile was regarded by them as an integral river, but correspondingly they paid homage to two Nile gods. Moreover they saw separate rivers in the various branches and even canals of the Lower Egyptian Nile. Cf. Winckelmann, Das alte Äg., p. 21.

1 Pišôn and Gihôn are not found elsewhere in the Bible as the names of Egyptian rivers, but occur in later writings, independently of the Paradise story, as e.g. Ben Sira 24, 25 and 27, who, it appears, following the then general view of his time, found also in the LXX Jer 2, 18 and Josephus Ant. 1, 1, 3, the name of Pišôn to be the Nile, whereas later Sadsa (died 941) and others interpreted Pišôn as the Nile. In any case neither name passed from literature into current speech. Their identity must have been forgotten very early in Israel, so that the interpretation of Gihôn as the Nile can hardly have been due to ancient tradition (cf. above, p. 171, n. 1). Abraham ibn Ezra in his Commentary on Gen. 2, 12 actually challenges Sadsa for taking the Nile without any traditional basis as one of the Paradise rivers. Of course, it is merely owing to the etymological consideration that the ‘increase’ was applied to the Nile, see Nachmanides and Rashi ad loc. where also the other rivers are interpreted on etymological considerations, likewise Brr. rab., § 15, where a different etymology for Pišôn is adopted. Sadsa’s suggestion that Hāwâli is Zawli is untenable as that district does not lie at all in the Nile region. Cf. on Zawli, Jacotin’s Geographical Dict., ed. Wünsfeld, ii, 912 and Description de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne par Edouti, ed. Dozy et de Goeje, Arch. Text, pp. 37 and 130.

ĕḇr shows the same usage as ăḇbô‘ to go round, to go round, encircle, turn round’ as well as ‘move about, traverse’ (Er-Gr. 52), and is not only used of rivers but also of seas, e.g. Pyy. 669 a-c of the sea which ‘surrounds’ (ĕḇr) the Aegean Islands (hẖ-w-ḥw.t). It is very remarkable that in this passage the sea itself is called ‘the great round’ (hẖ-r) ‘the circle’ ( hton) and again ‘the great round’ (hẖ-r).
is nowhere employed, not even of the Tigris and Euphrates in this same Paradise passage, leaves no doubt that *pbr* was actually the model for this expression. This provides a further important factor in illustrating the effect of the Egyptian milieu on the language and elements of the Paradise story just as it has come down to us. There is, however, another feature sufficiently remarkable to deserve attention being drawn to it. The expression used of the course of the Tigris, ʾ̱nīm ‘to go’, coincides with the word used in Akkadian of the course of a river alākūnu ‘to go’. We thus see here quite distinctly how the employment of ʾ̱nīm = alākūnu for the Mesopotamian river, a reminiscence has been preserved of the pre-Egyptian period when the first generations of Hebrews from the original Babylonian home still used expressions current among them in Babylonia in their Aramaic, and later in the Canaanite dialect adopted by them. The expression ʾ̱nīm, which in popular tradition was still used of the course of the Tigris is therefore retained in the narrative; but in his description of the two Egyptian rivers, the author, influenced by the conception conveyed by Egyptian expression *pbr*, employed the analogous ʾ̱nīm.

(f) The two Hawai’lās.

In concluding our discussion of Pišon and Gihon, we would touch on one question more which is of some importance and should, therefore, not be disregarded here, though we are unable to carry its solution much further than others. The mention of Hawai’lā Gen. 10, 7 and 29, 25, 18 and 1 Sam. 15, 7 has always presented Biblical scholars with great difficulties in that the Hawai’lā of these passages had at all costs to be identified with the Hawai’lā of the Paradise story, yet every attempt in this direction has failed. Our own very exhaustive investigation and close scrutiny of all the suggested possibilities, as well as others considered by ourselves in order to find a common basis for the reconciliation of the diverse data concerning Hawai’lā, especially in Gen. 10, 7 and 29, in every case yielded unsatisfactory results. The assumption of a mixed population of Hamites and Semites on the African and Asiatic sides of the Red Sea respectively cannot remove the obstacle of the discrepancy between Gen. 10, 7 and 10, 29, nor can the conception of Hawai’lā as a geographic collective denomination for a complex of lands on both sides of the Red Sea be summarily accepted. This, for the simple reason that Hawai’lā would embrace an enormous territory, which, in the south, would extend from Nubia (Kūf) into the interior of Arabia, approximately below Tēmā and Dedān in the neighbourhood of the present Taima and el-’Ola,1 and in the north would extend from the Syrian desert in a straight line across the isthmus between Palestine and Egypt to the point where the Egyptian ‘wall’ ʾ̱ndūn = ṣwāw, Gen. 25, 18 and I Sam. 15, 7, stood to protect Egyptian territory against Bedouin incursions.2 Such an extension would be out of all proportion and could not possibly be reconciled with I Sam. 15, 7.3 Finally the only possibility remaining is assumption of the existence of two lands Hawai’lā, one in Egypt referred to Gen. 10, 7 and the other in Arabia mentioned Gen. 10, 29, although such a hypothesis would not lead us to a definite solution with regard to the Paradise passage. We must therefore suspend any attempt to establish a connexion between Hawai’lā Gen. 2, 11 and the other passages mentioned, so long as we are merely dependent upon the Biblical material. In any case it should be emphasized that there is no absolute necessity to establish such a connexion. Indeed the definite article in Hawai’lā Gen. 2, 11 serves as an indication that it is to be understood neither as an ethnical nor geographical name, but rather as a substantive, to characterize a specific soil formation or appearance of a land.4 For the present investigation, at any rate, it is sufficient to have established the identity of this Hawai’lā with the eastern portion of Upper Egypt.5

---

1 See Gen. 10, 7 and 29 f., likewise Is. 21, 14; Jer. 25, 23. By the South-Arabian inscriptions of el-’Ola ʾ̱nīm has now been established as the name of a town near Taima. Cf. Euting, Tagebuch einer Reise in Inneraramäen, ii, 146 and 244.
2 On this wall cf. inter alia Bruchsch, Gev., pp. 191 and 195; Die bibl. 7 Jahre, etc., p. 89; Lit. 17, p. 2; Müller, AE. 182. The identity of ʾ̱ndūn and ṣwāw is not to be doubted. The desert ṣwāw ‘STH’ occurs, Ex. 15, 22 ff. in South-west Palestine certainly derived its name from this wall.
3 The author was certainly well informed concerning the district of Hawai’lā and ʾndūn. It is a gustatious way out of the difficulty to represent the whole passage as a meaningless reproduction of Gen. 25, 18. Our knowledge of the geographical conditions in the borderlands of Palestine at that time is insufficient to venture a definite solution.
4 The derivation of Hawai’lā from ʾ̱nīm ‘sand’, in the sense of ‘desert’ (cf. Ges.-Buhl.) is not impossible. The term might be explained as a sort of intensification of ʾ̱nīm used in later literature (Tal. Bab. Sikk. 31a) in the sense of an extensive or dense sand desert. In my view Hawai’lā might refer to dune-land or sandhills, which would very well suit the district between the Nile and the Red Sea on one side, and the opposite portion in Arabia on the other side. This would perhaps also apply to I Sam. 15, 7.
5 I reached the above results quite independently of Weinheim’s (ZATW. 32, p. 33 f.) and Albright’s (JJSL. 39, p. 15 ff.) articles, which became known to me only after my investigations on Paradise had already been concluded. Though I set out from a quite different standpoint and from quite different premises, Weinheim’s supposition concerning Pišon and Gihon, is in the main confirmed. I cannot, however, agree with Albright’s identification of these two rivers with the White and Blue Nile, as I cannot follow him along the ways he pursued to reach that result, although I am indebted to him for some useful suggestions.
6. The two Trees of Paradise.

Other points of comparison with the Paradise story are furnished by the Pyramid texts, as well as numerous passages in the books of the dead and sarcophagus texts containing many references to the habitations of the gods and dead in the land of the 'blessed' and 'glorified' in the nether world.

This was conceived as a sort of Paradise, with fruitful groves, gardens, and oases, studied with lofty trees, and encompassed on all sides by large rivers and waters. The texts describing the 'fields of the blessed' contain very remarkable details which strikingly agree with those of the Garden of Eden, and in addition illustrate and amplify them by many features.

(a) The Tree of Life.

Just as in the Garden of Eden there was 'every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food' (Gen. 2, 9), so also in the Egyptian 'fields' (ḥb.sn) and in the 'Garden of God' (kn ntr) there were all kinds of trees with sweet fruits, such as sycamores (nh.t), figs (dbh also dhb perhaps also dbr), dates (ḥmr.t), and vines (ibrtr.t), as well as other 'lovely trees' (ḥt nfr) and 'beautiful trees' (ḥt nfr).

The best known and by far the most frequent are the ḫt yw n ḫt 'Fields of the rushes' and ḫḥt yw n ḫḥt 'Fields of the blessed'. Of the 'Garden of God' (kn ntr) mention has already been made above (p. 162). An oasis (wḥd) is mentioned in the second section of the 'Fields of the blessed'. In Pap. Nebchay (Budge, BD, pl. p. 319, cf. also p. 333); in the reference to the fields in which the gods flourished on the all of the days of the beginning of the years'; and ibid. 1392 to 'the field, the good place, of the great god, where he fulfils his task among the blessed'. In the Books of the Dead other 'fields' are mentioned bearing the names of various gods, e.g. ḫt by 'field of Horus; also ḫḥt ntr n nfr' 'field of the gods'; ḫḥt 'field of life'; ḫḥt nfr 'field of eternity'. A pretty picture of the 'fields of the rushes' is inter alia preserved in the tomb of Senenjem (Cappart, Thébes, pl. 250, p. 339). The rendering of ḫḥt by pḥḥ 'Fields of the Blessed' is only conventional. Literally it means 'the field of foods' (Speiserfeld, Äg. WB, ii. 184) or 'of offerings'.

In many cases the surprising fact is established that many earlier Jewish traditions concerning Paradise which were dismissed as fiction or apocryphal have their origin in the Egyptian literature of the dead and undoubtedly go back to very early traditions, as will be shown on other occasions.

Fig trees are mentioned already in the 3rd dynasty together with vines among the 'good' or 'beautiful trees' (ḥt nfr) of a high personage named Mesea (Erman-Brugsch, p. 209). Also in a garden sculpture of the 18th dynasty, fig trees appear together with sycamores, vines, pomegranates, dates, and other fruit trees. Brit. Mus. No. 37, 853 shows a coloured picture of Amenemhet's garden of the 18th century A.C. In Thebes with flourishing trees, green palms, hanging date clusters, and other fruit-laden trees, planted in two rows round a pond fenced in with flowers and blossoms and alive with leaping fish. A similar picture is also preserved on the tomb of Rahmire (Cappart, Thébes, pl. 246, p. 333). These
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Of most importance for us, however, is the fact that among the trees of the Egyptian Paradise was also the 'Tree of Life'. The idea that the food of the gods was also the food for eternal life is quite natural and was not confined to Egypt but was also, and is, common to the mythology of the Babylonians. But whereas the Akkadian expression, akall baladdu, 'Food of Life' (see above p. 116) is quite different from the Hebrew, the Egyptian ḫt n 'nfr 'Tree of Life' corresponds literally with nfr ḫḥt 'Tree of Life'. Just as the ṣḥrt ḫḥt stood in the Hebrew Paradise so the ḫt n 'nfr also stood in the Egyptian Paradise, the 'Fields of the Blessed' (ḥḥt ḥḥt). It is mentioned already in Pyr. 1216: here the wish is expressed that the king proceeding to the great island in the 'Fields of Offerings' may be fed from the 'Tree of Life', so as to live from that wherefrom the gods live. Likewise Unk. IV, 130 the wish is voiced that the deceased may be given the food of the gods from the 'Tree of Life', in order that he may live from the same food.

The expression 'Tree of Life' which originally was only applied to the tree from which the gods fed, was later extended to all 'fruit trees' for men. But it is used rather as a poetical term in religious texts, e.g. in the Hymn to Amom, Cairo I. 7 in which he is praised as the creator: 'he made men and created the beasts; the lord of all that is; who creates (for men) the tree of life; (ḥm n ḫḥt) who makes herbage and gives sustenance to cattle (f âm ḫm nfr nwn).'

Further ibid. 6, 4: 'Who created herbage for the herbs and the tree of life for mankind (ḥt n 'nfr n nwn).' It should be noted that in both passages ḫt n 'nfr is determined as a plural. As it are the same trees that at all times constituted the glory and beauty of Egyptian gardens and oases, and which still to-day delight the eye with the glowing colour of their blossoms and fruit.

1 He is gone to the great island at the Fields of Offerings on which the gods let the swallows fly. The swallows are the everlasting (stars). May they (the gods) give to (King) N. N. this tree of life (ḥḥt n 'nfr) from which they live ('nfr n nfr nh nfr')

2 May the gods who are in their chapels give them their offerings from the tree of life (m ḫt n 'nfr) their food from the necropolis. Only in the Egyptian literature of the dead is the conception so frequently and so expressively pronounced that the dead live from the same food as the gods. He receives his meal of that which is in the barn of the great god, he is chief by the eternal (star), and he is given bread and beer that last for ever (Pyr. 1172a and 1175); or 'When Re eats, he gives it to him; when Re-chews, he gives it to him' (Pyr. 123f. and 133): 'He (the dead) eats from that which ye (the gods) eat; he drinks from that wherefrom ye drink' (Pyr. 1238). Later: 'thou eatest the bread beside the god (Osiris) on the great stairway of the lord of the nine (in Abydos)', Faberi, Erman, Relig, 132.

This extension may be simply explained by the fact that even for the gods the tree of life was regarded in a magical sense, but as a real fruit tree from which they fed. The Egyptian was fond of using 'nfr' to live' for 'feed' and the cau. Peh for 'give food', cf. p. 55ff.
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stands, it may refer to הַץ 'tree', but as the whole is a collective expression, the plural signs could refer also to יָבִי 'life'. In this case, נָתָה, as subst. plur., would coincide also grammatically with the invariable use of the plural יָבִי 'life' in the Hebrew, and יָבִי יָבִי would agree also in this particular with the Egyptian.1

(b) The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.

Before we attempt to establish the nature and character of this tree, it may be remarked that the expression יָבִי יָבִי 'knowledge of good and evil', which only occurs here, exactly coincides with the Egyptian phrase רַב נֶפֶר בַּי 'knowledge of good and evil' thus e.g. in the panegyric hymn of Nefer-Abu to the 'Mistress of Heaven' Mer-seser (Turin Stela 102, Erman, Sitzungsbs. Berl. Ak. d. W. 1911, p. 1098); 'I am an ignorant man that has no heart, without knowing good and evil (be r nab bey)i'.

As far as the tree itself is concerned, we find that in the same region, in the eastern heaven where the tree of life stood, there was also a 'lofty sycamore' (נַחַט בִּית) to which was assigned extraordinary importance as seat of the gods.2

In numerous passages the sycamore is described as the seat of the gods, above all of the supreme god Re, e.g. BD., p. 318: 'Truly I know the two sycamores of malachite (מָפָרָא) between which Re shows himself when he strides over the pillars of Shu (God of air) forth to the gate of the gods in the east (sunrise) out of which Re emerges'. Hathor in particular is designated as the native goddess of the sycamore, and indeed in graphic
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representations in the Books of the Dead appears beneath the sycamore or among its branches, e.g. in the vignette of the Papyrus Nu (Brit. Mus. 10, 477, sheet 7 and BD., p. 205). There the deceased is seen at the edge of a pool of water, kneeling beneath a sycamore. In his right hand he holds a bowl into which Hathor pours water from a vessel. In the Papyrus of Ani (Brit. Mus. 10, 470, sheet 16, and BD., p. 204) it is however, Nut, the goddess of heaven, who appears as goddess of the sycamore. Here the deceased is seen kneeling beside a pool out of which a sycamore grows. The goddess Nut emerges from the branches, and with her left hand pours water from a ewer into his bowl, and hands him cake with the right. In the tomb of weser-khet (Capart, Thèbes, Pl. 247, p. 335) the deceased is seen beside his mother and wife sitting beneath a sycamore, and human-headed soul-birds stand before an altar-table set with all kinds of foods and drinks. A goddess, Hathor or Nut, hands the deceased water and foods, and the soul-birds also refresh themselves with the sacrificial gifts. One of the finest and most vivid representations of a Paradise with wonderful groves of sycamores, date-palms, and other fruit trees is to be seen on the tomb of Sobek-hotep (Capart, Thèbes, Pl. 248, p. 337). Here too the deceased and his wife are sitting beneath sycamores and are being fed by a goddess from a smaller sycamore opposite.3

The veneration of the sycamore as a sacred tree is very ancient, even though it can be traced back only to the 5th dynasty; its fruit was always preferred as sacrificial offering for the dead because it was reckoned as the most luscious food of the beyond. It was piled up in heaps on the tombs, sometimes in clay models, to be offered to the dead with the wish that they might get (in the beyond) sycamore figs to eat and wine to drink.4 The idea of eating this sweet fruit beneath the sycamore itself, and dwelling in the midst of divine beings who descended upon it to enjoy its fruit was the highest bliss of the 'glorified' in the heavenly Paradise.5

1 Although we shall deal elsewhere with the plural formation for collective or abstracta in Hebrew and Egyptian, we would here observe that the plural יָבִי 'life' actually occurs in Egyptian ר'נ (plur. of ר), and similarly ל'נ 'blood' finds an Egyptian equivalent in dtr.w 'blood' in the plural (from dtr 'the red'), Ex., Gen., p. 316. In this way may best be explained such plural formations which are more especially peculiar to the older Bible texts.

2 n.to y.b. n.to y. '莖 that has no heart, the heartless' denotes the foolish, just as in the Hebrew 25 נ. י. Jer. 5, 21, and 25 יי Prov. 7, 11, 17, 18. יב here is in the infinitive, i.e. 'to know good and evil', and thus also grammatically coincides with the Hebrew form יבכ. It would be more correct to render יבכ יבכ יבכ יבכ 'Tree of the knowing of good and evil', whereby the article in יבכ would be explained. In any case the originality of the sentence is confirmed by the Egyptian parallel, so that the whole discussion as to the necessity of eliminating יבכ יבכ is quite out of place.

3 In Prit 914 f. נ. נ. 'N. N. goes to heavens for all of life and enjoyment, to see his father, to see Re. N. N. calls to the exalted places and the places of Set; the exalted places conduct him to the places of Set, to that high sycamore in the east of heaven on which the gods sit'; Prit. 1433: 'O N. N. Thus fallest not to earth. N. N. turns for himself the two sycamores that are in the midst of this portion of heaven and which conduct him to this eastern side of heaven'.

4 Cf. also Budge, The Gods, ii, 103 and 106, picture of the sycamore of Nut or Hathor. There was another tree of specially sacred character, the 111 which to the Egyptians attached the greatest significance because the name of the dead king was written on its leaves by the goddess Sethket-Abw to make him live eternally (cf. inter alia Erman, Relig., p. 26 and pl. 27). It is believed that it was the sycamore (cf. Rec. 15, 107; PSBA. 13, 499; Wiedemann, Das alte Ägypten, p. 16), but Wiedemann (loc. cit., p. 276) sees in it the mimosa Schimpferi corresponding to the Persians of the Greeks. Cf. also The Gods, i, pl. 374.

5 Cf. Wiedemann, Das alte Ägypten, p. 376. Wesselski, Atlas, pl. 23, showing women bringing offerings with sycamore branches as head adornment.

6 BD. p. 69, Papyrus of Nu, sheet 19, the deceased says, inter alia: 'The gods and the Akhu (the soul spirits of the dead) will say to me: Which sort of food wouldst thou like to be given thee?'—(1 answer): let me take my food under the sycamore of the goddess Hathor and may I pass my hours beneath the divine beings that rest upon it.
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Alternatively, the sycamore in Prr. and elsewhere the fig (dbh) together with wine (frp) are mentioned as food and drink of the gods and god-descended kings. Thus e.g. Prr. 816, it is said of the dead kings, the ‘beloved of the gods’, that they ‘lean on their sceptres, clothe themselves in red linen (see also Prr. 15:11), live on figs (nd.nw m dbh), drink wine, and anoint themselves with fine oil’, in order to speak to the great god and to go up to him. ¹

The most important feature for our investigation is that this striking preference of the sycamore fruit is due to the fact that the sycamore is besung in Egyptian love-poetry as the love-tree, and its fruit as love-fruit. The aspiration to enjoy sycamore fruit and wine ‘in the fields of the blessed’ is thus closely connected with the yearning for the enjoyment of love, which is expressly cited as one of the chief blessings in the beyond.² But just as in Paradise the fig (dbh) appears together with the sycamore fruit as the food of the gods and delectation of the glorified blessed, it has the same role among lovers. The lover is compared with the fig tree, whereas the little sycamore ‘which she (the beloved) planted with her hands’ speaks her language in its mouth; with its whispering, that is as sweet as pure honey, it lures the lover to its cool shadow for the love potion, so that he hastens to it being already ‘drunken without having drunk’ (Liber Poeticus, I, 11 f. and 15 f. = Lit. 250 f. and Erman-Ranke 210).³

¹ As a rule dbh (also ndbh) is used for a special kind of fig, perhaps as the ordinary fig (ficus carica), and, as we have seen above, is also mentioned as a special tree besides the sycamore. But dbh also occurs as the fruit of the sycamore (ficus sycomorus), e.g. Ukh. 14, 73; nd.bh nd dbh. That dbh or ndbh (827) and the Hebrew נַחַת (nakh), plus כּוֹנֶה (koneh) (1 Sam. 25, 18, etc.) are one and the same (AZ. 32, 33, and 40, 88) can be taken for granted. But in Egypt the ordinary fig and the sycamore fig seem to have been denoted indifferently by dbh, whereas probably in Canaan or Israel the dried figs were called קְוֹנֵית (konih) in contradistinction to קְוֹנֶה for fresh figs, whereas נַחַת was used for a lump of pressed figs. Whether dbh was originally Egyptian or Semitic need not here be discussed. In any case the Semitic origin of dbh is just as probable as the non-Semitic origin of ndbh (‘sycamore’). ²

² Cf. e.g. Baville, Tob. 110: ‘He is there powerful and is there glorified. He ploughs there and reaps there, and drinks wine and plies love there, and does all that he did on earth’. Cf. also AZ. 49, 219 and Erman, Relig. p. 121. For the same reason wine was much esteemed as a divine beverage, and to be drunken was regarded as the greatest bliss in the world of the glorified. Cf. e.g. Prr. 130: ‘Hin (the deceased’s) offering (i.e. his food) is among you, the gods, and his water is wine like that of Re’. In Prr. 580 and 1524 the dead is designated like Osiris as ‘lord of the wine’. In Prr. 1523 immediately on his appearance in heaven he is brought water and wine. Cf. also 1722. Seldom is wine lacking among offerings to the gods and dead. Cf. e.g. Prr. 36, 92 ff. and many other passages.

³ As to the alleged close connexion between the Paradise story and Babylonian mythology it may be pointed out that whereas the fig assumes an eminent place in Egypt, in Babylonia it was probably not even known, because no certain word for fig exists in the

AND THE FALL OF MAN

Sycamore and fig are thus poetical and mythological symbols of love, vehicles of enjoyment, filling the heart with joy and bliss. That in Egypt the sycamore excels the fig and is given a more prominent position is to be explained by the fact that in the Nile valley the sycamore grows more lavishly, and it must certainly have been indigenous in Egypt much earlier than the fig, in spite of the fact that the presence of the fig can be attested already in the 3rd dynasty (Erman-Ranke, p. 209), whereas the sycamore can only be traced back to the 5th dynasty.¹

If the sycamore, therefore, was more characteristic of the Egyptian than the fig, the reverse was the case for the Hebrew because the fig (nakh) was a much more typical local plant in Canaan than the sycamore (ndbh). It is for this reason that the fig was like the vine, symbolic and proverbial of the fertility and beauty of the land (Num. 20, 1; Deut. 8, 8; 1 Kings 5, 1; Zech. 3, 10; Prov. 27, 18, etc.). This different position of the sycamore and fig in Egypt and Canaan found expression also in the fact that in Biblical poetry the fig appears instead of the sycamore as the love-tree (Song of Songs 2, 13).

In the light of these observations the mention of the fig leaves in the Paradise story assumes special importance. If the author avoids mentioning the ‘tree of knowledge’ in this connexion it is because by going into such detailed particularization the beautiful simplicity of the narrative would be impaired, and the solemnity of the description of the episode which is intentionally kept in general terms would be marred. On the other hand he is not deterred from specifying the nature of the tree at the moment when the veil of mystery is raised and exaltation is dispelled.

To sum up, the following factors support the view that the ‘tree of knowledge’ was the love-tree, and actually was the fig: (1) that the ‘tree of knowledge’ stood next to the tree of life, just as in the Egyptian Paradise the sycamore (nakh) was to be found in the spot where the tree of life (at n ‘nah’ was); (2) that the fig tree in Biblical poetry is the tree of love, as is the sycamore in the poetry and religious literature of the Egyptians; language. Only hypothetically tinnan or timnan are connected with the Hebrew תִּנְנָה (Tinnan, 1179 b and 1175 b and Del. Pfr. 692 b and 49 b on many). ²

² Cf. Wiedemann loc. cit., p. 276. Very instructive on this point are the numbers given in the above-mentioned garden picture of the 18th dynasty (Erman-Ranke, 206): 170 date palms, 120 palm palms, 31 pomegranate trees, 12 vines, and only 5 fig trees, whereas there are 73 sycamores. This proportion indicates the greater popularity and the earlier indigenousness of the sycamore in Egypt. The fact that the fig is now predominant in the Nile Valley is in consequence of the growing prosperity in the country, the wild fig having been gradually replaced by the cultivated variety. Likewise on the coasts of Palestine the sycamore (Cumméa), probably for the same reason, has become less frequent than fifty years ago, when it was still to be found by many springs and wells.
only that in the Biblical narrative the fig tree takes the place of the apple-
more; and (3) the express mention of fig leaves in conjunction with the Fall.

Thus we have in the 'tree of knowledge' the typical love-tree of the
Bible, and in the mention of fig leaves the veiled hint that they were from
the very tree the fruit of which had aroused in the first human couple the
consciousness of love.

7. 'To be like God'.

The idea that man in the nether world would 'be like a god' or 'become
a god' was very widespread in Egypt, and is constantly repeated, especially
in texts of the dead. By the identification of the dead, not merely with
Osiris, the god of the dead for excellence, but also with other gods, this idea
had very early penetrated so deeply among all Egyptian classes that every
one aspired 'to be equal to god' ('tmt ntr'), to obtain all the advantages
accruing to a god, to enjoy all the delights of a god, and above all to live
like a god for 'thousands and millions of years and jubilees' in all eternity.

Both the oldest Pyr. texts as well as the latest ones of the Greek
and Roman times, which speak of the dead, or are addressed to the dead,
are full of the idea that the dead 'is like a god ('smf-ntr'). He has all the
privileges of a god; he lives eternally like the gods; rules the whole heavens
like the gods, and can ride from one horizon to another like the Sun God
Re. The whole literature of the dead is thoroughly permeated with this
idea and is full of exorcisms intended to remove all obstacles 'in the way
of the dead', so that in all respects he shall be equal to a god. And
because for the Egyptian this was the highest and sole aim, he did every-
thing he could to preserve his body for ever, and provided himself with all
possible magic formulæ in order to be in the nether world 'like God' and
to live eternally 'like God'.

From a very great multitude of such references the following few examples
may be quoted: 1 Pyr. 393 f.: 'They (the demons) saw him (the dead
when he appeared and his soul was like a god, etc. He is the lord of

1 The expression byr n tr to 'become a god' rather expresses the transformation of the
dead into a god (Osiris), in the nether world.
2 We give here merely examples for the 'being like a god' or 'becoming like a god'
in the nether world, because in our Genesis passage the idea of 'being, becoming
like a god' is essential. That the king during his lifetime was also spoken of as a god, does
not belong here but is connected with the conception of his being a god in essence, cf.
above p. 43, n. 2. For this reason 'to become like a god' was not deemed an adequate
'promotion' for a king after death, and so many Pyramid texts represent him as becoming
even stronger, greater, mightier than the gods, and even let him appear as 'lord of the
gods', or 'prince of the gods', e.g. Pyr. 204 f., 776, 813, 1624, 1645.
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these two parallel expressions are used in Hebrew and in Egyptian side by side with reference to the life of man in Paradise and in the nether world of the gods respectively is another striking testimony to the influence of the Egyptian milieu.¹

8. The Serpent of Paradise.

(a) Nature and Character of the Serpent.

The Egyptian conception of the world of the gods and the 'blessed' also provides the background for our understanding the nature and character of the serpent, as well as for its role in Paradise. Just as everywhere in Egypt snakes creep about undisturbed in fields, gardens, and oases, and climb freely on walls and trees, so in all pictorial representations of the Egyptian nether world they appear in its gardens and groves, gates and entrances, as well as among its high and stately trees. In almost all cases, however, it is not a fantastic beast, but the usual uraeus, and in rare cases a viper. Even the serpents represented here and there as fabulous beings are not grotesque dragons as in Babylonian mythology, but have as a rule the appearance of gigantic uraeus serpents as, e.g. the Ninurta serpent, the seventy-ells-long serpent, the serpent with human legs, winged serpents, and the like.² In the same way the Hebrew narrator of the Paradise story, had in mind not a grotesque, terrifying monster as in the Babylonian myths (e.g. KAT. 505) but the uraeus indigenous to Egypt and the neighbouring lands.³ But whereas the serpent of the Egyptian myth usually appears in probably also the case in the masculine names s-n-b'k 'resembling Sobek' (confused with s-n-b'k 'man of Sobek'); s-n-s'tir 'resembling Osiris', etc. Cf. Hoffm. Theop. Personal Names, p. 60 and 57. I believe, however, that in all these names not the god himself but his idol was in mind in the same sense as 'Madonna-like'. Similarly names like n-s-my-t 'knowing like t', etc. belong to the same category.

¹ In this case also the preponderance of Egyptian influence as compared with Babylonian is very marked: in Babylonian it is the living, and not the dead, as invariably in Egyptian, who is compared with a god and then only poetically, as it is said incidentally, e.g. of the king that he was mutu-lu la ilu 'the likeness of a god', (cf. above p. 112). As a matter of fact the idea of the deification of the dead is foreign to the Babylonians and stories like that of Umsipatum and Adapa invoked as parallels to our passage, serve to show that the raising of a man to the rank of the gods was very far from being a common notion.

² Besides the already cited illustrations in BD.² cf. also p. 297 and 248, likewise Bridge, The Gods of the Egyptians, 1, 183, 191 ff; 231, 253, 515; ii, 63, etc.

³ The representation of a serpent under a tree in front of a human couple on a small Babylonian cylinder (Del. Wo lag das Paradies? p. 90 and Jerem. Das AT, p. 8) which is advanced as a proof of a Babylonian background for the serpent motif in the story of the fall, is only bewilderingly discussed by Zimmerm (KAT., p. 306), because its meaning and significance are not clear, even to Assyriologists. In any case this solitary, very doubtful, parallel is distinctly meagre in comparison with the numerous and quite palatable Egyptian

the nether world as rebel in eternal conflict with gods and men, the Paradise serpent is represented rather as a companionable, sociable being, apparently benevolently disposed to man. It is not the aggressive serpent of the myth, but the magic snake of fable. It talks to the woman in a familiar way, like all the animals in Egyptian and Biblical fables.⁴ It has something daemonic but nothing monstrous about it. Moreover, the selection of the arch-Semitic word הָעַרְוָא, identical with the Arabic حَدِثٌ, points to its interpretation as a common serpent and not a fabulous beast. As a matter of fact, הָעַרְוָא is still the usual name for the uraeus in Arabia, and more especially in the lands bordering on Egypt, though also הָעַרְוָא is commonly used for a snake.⁵ In the express mention of the fact that the serpent was more cunning than all the beasts of the field (Gen. 3, 1 and 14), its character as an ordinary snake is brought out. Even in the event that the narrator, as many believe, conceived the serpent before the curse as a creature walking on legs, he would still have thought of it in the form of a uraeus on legs, just as it appears in numerous representations of the Egyptian nether world.

It is tempting to compare the Paradise serpent with the serpent depicted on a sarcophagus in the Louvre, with human arms and legs, standing in an upright attitude before the god Seb, and putting a cake in his mouth. It is described as n-n af'sm 'Lord of foods'.⁶

(b) The Fight between Man and Serpent.

The use of one and the same expression נו for the manner in which man was to kill the serpent, and the serpent attack man has always presented parallels. It is rather remarkable that whereas some of the supporters of the Babylonian mythological conception in Genesis represent the Paradise serpent as a fantastic, grotesque, and gigantic dragon-like monster, others cling to the tiny thin reptile on the cylinder, which after all is nothing but an ordinary snake.

² Cf. e.g. the tale of the shipwrecked (of the N.E.) which speaks of a beneficent serpent 30 ells long on a fabulous paradisal island with wondrous trees that emerged from the 'flood' (doubtless the primal ocean Nuni) and then again disappeared in the deep. Ermancranes 609, also Lit., p. 31 f.

³ Though, דָּם is interpreted in the dictionaries, e.g. Lidd. al-ara rub., vol. viii, p. 177 and others as viper, it is also described at the same time as the black poisonous uraeus. As a rule among the Bedouins it is the name for snake generally, also for the blindworm. This is very significant; when we bear in mind this role of the snake to supply the gods with food in the nether world it becomes clear why, from among all the 'beasts of the field', it was the snake which approached the woman to talk to her about the fruits of the garden, without arousing suspicion or alarm in her.

⁴ Cf. Lansone, Dizionario, i, p. 337 and pl. 172 also p. 431 f. Similar serpent figures, cf. pl. 173 a and c. According to a Jewish tradition, before the curse the serpent was a creature in human form with 'upright stature' נֶאֶשׁ נוּשִׁי. Cf. especially Genesis rab. sec. 32, and Deut. rabb. sec. 5.
difficulty to Biblical scholars, because man and snake could not carry out their attack in one and the same manner. To solve this difficulty it had to be assumed either that ḫw represents two separate roots with different meanings, or one root with a basic meaning from which two others could have developed to denote the different mode of attack by man and snake respectively. That the latter is indeed the case will be shown by reference to Egyptian.

In Egyptian we find a whole series of words, e.g. ḫbb and ḫbḥ both for the sting of insects or scorpions, and for the bite of snakes. Moreover, ḫbb is also used for stabbing with a weapon such as a knife or spear. The basic meaning is to prick, to pierce, and this was extended, on the one hand, to the bite of the snake because the latter in fact was experienced as a violent prick and, on the other hand, to stabbing with a weapon. The same is also the case with ḫm as a rule it means 'Whet, sharpen', but is also applied to the stinging of insects and biting of reptiles. Now in ḫw we have an analogous double usage: in the first instance speaking of the man it means an attack by stabbing and in the second case referring to the serpent it means 'to bite'.

The illustration of this mode of combat between man and serpent, the graphic representation of the serpent in conflict with Re in various texts of the dead is of special interest. Thus e.g. in the Book of the Dead of Any and that of Khui-Nefer (BD, p. 103) there are scenes showing the eternal fight which the serpent, as the personification of night and darkness, wages every morning against the Sun-god Re at the moment when he, as a cat, obviously as an animal hostile to the snake, emerges from the interior of the iḥd-tree (cf. above, p. 195, n. 1) in order to lift the sun above the horizon. One can see the black snake, mad with rage, hurling itself against

1 Cf. Er.-Gr. 223. Metternich-Staal, verso 55 and 73. Amos., i, 21, 3. Ret. 35, 38 where it is said of the reptile that bites with the mouth: 'Thou removest far from me... every mouth (ṛ mb) that bites (ḥb) and stings (ḥbb) in its lair (ḥbh t)'. Also ḫbb means both the 'bite and sting' of reptiles or scorpions, e.g. Pyc. 230-32: 'they are bitten by a serpent; W. has bitten the earth, has bitten Geb (the Earth god), the father of that (snake) that bit him'. p. 23. The serpent manakin is bitten by the serpent elf (and vice versa). Cf. also Coptic ṭw and ṭwq (Spiegelb., WB, 95 and 98: 'bite' wherewith 392 Mich 3, 5 is translated). Besides ḫbb there is ḫm 'bite', Metternich-Staal, 189 and ḫm. WB, V, 654. The 'stinger' ḫdbh, i.e. 'biter' is the name of the serpent that guards the entrance to the 'Gate of the fourth hour' in the nether world (cf. illustrations Budge, The Gods, i, p. 183).

2 Cf. Er.-Gr. 214 and Coptic 3wək. Often it is used metaphorically of the king's crown (ḥḥ t), which is so lofty that it pierces (ḏn br t) the heaven with its top, e.g. Gapw, Biddi., p. 171. By the above-cited passage the meaning 'prick' is assured, and this also is the case in the metaphor referred to (cf., however, i.e.)

AND THE FALL OF MAN

the tree, and with convulsive coiling body it attempts to bite the cat on the paw. The cat, however, strikes it with one paw on the head, and with the knife in the other it cuts off its head, the blood spouting forth in great jets. Numerous other scenes show the dead man piercing the head of the snake with a long spear or pointed stick (BD, pp. 54, 58, 103, 158, 167, 170 etc.). In all the scenes we have a vivid illustration of the description given in Gen. 3, 15: 'and he (the man) will pierce (or stab) thee, ṣw, in the head, and thou wilt bite him ụm in the sole (or heel)'. This description shows quite clearly that the narrator could only have had in mind the common snake and not a monstrous creature, for only such would bite the man on the foot.

Very instructive light is thrown on our passage by some of the usual inscriptions accompanying some graphic representations of working scenes (cf. above, p. 140). These reproduce cries and shouts of workmen to each other as in the stress of work they chaffingly egg one another on. Thus for instance in the carrying out of a difficult piece of metal work demanding vigilance, one workman calls out to another: 'Hit it properly on the sole (ḏn ḥw t or f), mate, as well as you can!', i.e. 'give it a proper kick, comrade!'. The same is expressed by another in the following words: ụm ḥw t. 'Stick it in the sole'! (Erman, Reden, Rotfe etc., p. 40). As will be seen 'piercing the sole' and 'biting the sole' (or 'heel') was a common expression in Egyptian, and when it is remembered that in the east the people of the lower classes, as well as peasants at work in the fields, go about barefoot, the idea of a snake-bite in the foot was very present, just as was having and kicking on the sole or heel in fights and broils. Particularly noteworthy

1 Besides this passage ṣw only occurs in Ps. 139, 11 and Job, 9, 17. In both passages the meaning pierce, strike, in the sense of lay fits very well. It is true that in Ps. 139, 17 there may remain a dim reminiscence of the fight of darkness, personified in the Apophis serpent, against the light, whereby the use of ṣw in this passage can be explained by its double meaning of biting and slaying. Attention may be drawn in this connexion to the antithesis of ṣw 552 'wings of the morning star' for the sunrise and ḫw 553 'end of the west' (verse 9) of the sunset in the extreme west where the nether world lies (cf. above, p. 165 f.). It is there that the Night Apophis serpent arms itself for the fight against the sun.

2 By my interpretation I believe I have removed the difficulties encountered by Erman. There is no real connexion between the work to be done and the 'biting of the sole'. That is also the meaning with regard to the manufacture of a new jug: the potter is to be hit vigorously on his sole to remind him that he must take care; it is a new jug!

3 'Heel' and 'sole', more especially the under part of the heel belong together, and thus ḇw can quite well be applied to both heel and sole. Likewise in Coptic ḥw (Spiegelb., WB, p. 162) means 'sole' and 'heel', and in Hebrew ḥw is used both for 'heel' and for 'sole', so that also Gen. 3, 15 could mean 'heel' and 'sole'. Whether the Demotic ḥw = Coptic ḥw (Spiegelb. WB, p. 291) 'sole' is borrowed from the Semitic ḳ remains an open question.
is the expression :`~dm` for 'stabbing the sole' because it is applied, as we have seen, both to reptile bites and insect stings, thus presenting an exact parallel to ~w~n~n~ in our passage.

(c) The Serpent as 'Going on the Belly' and Eating Dust.

Another expression common to Egyptian and Hebrew is Gen. 3, 14 32 76 76 > upon thy belly shalt thou go'. It is the same expression used for reptiles in Lev. 11, 43 where it is a distinctive denomination for a special category of animals. This corresponds exactly to the elliptic expression in Egyptian 756 5 r t 5 6 t 5 6 f 6 t 6 that (which goes) on its belly' for snakes and reptiles generally. Cf. e.g. Pyr. 642 q 47 'Thou art the serpent (hpyw) that (goes) on its belly hpy w 6 f 6 t 5 6 f '. The Egyptian conceived the growing of creeping plants, like the motion of reptiles, as a movement on the belly, and said of them that they 'creep on the belly'. Cf. Pap. Ebers 51, 15 f. of a plant named `smt: 'It grows on its belly (rd-t hr b-t-d) like the plant `hd t and has blossoms like the lotus lily.'

A very remarkable parallel to the condemnation of the serpent to the eating of dust is provided in Himmeltskh, pl. xxvii, 59 (= Urk. Roed. 147), where the serpents of Re are entrusted to the care of the Earth-god Geb and he is commanded to impress upon them to guard against 'harming anything whatever'. It proceeds literally: 'Behold their sustenance (i.e. food) shall be he (i.e. Geb) making earth, dust) (m.k gry tr br.t-in nrf p3).'

Thus here it expressly stated that the food of the snakes is to be dust. Moreover, the 'snake' is succinctly described as 'son of the earth (hr-t-d)', because it lives in the earth, and in the Hymn to Osiris (Erman, A 5 3 38, 70) it is called 'son of the great earth, great in years (t-h d v m r p3.w t)'.

1 Elliptic expressions of this kind are frequent in Egyptian, especially in connexion with hr y (also lmy). We have seen an example above p. 30 f. in hr yr 'he over the house', i.e. house steward, with the corresponding expression `hr y' by nph. Others are hr y-n tr 'he (sitting) on the throne' for 'heir to the throne'; hr y-t 'he on the back' as a euphemism for 'steer mounting on the back of the cow'; hr y-t 'he (sitting) on the sand' for 'sand-dweller, Bedouin' (Br.-Gr. 113 f.).

2 It almost appears as if in this myth the eating of dust is conceived as a punishment for the serpent because it had effected some damage or other. I have the impression that the whole passage is taken from a myth in which a participation of the serpent in the fight against Re was described.

3 This occurs already in Pyr. 689, 69 t and elsewhere in numerous passages, e.g. Tesh, ch. 8 v. On the transformation of the dead into a serpent (hr-t-d): 'I am son of the earth (hr-t-d) advanced in years'; Pap. Bremer, 26, 22 (= Apophthegm, Urk. Roed, p. 108):

When in this place sons of the earth (w w t d) and worms were not yet created'; Griffith, Tell el-Yahudiyah, pl. xxv, 13 (= Urk. Roed., p. 154): 'Then went forth the son of the earth (hr t d)'. A similar designation for serpent is imy t-5, that (which is) in the earth'. Cf. Ap. WB, p. 75, where other elliptic expressions formed with imy are given.

CHAPTER V

THE EGYPTIAN ELEMENTS IN THE FLOOD STORY.

1. The Egyptian Word 73 8 for Ark.

No more striking evidence in support of the thesis advanced in our introductory observations (cf. p. 119 f.) as to Babylonian stories having been transformed by grafting of Egyptian elements, on the original Babylonian stem to be found than in the story of the flood.

To begin with, the most characteristic fact is that for the chief feature of the whole story, the ship, neither an Akkadian word is used (cf. above, p. 114), nor the Canaanite 'nr, current elsewhere in the Bible, to be found even in the Pentateuch e.g. Gen. 49, 13 etc., but 73 8 in which long since the Egyptian word gb t 'box, coffer chest' has been recognized.

The choice of an Egyptian word cannot be accidental but must be intentional and can only be explained by the fact that the author saw the whole story in an Egyptian light and consequently conceived the ship as a rectangular bark, as a box-ship, in the shape of a chest or a box, known in Hebrew circles under the Egyptian word 73 8 .

As, however, 73 8 also occurs in the story of the finding of the infant Moses, Ex. 2, 3, a comparison of both passages at once suggests itself. Such a comparison is all the more instructive for our whole thesis, as, on the one hand, it clearly reveals the combined Babylonian-Egyptian character

1 The Canaanite origin of 73 8 is proved by the fact that in the Amarna Tablets 251, 25 it is given as a Canaanite gloss to the Akkadian word elippi 'ship'. The question arises whether it is connected with the Akkadian and, snawu vessel, utensil. It should be remembered that the ship is also called 'vessel' (cf. Gen. 9, 11-12) and this seems to be the case in L. 16, 10, that only by the special kind of canoe is it to be understood (cf. below p. 206, n. 1).  

2 Ap. WB, iv, p. 50 et. The more vernacular form is sb t or gb t as it appears in the Greek period (West p. 261) and is reproduced in Copt. by τα o, ωβ (5), τα etc. (B), ωβ (A), KWB. 140. It seems that this was also in the Hebrew-Egyptian period the common word for gb t. As we shall see later in the Moses story 73 8 was used like gb t in its older meaning 'coffin, divine shrine'. It is significant that the vocalization in Coptic agrees with that in 73 8 (see above p. 50, n. 2 and p. 155, n. 2).

3 The fact that dp t means ship makes it very plausible to take this word as the real prototype of 73 8 , as I suggested in Spr. d. Pent., p. 196 f., on the assumption that both dp t and gb t were originally derived from the older form with the basic meaning 'box, chest', cf. also Erudierung, p. 26. But this question is of minor importance. For us it is essential that 73 8 is an Egyptian word, and in this all Egyptologists agree.
of the flood narrative, and, on the other hand, shows how much more powerfully Egyptian influences prevailed in the Exodus narrative (cf. above, p. 3). For whereas here for nature of timber and kind of pitch, the Akkadian words 𒎏 = 𒏗𒍂 and 𒎏 = 𒏕𒒆 survived as remnants of the original Babylonian narrative (cf. above, p. 113), the Egyptian word 𓊫 = 𓊫 ‘Nile rushes’ is used to denominate the material of the Ark of Moses. Moreover this Ark, unlike Noah's Ark, is not pitched with 𓊫 = Akkadian kudru but with 𓊫 ‘asphalt’ and 𓊫 ‘pitch’, which were used in Egypt for rendering tight boxes, coffins, ships, and all kinds ofwatercraft.

2 𓊫 and 𓊫 in Egyptian Architecture.

Besides 𓊫 the expressions 𓊫 and 𓊫 Gen. 6, 14, 16, employed in the building of the Ark also furnish indications of Egyptian influence as they are only to be explained from the technique of ship-building and architecture respectively among the Egyptians.

It should be pointed out that 𓊫 in this passage, cannot, as is generally thought, be the plural of 𓊫 ‘near’, in the sense of ‘cell, compartment, room’, because here the text does not refer to the division of the Ark, which is the case only in verse 16, but merely to construction and material. As a matter of fact 𓊫 refers to a specifically Egyptian carpentry technique. Therein we have the Hebrew plural of an Egyptian loan-word 𓊫 = 𓊫 denoting papyrus fibre employed for stopping the joints between the planks, especially of light river-boats, skiffs and ships, as also for the manufacture of all kinds of cane work, like mats, armchairs, litters and the like, which were therefore, called 𓊫. 𓊫 thus denotes the mode of making the Ark water-tight, whereby 𓊫, exactly as in the Egyptian 𓊫, is applied in the plural to objects on which this particular technique was

1 The plant 𓊫 is said to be the Papyrus nilotica, Coptic 𓊫, Arabic 𓊫, WB. V. 37. On account of its adhesive qualities this wood was very well adapted for the building of skiffs, canoes, etc. Such water-craft are meant in Is. 18, 2 by 𓊫 and Job 9, 26 by 𓊫, and just as at that time and much earlier in Nubia, so even to-day throughout the Sudan, light boats are constructed of Nile rushes. Cf. Erman-Ranke, p. 571 f. and P. Montet, Scènes de la vie prière, etc., p. 78 f.

2 Asphalt and pitch were very common in Egypt and obtainable in Palestine and Syria. Mention has already been made in Gen. 14, 10 of 𓊫 from the region of the Dead Sea which is particularly rich in asphalt. In Egyptian asphalt is rendered by ㎡, Coptic 𓊫 = 𓊫, 𓊫 = 𓊫 KWB. 37, possibly ‘smeared’ from ㎡, or ㎡, rub in, paint (a wound, etc.) and is hardly derived from 𓊫.

3 Cf. e.g. P. Westc., xi. 7 f. (= Lit. 45). ‘Give this barley to your chair-bearer (fr-beney)’. It is possible that the use of chair-bearer was extended to ‘porter’ generally. On this technique, which moreover is still current in Egypt, see P. Montet, Scènes de la vie prière, p. 76 f., and Wiedemann, Das Alte Ägypten, p. 215, according to which even Herodotus observed the employment of reeds for the stopping of joints.
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employed. The whole procedure is now clear: first of all, the timber 𓊫 is mentioned; then comes the closing with papyrus fibre 𓊫 and lastly, the pitching with bitumen 𓊫, which, as we have seen, was common in Egypt for water-craft, as well as for wooden vessels, coffins, boxes, etc. The phrase 𓊫 𓊫 𓊫 means simply ‘fibre-tight shalt thou make it’, where 𓊫 is a form of expression to be found elsewhere in technical specifications, e.g. Ex. 25, 18, 27, 4, 8, 28, 11 etc.

As far as 𓊫 is concerned, it has, of course, the form of a genuine Hebrew word, and could, therefore, be very well interpreted in the meaning of ‘light’ as the singular of 𓊫 (used for ‘noon’). Nevertheless it cannot mean an ordinary window (Targum, Peṭāṭa etc.) because for this the usual word 𓊫 occurs in 8, 6, and must obviously be different from 𓊫 as otherwise the text would have 𓊫 instead of 𓊫. In reality 𓊫 denotes a kind of skylight or rather dormer so characteristic of Egyptian houses and temples. It consisted of a longish square or semi-circular opening divided by two or three stones or pillars, barely more than an ell in height, situated high over the door or a window, fairly near to the roof, in order to admit that light penetrating from above when windows and doors had to be closed against overheating heat or driving rain. That the 𓊫 was in fact to be made close to the roof is expressly indicated in Gen. 6, 16 in the words 𓊫 𓊫 𓊫, which means nothing less than that the opening should not be more than an ell in height and that it should be fixed high up, close beneath the roof, in order that the Ark might be lit from a spot high above the inhabited compartments, a spot where no water could penetrate as it was protected by the eaves against the pouring in of the rain. This provision was necessary to obtain sufficient light when the window had to remain closed against storm and water.

As to the three compartments, they are to be conceived not as three self-contained floors covering the whole space of the Ark, but as three tiers opening on to a common well, from which each one was accessible. It was on the outer wall of this well, high above the window or door, close to
the roof that the dormer, חֵור, was placed, so that the light from thence might reach everywhere.1

The injunction to fix the door at the side of the Ark, 6, 16, is also peculiarly characteristic of Egyptian architecture; as may be seen from many pictures of Egyptian houses of the New Kingdom; the door is not in the centre but at the end of the frontage near the corner (cf. e.g. Erman-Ranke, pl. 55, p. 205, 56, p. 207 and Wiedemann, ‘Das Aile Ägypten’ pl. 30, p. 168).

In the Ark the door would have been fixed high up, in order to guard against the penetration of water through the dipping of the Ark during the storm.

3. The Expression הָעַשׁ for Flood.

The Deluge as Inundation and Rainstorm.

A further telling example for the influence of the Egyptian and the introduction of Egyptian elements into the original Babylonian framework of the deluge-story is provided by the specific expression הָעַשׁ for the Flood. As we shall presently see, the choice of this word will help us over the great difficulty involved in the Flood being described both as an inundation and as torrential rainfall (7, 11).

As far as the word הָעַשׁ itself is concerned, Assyriologists assign it to the Akkadian babātu.bu, bibīlu or bibibitu ‘inundation’ from 3N(r)l ‘wash away’ (cf. Zimmer, Akkad. Fremdw., p. 44, Meissner, Mitt d. Vorderas. Ges. x, 238, and Delitzsch, HWB., p. 107). In regard to the etymological aspect of both the Hebrew and Akkadian words, one might well concur, in the view of their common origin, that they are to be derived from a root common to Akkadian and Hebrew, חַשׁ or הש, but not in regard to their usage. For whereas in Hebrew הש is the exclusive expression for deluge, in Akkadian it is the analogous expression babātu.bu, bibīlu, or bibibitu, but it is a quite different word, never adopted by Hebrew, viz. abātu which we find as the standing term for deluge in all the Akkadian texts (cf. e.g. Gilgamel XI, i, 14, iii, 4, 19, 22, iv, 20 ff., etc.). Moreover the הש coincides with none of the three mentioned Akkadian forms but is on the contrary a perfectly regular, though rare, derivative from a root חַשׁ or החש which is represented in Hebrew, and similarly to the Akkadian 3N(r)l means ‘wash away, flood, stream’ as the use of חַשׁ and חַשׁ for ‘flow, stream’ proves most conclusively.

The usual rendering of הָעַשׁ as ‘inundation’ is quite correct, as it is clearly stated in Gen. 7, 11 that the fountains of the great deep, i.e. the world-ocean, (cf. above p. 130), were opened. Now in this verse and also in 4, 12 the deluge is equally described as a ‘strong rain’ (3N(r)l) which poured forth from the openings (3N(r)l) of heaven.1 Thus our deluge-story so far agrees with the Babylonian, as in all the Sumerian and Akkadian versions known to us the deluge is succinctly characterized as a ‘strong rain’;2 on the other hand it is far from certain whether in the Babylonian the conception of an inundation is also present, as the exact meaning of abātu has not been determined, and according to Delitzsch, HWB., p. 4, and others, has the more general meaning of ‘desolation’. While in the Babylonian we can find no sure parallel for הָעַשׁ deluge, as ‘inundation’ neither linguistically in the word abātu nor in the content of all the Babylonian flood stories, we are nevertheless furnished by Egyptian with a solid background for the הָעַשׁ as inundation and in addition with other points of contact which in many respects are of great importance for the Hebrew narrative, as we shall soon see.

In a text preserved in two papyri from the period of the 19th dynasty, in which, however, much older legendary material is incorporated, reference is made to the ‘quarrelling and discord’ among the ‘children of Nut (the goddess of heaven’), with Osiris, and there is allusion to a great flood in which the ‘windows of heaven’ are opened.2

1 Meissner, Babyloniens und Assyriens, ii, p. 108 and 112 arbitrarily represents this Babylonian conception the idea that when the ‘windows of heaven’ open, the heavenly ocean is poured forth as rain upon the earth. Unfortunately I am nevertheless unable to find any support for this either in the language or conceptions of the Babylonians. Meissner seems indeed to have used the Hebrew text of Gen. 7, 11 as proof for his purely hypothetical Babylonian conception. It is true that in one instance it is said that in the month of Tilir ‘the door of the apsu opens (bab aps apiret)’, F. Weidner, Handbuch der bab. Astron., p. 86, col. ii, 1. 35; as, however, Weidner, p. 91 f. remarks, apsu here means neither the heavenly nor the earthly ocean, but a sacred apartment in the Temple, and the opening of the door of the apsu refers to a particular ceremony which took place every year in this month. But even if apsu should mean the heavenly ocean, Meissner, loc. cit., i, p. 86 assumes, the ‘door of the apsu’ would in no way correspond to the הָעַשׁ which he himself renders ‘windows of heaven’.

2 Cf. Gen. 8, 6. It is obvious that the sending forth of the dove and of the raven was effected through the window, as it was wider and more convenient than a trelissed dormer. Moreover the storm had already subsided and the window could then have remained open till the water was dried up’, 8, 7.
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primeval time, by which the world was completely inundated and put back to its original state when the primal water, Nun (memn), filled the whole of the universe.1 The following words are placed in the mouth of the primal god Atum: 'Forsooth will I destroy all that I have made. This land will perish in the Nun through a flood, as it was in its primal beginning I (alone) will remain together with Osiris'.2

For inundation in both texts we have the word ḫaššu, which is to be taken as substantive of a re-duplicated root ḫu, the basic meaning of which is 'to flow, to stream' (Er.Gr., p.160), but which frequently occurs in the meaning of 'flood, inundation'; so also of the overflow of the Nile (cf. Naville, ad loc.). In Pyl. 1146 we find ḫu of used of the flood of the primal water,3 and Pyl. 707 of the flood of the 'great Sea';4 the word ḫu was also used of the flooding of the sea, as e.g. Pup. ḫu.l x; 6 (= Lit. 156); 'Then the sea saw the maiden and flooded up (ḫu) behind her.' The meaning 'inundation' is thus certain for ḫuššu, and as reduplicated roots usually serve to intensify and heighten the meaning, ḫuššu obviously denotes a very powerful, unusually severe inundation. We, therefore, have in ḫuššu a word completely equivalent to ḫuššu both in the basic meaning of 'streaming, flowing' as also in the extension of meaning 'flow' to 'flood and inundate'. Even assuming that ḫuššu was not first coined by the Hebrews

1 Cf. the beginning of the 17th chapter of the Book of the Dead, ed. Naville, p.193; 16 f. (= Text A) and in the Book of Anu, ed. Budge, Facsimile of the paper of Anu in the British Museum, 1900, pl. 33 (= Text B). See Naville, PSBA. 26 (1914); A mention of a Flood in the Book of the Dead, p. 257-79; and 287-94; this was later also reproduced by Ranken in AOTP, p. 6 f., both in the Texts A and B reveal some differences, but not in the passage under consideration, except as to a few words lacking in A.

2 The passage reads (Text A, l. 16 (deficient) and Text B, l. 17 f. (complete)) as follows:

'Lo-y get r ḫy fr-im-y nbt ti ti pn r ḫy m nmr m ḫuššu my ḫy-g이 tak ḫy st m. The words ti pn r ḫy m nmr m ḫuššu do not mean, as Naville, p. 193 assumes, 'this earth will become water (or an ocean) through an inundation, nor as Ranken cit., renders 'this earth will become as Nun, inundated', as is formerly was', but: 'and the land will come into the Nun because of a flood', i.e. that the world, which the Egyptian identified with his country, would perish in the Nun through a mighty flood. The construction of the sentence presents no grammatical difficulty. On the use of the preposition m for 'in, into' and 'by, by means of', cf. Erman, Gramm., § 445; for ḫy m 'to go into something' cf. Ag. WB., l. 37.

3 Of the dead one, that he was 'a flowing of a great flood (r̥ḫu ḫu); 'gone forth when the water went forth', i.e. that he was like the Nun when its arose as water and flooded the universe.

4 Literally ḫuḥu n wrw šr means 'the flood of the great green', as the Mediterranean Sea was generally called, but here is employed metaphorically and metaphorically for the multitude of blessings reserved for the dead.

4 The Expression ḫuššu 'to blot out' and the Egyptian ḫh

In the Egyptian passage about the flood just cited there is another expression that arouses attention in that it coincides in highly remarkable fashion with a Hebrew word in the flood-story: for 'annihilate, destroy' the Egyptian text has ḫhwy with the basic meaning 'make white', 'scratch out' 'blot out' for which the Hebrew text Gen. 6,7, 7, 4 and 23 has ḫy which has the same concrete and also extended meaning as the Egyptian. The sentence uttered by Atum (in the text cited l. 13): ḫy get r ḫy fr-im-y nbt meaning literally: 'I will, however, blot out everything that I have made', reads almost like Gen. 6, 7: ḫwmy ḫuššu ḫy fr-im-y nbt 'I will blot out man that I have created', and 7,4: ḫwmy ḫuššu ḫhwy 'I will blot out every living substance that I have made'. In this last passage the phrase ḫhwy ḫwmy coincides even more closely to the Egyptian ḫw fr-im-y 'that I have made'.

So striking an agreement between Hebrew and Egyptian in the flood-stories cannot be accidental. It is rather an indication of the fact that the Hebrew narrative in the form in which it has come down to us was composed in a milieu in which myths, like that to which the Egyptian flood-text alludes, were widespread. Hence it is that our narrative contains phrases and expressions which betray a thoroughly Egyptian colouring, and which could very well have eminated from a store of such Egyptian flood-
5. The Egyptian origin of גשם 'Rain'.

Besides גשמי denom. of גשם 'rain' Gen. 7,4, which is common to all Semitic languages, including Akkadian, and which actually occurs in the text of the Babylonian story of the deluge, we find that Gen. 7,12 and 8,2 use the word גשמי which does not exist in any other Semitic language in this meaning. This leads to the assumption that it is not a genuine Hebrew word. Furthermore, in the Bible as a rule it means rain; nevertheless, in passages like Zech. 10,1 where גשמי stands in status constructus to גשמי, or Job 37,6 where the reverse occurs, גשמי governing גשמי must denote a wider conception, not confined merely to rain, but extending also to its concomitant phenomena. As a matter of fact in Egyptian the word גשמי means storm or sea-storm e.g. Pap. Insinger 4,1: 'Dispair not on account of wind (גשמי), of shipwreck and of storm (gしまい). The same word is preserved in Coptic גしまい (B), גしまい (S) Spiegelb. KWB 378, meaning 'storm with heavy cloud, rainstorm'. All this indicates that גしまい is an Egyptian loan-word with the same comprehensive meaning, and it appears that the Hebrew narrator intentionally selected this expression to describe the deluge as a mighty rainstorm. From the two passages cited Zech. 10,1 and Job 37,6 as well as others like 1 Kings 18,45; Ez. 13,11; 38,22; Prov. 25,23 it is clear that in the use of גしまい, a reminiscence of the original meaning 'storm, strong rain' was still present. On close examination of all remaining passages with גしまい one can further detect the nuance of difference between גしまい and גしまい whereas גしまい is an ordinary rain, גしまい is like a cloudburst, a tearing, pelting rain, such as actually occurs at the beginning and close of the rainy season in Palestine (Joel 2,25).

1 Cfr. e.g. Rag., p. 105, col. i, l. 15 ubiestum liminarnimo 'the clouds shall rain', etc.

2 Cfr. also Peyron, suppl. p. 19. In many Biblical passages גしまい is used for dark clouds, darkness, etc. The original meaning is doubtless 'clouds-masses'. That גしまい is only to be found in Demotic is no criterion whatever for the age of the word. There are other words in Demotic and Coptic which at first were unknown from Egyptian but were found later, on the basis of newly discovered documents, to have been quite ancient. Moreover the Bohairic, Syrian and Sah. are actually point to an originally Egyptian g, i.e. גしまい, exactly as in the Hebrew גしまい. It is strange that this word in the above meaning is missing in Ap. Wix. v. 206 though it occurs in Pap. Insinger.

3 The idea conveyed by the rendering of לַיהַנֵי as 'moderately' is in drastic conflict with the characteristic of the first rainfall in the Holy Land. On the contrary the prophet means that the people should rejoice because of the abundance of the rain in which the very לַיהַנֵי i.e. beneficence bestowed on the land consists. As to לַיהַנֵי instead of the usual לַיהַנֵי, it is not at all impossible that both words were used in Palestine for the first rainfall; otherwise we must assume that the writing of לַיהַנֵי is a copyist's error due to the similarity of these two letters in the ancient Hebrew alphabet, or to the vicinity of the D in לַיהַנֵי which makes
6. The Rainbow.

For rainbow Gen 9.13ff. has רַעְשָׁן a common Semitic word, which is also represented in the Akkadian hátatu, which, however, is used exclusively for a shooting weapon. Only in Egyptian do we find the word ḫw.t ‘bow’ both for a shooting weapon and an arc in the sky. Thus e.g. Pyr. 393ff. speaking of the appearance of the dead king in the Beyond: ‘The heaven storms, the stars fade, the bows (ḫw.t-ṣfr) stagger when they see him’. Similarly in Pyr. 1443 and Pyr. 1572 ḫw.t is connected with heaven: ‘Washed (i.e. cleaned) is the surface of heaven, bright is the bow (ḫw.t)’ and ‘Opened are the doors of heaven (in ’eṣer ḫw.t), opened are the doors of the bows (in ’eṣer ḫw.t-ṣfr), obviously denoting the interior structure of the sky.

This conception also underlies רַעְשָׁן: it was conceived, as by the Egyptians, as an essential part of the heavenly building viz. as a permanent portion of the solid vault of heaven, and not that it was caused by a rain-storm, still less that it was the momentary effect of a play of colour in the rays of the sun, knowledge of which was completely foreign to the ancient world.

The symbolic significance of the phenomenon does not consist in the melodramatic appearance of the rainbow, but in the fact that when catastrophic rainstorms fill the world with terror, and the danger of a cataclysm by a deluge is thought imminent, the impenetrable cloud is pierced, and the hidden vault of heaven, otherwise invisible, is suddenly revealed in all its multi-hued glory as renewed confirmation of the Divine covenant with man, to indicate that so long as heaven is supported

1 The true rendering is ‘bow, or arc of sky’; ‘rainbow’ is only a later interpretation of the phenomenon as a sign of the cessation of the rain-storm.

2 The very fact that in Akkadian the rainbow is not designated by hátatu as in Hebrew makes it clear that it was not the Babylonian conception which was associated with רַעְשָׁן. In Akkadian the word for ‘rainbow’ is tir-an-na, i.e. ‘abode of the god of Heaven’ (M. Jastrow, Relig. d. Assy. u. Bahl., ii, 684, n. 5). This meaning was established, contrary to other views, by R. C. Thompson, The Reports of the Magicians, 253, on the basis of many passages (Jastrow, loc. cit., ii, 376, n. 2). In any case the expression in Akkadian for ‘rainbow’ has nothing whatever to do with ‘shooting bow’, although the word hátatu in Akkadian for ‘shooting bow’ is just as frequent as in Hebrew, cf. also Jeremias, Handbuch d. Alter. Geisteswelt, 39f. For an extensive discussion of rainbow phenomena and observations in Babylonia, cf. Virolleaud, Étude sur la Divination Chaldéenne, Paris, 1903-12, Add., no. 212, Supplement, no. lviii and lxi; also Messinae, Assyriens und Babylonien, ii, 258 and Verhandlungen der Sitz, Ges. d. W., phil.-hist. Kl., 67, 2. Moreover in Babylonia the rainbow was regarded as a good omen for astrological predictions. Finally it is very important to note that in the Babylonian deluge-stories the motif of the rainbow is completely lacking.

it obvious beyond all doubt that nothing else can be meant here than the first and last rainfall.

1 Although this is not the place to go into the question bow the fusion of the various elements in the Biblical story as it has come down to us took place, we may straightforwardly establish the fact that the passages in which the Flood appears as rain reveal points of contact with the Babylonian deluge-stories, whereas the dates marking the subsequent phases of the Flood are contained in those passages in which the Flood is represented as inundation. Thus the Egyptian elements can be distinctly differentiated from the older Babylonian tradition and easily recognized as a new overlay. As we shall presently see, the chronology of the Flood has an Egyptian orientation.
by this arc the earth shall not perish. In the use of נָרַג as shooting bow and arc we have an exact adaptation to the usage of the Egyptian pd.t.  

It should be expressly emphasized that elsewhere נָרַג in the meaning of rainbow only occurs in Ezek. 1, 28. In Habakkuk 3, 6 נָרַג is used poetically for a shooting weapon, not for a rainbow, for the reason that here the reference is to a devastating storm and נָרַג is conceived as a means of annihilation, which could obviously not be said of the rainbow, as its appearance is on the contrary a symbol of the preservation of the world. The same applies also to Ps. 7, 13 where it is impossible for נָרַג to have been conceived as rainbow. Here too it was used poetically as a Divine weapon, parallel to the 'Sword of God'.

7. The Two Seasons.

In Gen. 11, 22 פּ אָב 'seed' and פּ נָרַג 'harvest', פּ 'cold' and פּ ה 'heat', פּ 'summer' and פּ נָרַג 'winter' are used to designate the seasons. That here there is a division into two and not four seasons is obvious from the fact that פּ ה is used in the Bible always for winter, never for autumn, and that on the assumption of the division into four seasons, פּ would here have to correspond to the spring, which is, however, unthinkable. As a matter of fact, all three word-pairs have always been used generally as antithetic designations for two half-years. The question merely arises why, in addition to פּ אָב 'sowing period' and פּ נָרַג 'harvest time', two further pairs of opposing expressions פּ ה and פּ אָב, פּ נָרַג and פּ נָרַג are mentioned for summer and winter. The view that the first refers to climatic and the latter to agricultural conditions, that is the harvest (cf. inter alia Gunkel's Commentary ad loc.), is incorrect for the simple reason that פּ נָרַג never refers to the fruit crop but only to the rainy season. Moreover only the fruit harvest in autumn could have been meant, as there is none in winter. On the other hand in this case פּ אָב would also have included the corn harvest, which is, however, never the case. Thus both these pairs can only refer to climatic conditions, and the double designation can only be explained by the fact that the author had in mind lands of different climatic conditions in which the marks of distinction between summer and winter were not the same. As a matter of fact, this is in reality the case: פּ אָב really means 'aridity, dryness', and פּ נָרַג 'wet, moisture'. They can therefore apply only to those lands in which winter is characterized by rain, and summer by drought. פּ אָב implying 'cold' and פּ ה 'warmth', 'heat' are applicable only

1 For the conception of pd.t as heavenly bow or arc, cf. also Pyl. 2140, 2401 and 3600.
2 On another occasion we shall revert to this question in a chapter on Times and Festivals.
of the Sun-god Aton: 'He makes the seasons (tr.w) by months: the scorching season (kh) according to his will, and the cold season (hbb) according to his will' (cf. Breasted, *De Hymnis in Solem*, p. 68). It was indeed so repugnant to the Egyptian to regard winter as a rainy period, that in the same Song of Ebenaten, it is emphasized as a special grace of the gods that Egypt was not dependent upon rain from heaven like the lands of the barbarians, but it received all blessings straight from the Nile that came from the nether world.¹

There is another very important point to be considered, viz. that 𓊋𓊫 sowing period occurs only here, whereas elsewhere 𓊋𓊫 ploughing period is used antithetically to 𓊋𓊫 harvest period, and this gives rise to the assumption that the author in using 𓊋𓊫 sowing period had actually the Egyptian word *pr.t* 'seed' for winter in mind. In Egypt it is not so much ploughing as sowing that is characteristic, and this is the reason why the Egyptian did not designate the winter as a 'ploughing period' like 𓊋𓊫 in Palestine, but as the sowing period *pr.t* 'seed' = 𓊋𓊫. Perhaps our author gave preference to the term 𓊋𓊫 for the additional reason that it was at the same time applicable to Egypt and to all other lands. This would also explain why 𓊋𓊫 is used only in this passage whereas elsewhere, when Egypt does not come especially into consideration, the word 𓊋𓊫 is used. Finally we would add that also 𓊋 and 𓊋 are only here used for the seasons. All this evidence clearly points to the fact that the author in his choice of the various designations for the seasons had Egypt vividly in mind.

summer when they are destroyed by the glow of the sun; the creator has all his works in his power, has determined a time for their animation and another time for their destruction; everything rises and perishes at its appointed time. That is, in my view, the meaning of our passage. The reading *it* is quite correct and relates collectively to the creatures (tr.w), whereas *seems to be an emendation based on misunderstanding. In Laps. Tob. 169, 4 *dp* occurs actually in conjunction with *kh* in the sense of 'consume, destroy', and this may have been in the mind of the author of the hymn, thus supporting our view. It is said there of a god-demon that 'from his mouth comes forth a burning to consume the souls (of the dead) (pr *h k *r.w *e *dp *h.w). The difficulty felt by Erman (Lit., 306, Engl. 293) is thus removed. It should be considered that 'tasting' of the glow of the sun in summer can hardly be meant, but that on the other hand it is in winter that the sun can be 'tasted'.

¹ Line 22: 'The Nile in heaven (meaning the rain) thou givest over to the mountain lands (i.e. foreign peoples, etc.), but the (true) Nile comes forth from the nether world for Egypt'. Cf. Lit. 291. It is noteworthy the same is said with reference to Canaan, Deut. 11, 10, but in another sense as will be shown elsewhere.

² The only occasion on which 𓊋𓊫 ploughing time is used antithetically to 𓊋𓊫 'reaping time' in reference to Egypt is in the conversation of Joseph with his brethren, Gen. 45: 6; this is because the narrator is referring to Canaan the home of his brethren, after he had revealed himself to them, and therefore makes him say 'ploughing time' which is more in conformity with soil conditions there, instead of 'sowing time'. Cf. above p. 6.

³ The duration of the Babylonian deluge, according to Gilg., xi, iii, s.f, was six, and according to the Sumerian version, seven days, lasting altogether until the earth was dry thirty-nine or forty days, if one assumes a period of seven days each for the sending out of the swallow and the raven. The season is not given, but obviously the rainy period is presumed, as the six or seven days' duration of the rainstorms corresponds to the duration of the first rains at the beginning of winter in Mesopotamia.

⁴ On this question as well as on the divergent figures in the chronology of the Flood in the Pentateuch, in the LXX and other Greek texts, as well as in the Book of Jubilees, cf. especially Duhse, *ZAW*, 38 (1908), 7 ff. and Gunther, *Komm. zu Gen. 8, 13-15*; these questions, however, had already occupied the ancient (cf. *Reb Hattan*, 11 f.) as well as the later rabbinical exegetes Rashi, Ibn Ezra and others.

8. Duration and Chronology of the Flood.

For the phases of the flood the following data are given: It begins on the seventeenth of the second month (Gen. 7, 11), the water rises 150 days (7, 24) and reaches a height of fifteen ells above the highest mountain peaks; on the first of the tenth month the highest summits of the mountains become visible (8, 3), on the first of the first month of the following year the waters recede (8, 12) and on the twenty-seventh of the second month the earth is dry (8, 14).

The only clear points of importance in these data are: (i) that the duration of the flood extends over a complete year, a view which we find also in the Book of Enoch 126, 15; (ii) that this year does not end on the same day as it began, viz. the seventeenth of the second but on the twenty-seventh; and (iii) that the rise of the waters lasts 150 days.

The assumption that the 150 days are reckoned to be five months on the basis of thirty days each, as is actually done in the Book of Jubilees 5, 27, forms the starting point for the question, whether the whole flood-year is to be regarded as a lunar or solar year, a question which, however, has hitherto not been decided.² For on the basis of a thirty days' month neither the one nor the other year can be adjusted: the former not, because five lunar months would only give 146-7 days, and the latter not, because 12 x 30 = 360, and does not yield the 365 days of a solar year. This question indeed cannot be solved, because either a lunar or a solar year alone could have been thought of. Even those who see in the ten to eleven days (from the seventeenth to the twenty-seventh of the second month) an adjustment of the difference between a lunar and a solar year leave unanswered the question according to which system the months themselves within this year are reckoned. Moreover on the ground of such an assumption in this connexion the difficulty is overlooked that the intercalation of the ten to eleven days is effected at the end of the year, a procedure which certainly requires some explanation.
Another question which has also been much discussed is the sequence of the months in the flood year, i.e., whether by the ‘first month’ Gen. 8, 3; *Nisân* or *Tīrî* is to be understood. The fact that the flood begins in the second month and that the rise of the waters lasted five months, leads to the view that the climatic conditions of a land like Babylonia or Palestine were in mind, for there the rainy period begins in the second winter month terminating after about five months. Thus in this case the ‘first month’ would be *Tīrî*. Against this, however, is the insurmountable difficulty that in the Pentateuch and elsewhere the ‘first month’ always means the first Spring month, i.e. *Nisân*, consequently the second month can only be the second Spring and not the second Winter month, and accordingly the flood must have begun in summer, and not in winter. Actually the view of the Book of Jubilees, is that the flood began in the second Spring month. This results from the fact that Jub. 6, 17 Noah’s exit from the Ark is assigned to the first of the third month and the remark is added that this is the month in which the Feast of Weeks (נִשָּׁעַר) is celebrated. As this festival is celebrated on the sixth *Sēdaq* obviously this month must be meant, and consequently the first month can only be *Nisân*. According to this reckoning, the climatic conditions neither of Babylonia nor of Palestine can have been in mind in connexion with the flood, and it remains incomprehensible, at any rate very remarkable, that the flood should have begun in the Spring and extended over the Summer.

But the most important question, of fundamental significance for the interpretation of the flood-story itself, as well as for the calendar question, is whether there is a system by which the duration and the dates of the flood are reckoned, and if so what that system is? Is it possible to find an acceptable, coherent basis for them or are they merely haphazard figures?

If in this case also we turn our eyes to Egypt, whence, as we have seen, the conception of the flood as inundation has been taken over and interwoven in the Biblical narrative, and consider the various phases of the inundatory conditions of the Nile in its rise and fall, we arrive at the surprising fact that the chief and most important data of the Flood are given in a most remarkable manner with those of the overflowing of the Nile.

As is well known the onset of the Nile flood depends primarily on the

The fact that the Book of Jubilees adds to the Flood dates a date also for the exit of Noah from the Ark which it assigned to the first of the third month was obviously with the intention of supplying a historical foundation for the Feast of Weeks (נִשָּׁעַר) as well as for the Pesah (Ex. 12, 17) and Sukkōt (Lev. 23, 43) Festivals in the Pentateuch. In a chapter on Times and Festivals, we shall show, however, that particularly in the case of the Feasts of Weeks such a foundation was not necessary.

1 H. G. Lyons, Ptolemy’s Geography of the River Nile, Cairo, 1906, is of all the older and newer works the best informed on the rise of the Nile and its variations on the strength of more than thirty years’ measurements and observations at various points (cf. especially p. 350 ff.). Also his essay in the Geographical Journal, 56 (1903), p. 249 ff.; also Erman-Ranke, 16.

2 This has been the case at all times, as is shown by the fact that most of the Nilometers are to be found in Upper and Lower Egypt. Cf. below p. 256, n. 1. Moreover the difference at various points of the Nile does not consist in the duration, but in the dates of the beginning and ending, of the rise of the Nile.

3 The 100 days given by Greek writers for the duration of the Nile flood would correspond only to the middle figure which fluctuates between the limits of a period of 100 days.
took the Nile flood as the basis of his calculation, everything becomes straightway clear:

1. The duration of the flood extends over a full year, like the Nile flood.

2. The 150 days correspond to the period within the two limits between the onset of the rise of the Nile at the beginning of May, and the highest water level at the beginning of October, i.e., five months.

3. The recession of the flood begins after the expiry of 150 days and is carried out in three stages: first the water falls by 15 ells so that the highest mountain peaks become visible on the first of the tenth month (Gen. 8, 3); then the water recedes further, till on the first of the month of the second year it dries up from the surface of the earth (8, 13) though the ground still remains moist; finally also this moisture vanishes, and on the twenty-seventh of the second month (8, 14) complete dryness ensues.

4. It becomes evident that here also the sequence of months remains consonant with the customary usage of the Pentateuch, so that the first month is Nisan and thus the flood actually begins in the second spring month just at the point when the rise of the Nile begins.

5. It is only by calculating the chronology of the flood on the basis of the Nile that it can be explained why the deluge took place in summer and not in winter, and only the beginning of the rise of the Nile in May provides us with the key to the solution of the question why the flood began in the second spring month. Even the more exact dating of the seventeenth of the second month could tentatively be explained, on the assumption that the Flood was assigned by our author to a year, which, according to his reckoning, began six to seven weeks before the onset of the rise of the Nile in Upper or Lower Egypt.1

Of course, the two first dates (May–October) are the most important and, therefore, coincide more exactly with those of the rise of the Nile. But even for the period of the recession of the waters he follows the successive stages of the fall of the Nile, namely: (1) The soil becoming visible when the river returns to its bed, for which it takes something over two months. (2) The time when the soil is still sodden, lasting about three months till the seed takes root. (3) The time of about six to eight weeks till the soil is completely dried out by the sun.2 It is, however, of importance to point out

---

1 This date is one of the most important factors in the whole structure of the chronology of Genesis, as well as in the question of the combined lunar and solar calendar in the Pentateuch, and will be dealt with elsewhere in connection with these questions.

2 Note the difference in the expressions 12 1/2 and 12 1/2 Gen. 8, 13 1/2: the first denotes the
As will be seen it cannot at all be taken for granted that all five months were equal units of thirty days each. On the other hand it must not be overlooked that the question whether a lunar or solar year is implied cannot be decided for the Deluge year alone, since it cannot be isolated and regarded as independent of all connexion with the chronology of the creation of the patriarchs, and even of calendar calculations throughout the Pentateuch. This is all the less the case seeing that the Flood year begins in the second month of the year and thus presumes a quite established calendar reckoning. Furthermore, as we have shown that the Flood story rests on a combined lunar and solar reckoning it is quite impossible to assume that between the second and seventh months five successive full months of thirty days each could be placed. The very fact that the 150 days do not start at the beginning of a year, nor even at the beginning of a month, renders it in the highest degree improbable that the rounding off of 150 days was dependent on any calendar consideration. The author can have had in mind neither a lunar nor a solar month, but only a certain period taken over as a whole from another environment, and this was the period of the rise of the Nile, which, as we have just seen, begins in the middle of a month and lasts five months. It was indeed this distinct period of time which had been familiar to him in Egypt and which was reckoned by the Egyptians (not by the author of the Flood story!), at five months of thirty days each, making a total of 150 days. For it was particularly the Egyptians who, in fixing the month, did not adhere strictly to the observation or circulation of the new moon, but arbitrarily rounded off the months into twelve units of thirty days each, and at the end of 360 days added five epagomenal days in order to attain the 365 days of a complete solar year. The first period of the Flood thus corresponds both in months and days to the Egyptian reckoning of five months, the duration of the rise of the Nile. The number of 150 days is an adopted round figure which has no connexion with the calculation of the Flood year per se, and cannot enter into this question. The only decisive factors are those above-mentioned, namely: the sequence of the months for the calculation of the month by the moon, and the addition of the ten to eleven days for the calculation of the year by the sun. Thus the chief obstacle on which all attempts at a solution have been shattered is

removed, and there is no longer anything against the assumption that the Flood-year was actually based on a combined lunar and solar reckoning.¹

By the establishment of an Egyptian orientation for the chronology of the Flood, the difficulty mentioned above, p. 220, as to the mode of procedure in adding the epagomenal days is solved. The fact that the ten to eleven days are added at the end of the year necessarily leads to the assumption that our author must have been familiar with such a system. This knowledge can only have been derived from Egypt where, as we have seen, this system was employed. He simply followed the Egyptian model, with the difference that whereas the Egyptians added only five days owing to the fact that they had a solar year of 365 days but no lunar months, he had to add ten to eleven days so as to have a complete year of 365 days for the Flood.²

Finally attention may be drawn to another round figure in connexion with the Flood to which hitherto no importance has been attached, but which nevertheless has its good reason, and can only be explained by comparison of the Flood with the Nile overflow. According to Gen. 7, 11 the water of the flood rose 15 ells above the highest peaks of the mountains. This height corresponds in a very remarkable fashion with the rise of the Nile flood from the lowest to the highest level, which from very early times has been established at 15 ells and a fraction. Thus all the Nile stages from various times dating from the Second Millennium B.C. down to the latest one constructed in the eighth century A.D. at Rosetta in Cairo, have a scale of 16 ells. The level of between 15 and 16 ells has at all times been regarded as the norm for a full overflow of the Nile. Even

¹ If the Flood year—as strangy enough is generally done—is taken as an isolated year with its own reckoning beginning at the seventeenth of the second month, then within the framework of the lunar and solar calendar the 150 days could be fitted into five months by including the seventeenth of the seventh month, for in a lunar year of 355 days, the first three months have thirty days each, the fourth twenty-nine, and the fifth thirty, totalling 149, so that with the seventeenth of the seventh month we get a round figure of 150 days; at any rate the dates given in the Hebrew text are shown above to be correct. The fixing of the beginning of the flood on the twenty-seventh of the second month in the Greek versions is an emendation based on misunderstanding.

² This palpable knowledge of an intercalary system is of great importance, because it admits of the conclusion that such a system was introduced also in relation to the Festival calendar of the Pentateuch. This we shall discuss at greater length in the chapter on Times and Festivals and at the same time consider the views propounded by Dillmann, Monatsh. d. Berl. Akad., 1881, p. 914 ff., B. Jacob, der Pentateuch, p. 366 ff. Ed. König, ZDMG. 60 (1905), p. 605 ff., and Ed. Mahler, Monats. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judenth., 1929, p. 224. He would technically be right in saying that the Flood year is to be taken as a regal year if it could be proved beyond doubt that the months were throughout reckoned as equal units of 30 days each, which, however, is not the case, as indicated above.

That in so short a story as that of the Tower of Babel clearer traces of its Babylonian origin have been preserved than in other much longer Genesis stories is primarily to be explained by the fact that the ancient scene of this story lay in Babylon itself. It is only natural that the original impress should have been preserved by the Hebrews in spite of later wanderings and vicissitudes. This is already shown by the phraseology at the beginning of the narrative 11, 3: $\text{הָעֲנַיָּהּ} \text{הַשְּׁכִית} \text{הַשְּׁפַר} \text{הַשְּׁמָוֹן} \text{הַשְּׁמַעְתּ}. This sentence corresponds in all respects to the Akkadian mode of expression, and also shows familiarity with building techniques in Babylon. $\text{עָנַי} \text{שְׁכִית} \text{שְׁפַר} \text{שְׁמָוֹן} \text{שְׁמַעְתּ}$ is used here exactly in the same sense as the Akkadian $\text{lātu} \text{ibidu}$ ‘brick making’; $\text{עָנַי}$ is the same word as $\text{ibidu}$, $\text{libbu}$ for sun-dried bricks, and $\text{שְׁכִית}$ refers to the fire-baked bricks. The suggestion that these words refer to $\text{שְׁמָוֹן}$ is incorrect because $\text{שְׁמָוֹן}$ conveys the idea of making a kind of brick called $\text{שְׁמַעְתּ}$ which as we have seen is a sun-dried brick; therefore.

1 The oldest Nilometer still completely preserved is to be found in a temple in Thebes from the period of the 18th dynasty (Blücher, 1906, p. 311). The Nilometer in Elephantine already described by Strabo, and till recently in use (ibid., p. 337), has the scale of 16 ells. But though this is from the period of the Roman Emperors, it obviously replaced a much more ancient one. The remains of other early Nilometers are also preserved at Philae (ibid., p. 344) and at Kalabsha (Thalmäus), about 30 kilometres south of Assuan (ibid., p. 204), dating perhaps from the period of Amenophis II. On the arrangement of such a Nilometer see ibid., p. 337. The description given by Strabo of the Nilometer at Elephantine also applies to other Nilometers, including the Arabic Nilometer ($\text{mīqāt}$) built by the Kalif Bulusman, 715 on the island of Roda near Cairo. The oldest traces of water gauge marks still preserved are probably those of the period of Setosiris II (1720–1702 B.C.) on the sand-stone rock at Semna, not far from the second cataract (Erman-Ranke, p. 595 and Blücher, pp. 93, 380). A graphic representation of the scale of 16 ells is shown on a statue of the Nile god preserved in the Vatican, with sixteen figures of men standing above one another in climbing attitude indicating the 16 ells (Erman-Ranke, p. 16). According to the Arab historian and geographer Al-Maqrizi (born 1354), the Copts at the time of the conquest of Egypt by Omar the ex-Aji, 632 regarded the ancient measure of over 15 ells as essential and sacrificed to the Nile a virgin as ‘bride’ when this height was not reached. ‘To-day the highest state of the Nile is called nafa en-Nil, i.e. ‘the completion of the Nile’, or ‘the fulfilled promise of the Nile’, and until recently was publicly proclaimed as soon as a height of 213 feet (= 64.6 metres or 201 feet) was reached. Cf. Meyers, Führer durch Ägypten, 1914, p. 955, E. W. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, chapter 26, and Encyclop. of Islam, s.v. Cairo, 4.

THE EGYPTIAN ELEMENTS IN THE FLOOD STORY

In a building inscription of Nabopolassar concerning the restoration work he carried out in the decayed ancient Step-Tower E-teqen-an-ki of E-sag-ila, the chief temple of Babylon, we find a sentence almost literally coinciding with Gen. 11, 3: It reads: alib in lutibin libnitum usatik agurr ‘I caused air bricks to be made, and burnt bricks to be formed’ (VAB IV, p. 60, col. II, 5–6).

Moreover the expression used in reference to the height of the Tower in the words ‘that its top may reach to heaven’ recalls a similar phrase

1 Akkadian $\text{lebētu}$ in stat. consat. $\text{libbu}$, pl. $\text{libnīt}$ is ‘sun-dried brick’, and $\text{agurr}$ ‘fire-baked kiln-stone’ burnt in an oven (hebi–$\text{ibibu}$, or $\text{uṣur}$ (=$\text{qur}$)); $\text{libbu}$ is ‘making, hardening the bricks’ and $\text{libnīt}$ is ‘brick maker’. Cf. Besold, Bab. Assy. Glossar, 166 and 157 b.

2 Cf. Del, WB, p. 19 b, for other examples of the connotation of sun-dried and kiln-baked bricks. Moreover it appears to me that agurr like $\text{qur}$ is to be derived from a root $\text{agur}$, which must have meant ‘to burn’ or otherwise agurr could not have acquired the specific meaning of ‘burnt brick’. Though agurr in this meaning has not yet been found in Akkadian, it has been preserved in Chaldean in $\text{aqār}$ ‘to stoke’ which is obviously a $\text{qur}$'al form of $\text{aqur}$; e.g. $\text{qur}$ $\text{uṣur}$ ‘to stoke a furnace’, Targum on Ezek. 39, 9. Cf. also other examples in Levy, Neuḫb. WB, s.v. It is to be differentiated from $\text{ṣūr}$ ‘to throw’ as in this case ‘furnace’ as object would be incomprehensible.
which repeatedly occurs in Babylonian building inscriptions. Thus in the
inscription already mentioned ad loc., p. 6o, col. i, 32–39: 'as far as con-
cerns the Step-Tower of Babel E-temen-an-ki which before my time was
tottering and decayed, Marduk bade me to lay its foundations on the breast
of the nether world and to make its top level with heaven' (rîšîtu šîmami
which would read in Hebrew ṯanut šw). This phrase is indeed very
ancient in Babylonia, and is to be found already in the Sumerian inscription
of King Gudea (about 2100 B.C.) in which it is said of the Temple E-ninmu
that it was built 'up to heaven' (VAB, i, p. 99, Cyl. a, l. 11), and further that
'tis terrifying glory would reach to heaven.' A similar statement is
made in the inscription of Nebukadnezir II on the restoration work of
E-temen-an-ki viz., that he 'built' its top (rîšîtu) 'so high that it' could
measure itself with the heaven (šîmami ana šidanunum).1 (VAB, iv,
p. 146, col. ii, ll. 7–11, cf. inter alia also Jeremias, Das A.T., p. 160 ff.,

Likewise, the expression 'to make oneself a name' Gen. 11, 4 ש"ה וֹרֶשְׁע
שֵׁנֶה, is the same as in Akkadian epil (make) šuma (name), e.g. the Adapa
Myth in RCG., p. 75, 59, šuma irtašuš 'he made himself a name'. But also
the entire phrase is to be found in the above-mentioned inscription of
Nebukadnezir II on the E-sag-ila Temple (VAB, iv, p. 80, no. 4, col. ii,
ll. 9–11): 'The fortress of E-sag-ila and Babylon I have strengthened and have
established (aššakhen) an eternal name (šumunum dårân) for my kingdom'.
All these expressions could be further substantiated by older Akkadian
inscriptions: we have merely chosen the passages cited because being
building inscriptions they are in subject matter and language akin to
the Hebrew text, and thus best reveal the identity in mode of speech.
From these parallels it is apparent that we have to do here with ancient
expressions current in Babylonia in all periods, and we can, therefore, very
well regard those in our story as reminiscences of the time when it was
taken over by the patriarchs in its original Babylonian dress.

Though, however, the Babylonian origin of this narrative is quite clearly
recognizable, it also reveals some features foreign to Babylonian which must
have been introduced later. As a matter of fact we find that also in this
case these elements are to be attributed to the influence of an Egyptian
milieu. It is first of all noteworthy that though the building 'of a town

1 The height of the Tower is also compared with the height of a mountain, e.g. in an
inscription of Nabopolassar (VAB, iv, p. 62, col. iii, l. 19–24): 'The Temple I built after
the pattern of E-bana, with joy and jubilation, like a mountain I made high its summit'
(kîma satânîm rîšîtu lu ullağum). Cf. also the inscription of Nebukadnezir II on E-sag-ila.
VAB, iv, p. 80, no. 4, col. ii, l. f. f.: 'Its summit (rîšîtu) I raised to mountain heights
(tadantu uallağûm)'.

1 In Egyptian r corresponds to a Semitic l. In Coptic mkr is rendered by merūn,
merūn = midjâl as in Hebrew. Cf. Burchardt, Altor, no. 327 f. and above n. 2.
CHAPTER VI

INTERPRETATION OF NAMES BY ASSONANT WORDS IN THE GENESIS STORIES AND THE NARRATIVES OF THE PATRIARCHS.

In connexion with our investigation of the pre-Egyptian epochs we deem it necessary to subject to a full examination the method of the Pentateuch explaining certain personal names by a play on words, or more generally speaking by a pun with a similar-sounding word. Such name-interpretations occur for the first time in the Genesis stories, then more frequently in the patriarchal narratives, and also in later portions of the Pentateuch. Though from a purely external point of view they can be generally characterized as assonant name-interpretations, intrinsically they can be grouped into the following categories:

1. Symbolical interpretation, as e.g. נִנָּה the second name of the woman from נֵנה because she was ‘mother of all living beings’, Gen. 3, 20; נֵנה from נֵנה ‘to place, to set, to put’, because his mother said at his birth: ‘for God has set for me another seed instead of Abel’, Gen. 4, 25; נֵנה from נֵנה to be divided, split; ‘for in his days was the earth divided’, Gen. 10, 24; נ from נ probably ‘luck’, for his mother said ‘fortune has come’, Gen. 30, 11; נֵנה from נֵנה ‘forget’, because the father said: ‘God hath made me forget all my misery’, or נֵנה from נֵנה ‘to make fruitful’, because he said: ‘God hath caused me to be fruitful in the land of my deprivation’, Gen. 41, 51 f.

2. Augural or auspicious interpretations, e.g. מ from מ ‘bring comfort’ because the father said: ‘This one shall comfort us’, Gen. 5, 29. Then most of the names of the Fathers of the tribes, as e.g. מַמָּא from מ ‘to see’ in conjunction with the preposition מ because the mother said: ‘God has seen my affliction’; מ from מ ‘hear’, for she said: ‘God has heard that I am despised’, Gen. 20, 12 f.; מ from מ ‘increase, augment’ for she said: ‘May God add to me another son’, Gen. 30, 24.

3. Anecdotal interpretations in which the name is motivated (i) by the origin of the person concerned, as e.g. מַמָּא, because he was created from מ ‘red earth’, Gen. 2, 7, see above, p. 145 f.; מַמָּא, the first name of the woman, because she was taken from מ ‘man’, Gen. 2, 23; (ii) by reference to a particular occurrence in connexion with the birth of the boy or to an experience of the mother before or at his birth, as e.g. מ from מ ‘laugh’.

See fuller details in Gunkel’s, Kommentar zu Genesis, p. 97 f.
because the mother laughed incredulously at the announcement of his birth by the angel, Gen. 18, 12 ff. (also 21, 6): הָגָּדָה from פֶּפֶּר 'hear' + הָגָדָה God, because God heard the mother in her distress, 15, 11; הָגָדָה from פֶּפֶּר 'heal', because at his birth he held fast to the heel of his brother Esau who was born before him, 25, 26 (also 27, 30); הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'red', because Esau, in his greediness, assailed Jacob to give him to eat of his red lentils, 25, 29; הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'to break forth, to push oneself forward', because he pushed himself forward at his birth in order to precede his brother, 38, 29; הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'draw', because he was drawn out of the water, Ex. 2, 10.

Similar interpretations are also found of place-names, e.g. הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'mix, confuse', because there God confused the tongues of men, Gen. 11, 9; הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'small', because this town was described as small, Gen. 19, 24 and 26; הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'heap of stones' + הָגָדָה 'witness', because there a stone heap was thrown up as a witness to the covenant concluded between Esau and Jacob, 31, 47; הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'camp' i.e. 'two camps' in remembrance of the meeting of Jacob's camp with a camp of angels, 32, 3; הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'bitter', because the water was bitter there, Ex. 15, 25; הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'try' and הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'quarrel' because the Israelites tried God and quarrelled there, 17, 7.

Also the names of several Festivals are substantiated anecdotally: thus דֹּאָר from דֹּאָר 'leap over', because at the plague of the first-born the houses of the Israelites were overlapped, Ex. 12, 27, or הָגָדָה from הָגָדָה 'booth', because God caused Israel to dwell in booths at his going forth from Egypt, Lev. 23, 44 f.

The most remarkable feature of all these interpretations is that only rarely is there any plausible etymological or other intrinsic connexion between the name and the real meaning of the explanatory word, as for instance the case between פֶּפֶּר and פֶּפֶּר and פֶּפֶּר and פֶּפֶּר etc. In most cases the connexion is purely artificial, and generally there is not the slightest relationship between the root and the derived name, as e.g. in the case of פֶּפֶּר and פֶּפֶּר, פֶּפֶּר and פֶּפֶּר, Gen. 4, 1, or that of פֶּפֶּר which only contains the first two letters of the root of פֶּפֶּר, and even in the case of פֶּפֶּר which has nothing in common with פֶּפֶּר, Gen. 17, 5. In many cases there is not even a connexion between the two words in the same language, as a Hebrew word is invoked to substantiate a non-Hebrew name, as e.g. in the case of פֶּפֶּר 'to confuse' in explanation of the Babylonian town name פֶּפֶּר = קָבִיל 'Gate of God' or פֶּפֶּר 'to draw' for the name פֶּפֶּר, which is Egyptian (see below, p. 228).

The discussion of this class of name interpretations in this section of the book is essential because they are very characteristic of the Genesis stories and the Joseph and Exodus narratives. This is the more appropriate at this point as they are especially typical for the patriarchal narratives which thereby come within the ambit of our investigations into the Egyptian elements in Genesis. They are thus to be regarded as a special peculiarity of the portions belonging to the Egyptian and pre-Egyptian epochs in the Pentateuch. For while in these portions we encounter such name-interpretations with great frequency as a quite distinctive feature, they later only occur here and there, chiefly to substantiate certain local or festival names, and then gradually disappear.1 The Genesis stories and, most conspicuously, the patriarchal narratives down to the Egyptian epoch are indeed most prolific of this kind of name-interpretation.2

Let us now see whether this phenomenon may not be explained as the direct consequence of an intensive influence of the Egyptian milieu during the Egyptian epoch in Israel, and whether consequently this fact may not supply the reason for the more frequent appearance of the various kinds of name-interpretation in the Genesis stories, the patriarchal narratives, and the histories of Joseph and the Exodus. The significance attributed to names, and the magic power ascribed even to the sound of names, have been observed among many other peoples especially of the East, nevertheless among no other people of antiquity was the symbolism of names so widespread and so deeply rooted as among the Egyptians; and in no other known ancient literature of the East did assonant name-interpretations flourish so widely and acquire such profound influence as in the Egyptian literature of all ages, from the earliest to the latest times. Of far greater significance in our case is the fact that in Egyptian, as we shall soon see, all the above species of name interpretations are represented exactly as in the Pentateuch, and that more especially the tendency to explain names and also divine attributes by puns to bring them in accord with certain

1 This results from a cursory examination of the number of names interpreted in this way in Genesis and other Biblical books. In the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives there are about twenty-nine, in the Joseph and Exodus narratives four, in the account of the wanderings through the wilderness five, and in the rest of the Bible altogether only three or four. In the case of other symbolic or horoscopic names, the puns are completely lacking.

2 It is by no means accidental, but represents a definite tendency in the structure of the early history of Israel that in the Pentateuch name-interpretations were confined to a select number and restricted only to those men who occupied a particularly eminent place in the series of the forefathers, from Adam, the father of mankind, down to Moses, the creator of the Israelite people. Nevertheless in other early records the names of other forefathers of the pre and post-Egyptian periods must have been interpreted in similar fashion, as may be discerned from the interpretations of פֶּפֶּר 1 Chron. 4, 9 and פֶּפֶּר 7, 23, which were certainly derived from such early records. In a chapter on personal names we will revert to this question.
1. Egyptian parallels to assonant Name-interpretations in Hebrew.

We proceed to give a series of examples mainly from the religious literature of the Egyptians, the selection being made with regard to the various species of name-interpretations mentioned above, whereby names are explained either by associating them with similarly sounding words, or by connecting them with a particular event.

In the 'Book of the Cow of Heaven' (Roed. Urk. 143, Ranke AOT 3 p. 4) Sekhmet (šm.t — ntrw) 1 'the mighty one' the name of the Goddess Hathor is explained in the following manner: When Hathor was sent forth by Re to destroy the rebels among men, she overpowered the inhabitants of Ehnas and killed them. When she returned to Re, the Majesty of the God Re said: 'Welcome in peace O Hathor! Thou hast done that for which I sent thee forth ('). Then the Goddess said: 'As truly as thou livest! I have overthrown the men, and this is pleasant to my heart.' The Majesty of Re said: 'Thou hast over-powered them (šm.—ntrw 'to be powerful against

1. The text reads šn—r šm lm-in 'I will over-power them'. The meaning, however, demands the and pers. sing., as in Roeder loc. cit.

2. The formula reads špr ps with the name concerned in between, thus špr šm.t ps, etc., literally: so becomes (the name) Sekhmet, etc.

3. Literally: 'May it be said to thee (šmn.t) n-hi' exactly as ntrw described above, p. 155.

4. This goes back to a very ancient creation-myth which, in older forms, has been preserved in a later collection of magical sayings in the so-called Book of Apophis, Pap. Bremser, pl. 27, 1 (also pl. 28, 26 = Roed. Urk. 138 and 139), in which the engendering of Shu and Tefnet is described in a most obscene manner. The text proceeds: 'I spout out Shu, I spout out Tefnet' (šfšy m šm šn n-tfšt). The original meaning of Shu is perhaps 'He who raises up' from špr to rise up', because at the behest of the god-creator Re, or Khnum, he separated the goddess of heaven, Nut, from her brother and spouse, the earth-god Geb, with whom she was united, raised her on high, and spread her as heaven above the earth.

Cf. Inter alias Erman Relig., p. 355; Himmelkoh in Roed. Urk., p. 145; Pyr. 1871 and 784.
INTERPRETATION OF NAMES BY ASSONANT WORDS IN THE

ideas and events was a regular phenomenon, particularly in the myths of
primeval times, including the creation-stories. Here, too, the mention
of the name of a god, or a mythical being, or the narration of certain
events is followed by an explanatory gloss similar in form and phraseo-
logy to that appearing in the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives.
It should further be noted that in Egyptian this occurs especially in
reference to the names of the early gods, just as in Genesis it does with
the names of the first men and the patriarchs. It may be added that not only
is this mode of name interpretation and manner of selecting certain
names and events common to Hebrew and Egyptian, but that they are
likewise characteristic of the same class of legendary stories and narrative
literature in Egyptian and the Pentateuch. All these factors support the
view that we have here to do with a specific literary mode to be ascribed to
a distinct sphere of Egyptian influence, which indeed, as we shall see,
explains why this mode first appears in the Genesis stories and is found in
such abundance in the narratives of the patriarchs.

1. Egyptian parallels to assonant Name-interpretations in Hebrew.

We proceed to give a series of examples mainly from the religious
literature of the Egyptians, the selection being made with regard to the
various species of name-interpretations mentioned above, whereby names
are explained either by associating them with similarly sounding words,
or by connecting them with a particular event.

In the ‘Book of the Cow of Heaven’ (Roed. Urk. 143, Ranke AOT p. 4)
Sekhemet (ibm.-t–nyn)1 ‘the mighty one’ the name of the Goddess Hathor
is explained in the following manner: When Hathor was sent forth by Re
to destroy the rebels among men, she overpowered the inhabitants of Ehnas
and killed them. When she returned to Re, the Majesty of the God Re
said: ‘Welcome in peace O Hathor! Thou hast done that for which I sent
thee forth (7)’. Then the Goddess said: ‘As truly as thou livest! I have
overcome the men, and this is pleasant to my heart.’ The Majesty of Re
said: ‘Thou hast over-powered them (ibm.–nyn) to be powerful against

1 We would emphasize that in Egyptian quite early, as in Hebrew, Arabic, etc. the feminine
ending t (7) was weakened to h (7). Thus e.g. m.t was probably pronounced mânæh; ibm.t, tefnæh; n.t, tefnæh or tûmæh. It is important to note this fact, as thereby assonant
puns can be more clearly understood. We would expressly point out however, that our
transliteration of Egyptian words in Hebrew characters is only meant to give an approximate
idea of the appearance of the Egyptian words as the exact pronunciation is unknown (cf.
above, p. 33, end of n. 1).

anyone’) by destruction in Ehnas;1 thus arose the name2 Sekhemet
(ibm.t–nyn) = ‘the Powerful One’. In the same myth (= Roed. Urk.
147 f., Ranke AOT p. 5) the names nb–ibn ‘Ibis-bird’ and Ph–
r–npt ‘moon’ which the God Thot received when he was appointed
by the Sun-god Re to represent him at night on earth during his journey
through the nether world, are explained as follows: Then the Majesty
of this God (Re) said to Thot: ‘thou shalt be my representative in my
stead, thou shalt be called Thot, representative of Re.’ I shall, however,
cause thee to send forth others (hk snt) still greater than thou art’;
thus arose the (name) nb (Ibis) for Thot’. Then said Re further to Thot:
‘I will cause thee to surround (nh nfr or nr) the two heavens with thy glory
and thy brightness; thus arose the Ph–r–npt ( = r–r) ‘moon’ for Thot’.
In Naunet, Toth. chap. 112, 13 the attribute of Horus ‘He who is on his
papyrus’ is explained by the fact that Horus said to Re: ‘Appoint me two
brothers, they shall be about me so long as the earth is green (w–n–w =
w–n ‘green’); thus arose his name ‘Horus’ who stands on his papyrus
(w–n–w = w–n–w).’

Other names of Thot are explained similarly, thus, e.g. ibm (a bird)
from a play upon the word lmn; nmn (babenoon) from nmn ‘reject, repulse’,
because Re said to him he should ‘reject the isles of the (Aegean) Sea
(hwnr-nbän).’ The name Shu (s–w) of the Air and Wind God is
explained in Pny. 1871 by the word n–w nsw or n–w ‘split’, because he
was conceived by the primeval cosmic god Atum in his mouth and then
split forth. Similarly the name of his sister Tefenet (nwn) is brought
into connexion with s–w (sp) split, because she was split out together with
Shu.4 The name of the great god IMM (Amon) is derived in the Amen-
Hymn, Cairo, I. 5 (= Roed. Urk., p. 6) from lmn w ‘hide’: ‘He is the
supreme lord of men who hides (imm) his name from his children in this

1 The text reads lwn–y r ibm lm–mn ‘I will overpower them’. The meaning, however,
demands the and pers. sing., as in Roeder loc. cit.
2 The formula reads bhr pt with the name concerned in between, thus bhr ibm.t pt, etc.,
literally: so because (the name) Sekhemet, etc.
3 Literally: ‘May it be said to thee (ib s–r–n–nh) exactly as thy name’. Cf. above, p. 121.
4 This goes back to a very ancient creation-myth which, in older forms, has been preserved
in a later collection of magical sayings in the so-called Book of Aphatis, Pyp. Bremner,
pl. 27, 1 (also pl. 28, 2b — Roed. Urk. 110 and 112), in which the engendering of Shu and
Tefenet is described in a most obscure manner. The text proceeds: ‘I split out Shu, I split
out Tefenet’ (ib s–w w b–r w–n–ib y m–nh). The original meaning of Shu is perhaps ‘He
who raises up’ from f–r–y ‘rise up’, because at the behest of the god-creator Re, or Khnum,
he separated the goddess of heaven, Nut, from her brother and spouse, the earth-god Geb,
with whom she was united, raised her on high, and spread her as heaven above the earth.
Cl. inter alia Erman Relig., p. 35; Himmelsbuch in Roed. Urk., p. 145; Pny. 1871 and 784.
EGYPT IS CALLED 'mistress of the ret-crown' (ḥres), because it spat at the (ḥfr-nb) hostile gods; it is called 'mistress of strength' (ḥfrt), because its strength (ḥfrt-nb) is greater than that of its foes; it is called 'mistress of fear' (wsw-nb), because it produced fear (wsw) in those who blasphemed it; p. 53, i, it is called 'the running one' (mnn-nb), because it ran (mn-nb) on the body of the king to settle on his forehead. In another text, Ranke, Das Allag. Schlangenpiel, p. 21, mh-nb also mhn.t 'uraeus-serpent' which originally took its name from mbn 'to curl up', is explained by a pun on mh-nb 'to fill', because it fills heaven and earth with its beauty.'

All these and similar puns in name interpretations or in the derivation of a magical effect from a name are very ancient, and occur very frequently in the Pyramid texts, but must go back to much earlier sources containing the myths and stories to which the Pyramid texts allude. At any rate they are to be found in very large number presenting a wealth of examples for all kinds of assonant name-interpretation. These names are mostly early or later names and attributes of gods, demi-gods, demons, snakes, or dead kings, who, in their deified character, assume the form of one or the other God—e.g. of Atum, Re, Osiris, etc.—whereby they experience is their own person all the episodes ascribed to each of these gods in primeval times, and consequently transfer to themselves both their names and attributes connected with those episodes.

From the multitude of these examples, we select only such as are closest to the above-mentioned species of assonant name interpretations in Hebrew, and which most clearly reveal the analogy in the two languages.

The name of the Goddess of Heaven is Nut; nym means 'hasten, run', thus, Pyr. 1596 reads: 'Hasten hither O Nut! Geb has commanded that thou shouldest hasten (nym-nu) either with this thy name nymt.' (n=). The name of the Earth god is Geb (gb-gb)—gbgb—226 is means 'to sorrowful', thus, Pyr. 1612 reads: 'Geb, thou son of Shu, this (dead king) is Osiris; thy mother's heart is sorrowful (gbgb 88) on thine account as truly as thy name is Geb'. In Pyr. 1609 c, the name of the primeval god Atum (m—m) is associated with tem—nm 'to evade, retreat', as a pun; thus it reads: 'Thou dost retreat (tnm) before their (i.e. Horus and Geb's) countenance like Re, as truly as thy name is Atum (tn'). The name of the Sun-god Re (r—r) is brought into a pun with r—r (Fy) 'to rise, grow'. Thus, Pyr. 1449 reads: 'Thou risest (r—r) up to him (the dead king) with this thy name Re (r—r)'; Similarly also Pyr. 452. 'The God of the dead Anubis

1 Cf. on mh and mhn Ag. WB. ii, 116 ff., 123 and 128. For the ringed snake mh as crown ornament, cf. Amon Hymn, Cairo, S. iii (= Lit. 284).
with the name ‘opener’ (qdp.t—r̄n) of the ways of God’ conferred on the ‘eye of Horus’ in its form as a uresu (cf. Pap. Bremmer 27, 3 f. = Roed. Urk. p. 108). There we read: ‘Horus has opened (qdp) thine eye so that thou mayest see truly as truly as its name is ‘Opener (qdp) of the ways of God’ (eye is fem. in Egyptian). In Pyr. 1350 c in (fin-—nš) means ‘to associate with someone, to join him’ and šmr.t means ‘chapel’, which serves also as a designation for a god; thus the text reads: ‘They (the gods) join (in) themselves to thee with their name ‘chapels (šmr.t)’.” As asr-—nš means ‘repel, reject’, and the assenonic word brs.t—nš means ‘palace’, which likewise serves as a designation for god’ the text continues: ‘They do not repel (asr) thee as truly as their name is ‘palaces’ (brs.t).’

The above examples show how great is the analogy in the use of assenonic puns in Egyptian and in Hebrew, notably:

1. In simple cases where the root of the explanatory word coincides merely in sound with that of the name, as e.g. in ḫḥ and ḫḥ, or in Egyptian ḫḫ—nš ‘Ibis-bird’ and ḫḫ-—nš ‘send out’; šb—nš or šb—nš ‘flow, exude’ and šb—nš ‘bark’; šb—nš and šb—nš (= šmr.t) ‘corpses’; šmr.t—nš ‘Amon’ and šmr.t—nš ‘conceal’.

2. In cases where there exists also an etymological connexion between both roots, as e.g. ẖmr.t ‘be mighty’ and ẖmr.t—nš ‘the mighty one’; ḫḪ-ty—nš ‘that which cools’ and ḫḪ-nš ‘to cool’.

3. In more complicated and rarer cases, where the assenonic in both roots is confined only to a part of the word and without there being a coincidence of meaning between the two, as e.g. in ḫḥ and ḫḥ ‘the living one’; ḫḥ-ny ‘acquire’; ḫḥ-ny ‘comfort’; ḫḥ-ny and ḫẖ-ny ‘confuse’; In these cases there is only a coincidence of two radical letters, which sometimes stand together, sometimes apart, just as we have seen in the Egyptian examples of ḫẖ-ny-—nš and ḫẖ-ny-—nš; šmr.t—nš and šmr.t—nš; šmr.t—nš and šmr.t—nš: fo-—nš and šmr.t—nš. A more exact analogy of ḫḥ and ḫḥ, where the two first radical letters coincide, is furnished in Egyptian by the puns šb—nš and šmr.t—nš; ḫḪ-ty—nš and ḫḪ-ty—nš. This is very important because thereby the suggestion that Šmr stands erroneously for Šmr or Šmr falls to the ground. Both in Hebrew and in Egyptian the interpretation of the name, as we have seen, does not depend on an etymo-

1. The whole sentence reads: šmr.t—nš ma tayšen in šmr.t—nš. As will be seen from the puns: šmr.t—nš ‘Amon’ on šmr.t—nš ‘heart’ on šmr.t—nš ‘heart’s’ on śmr.t—nš ‘Amon’ Such a complete assimilation in a single sentence is accorded with the literary taste of the Egyptians, and was reckoned among the finest of accomplishments, cf. examples in Erman-Ranke, p. 477 f.

2. According to Roed. Urk., p. 37 it means ‘outspread heaven’, but on p. 32 as it ‘goddess of heaven’. Moreover in the latter passage Tēfenu is mentioned instead of Nut. From this pun it appears that as early as the pyramid-time the fem. was always pronounced like h.

3. The king is the corporeal son of Re, conceived from his seed in the womb, and son of Re. By šmr.t ‘strength, ability’ is meant.

4. The text has m-nš whereby the king is now indicated, as Horus can only refer to the son of Re. Here šmr.t is a play on šmr.t. It is possible that the writer thought of šmr.t the Semite.

5. Here šmr.t is a play on šmr.t. It is possible that the writer thought of šmr.t the Semite.

2. PARALLELS TO THE MOTIVATION OF NAMES FROM EGYPTIAN GODS—MYTHS AND FOLK-STORIES.

(a) TO מֵרְט FROM מֵרְוִי 'RED EARTH'.

To the parallels cited, which are chiefly of formal character, others may be added from homogeneous Egyptian myths and stories which present in their subject matter striking similarity in the mode of name interpretation, and thus bring out more sharply the background for the common Egyptian and Hebrew milieu. As we have seen above, pp. 145 f, מַשָּׁה is brought into relation with בּרַד 'red earth' not only at his creation, Gen. 2, 7, but also in his condemnation to mortality, Gen. 3, 19. Now the expression for man in Egyptian is מֹרָט = מַשָּׁה or מַשָּׁה, and as according to a myth in the Apophis Book Pap. Bremner, 27, 2 ( = Roed. Uthk. p. 108) men originated from the tears of Re, which he shed for joy as his lost eye was brought back to him, and the Egyptian word for tears is מֹרָט = מַשָּׁה, the word מֹרָט 'man' is thus explained from the word מֹרָט 'tear' in the following way: 'Shu and Tefnut ... brought me back my eye behind them, and after I had brought together my scattered limbs I let my tears fall on them, and men (מרט = מַשָּׁה) came from the tears (מרט = מַשָּׁה) that came out of my eyes.'

1 To this category belong also metatheses like מָכָה—מָכָה and בּרַד—ברד in comparison with בּרַד and מַשָּׁה, 1 Sam. 1, 20, or מֶלֶת and מֶלֶת, 1 Chron. 4, 9. There should also be noted assonances of r and r as in יָפֵע and יָפֵע, of '7 and r as in יָפֵע—ערל = יָפֵע, and יָפֵע—ערל = יָפֵע, of b—k and r—k as in בּרַד—ברד or of הב—םוֹד and הב—םוֹד Pyr. 1795. From such and similar examples, as we shall show elsewhere, many conclusions may be drawn as to the pronunciation of Egyptian. In the case of מֹרָט, 3 Chron. 2, 7, there may be either an intentional alteration from מֹרָט to מֹרָט, Josh. 7, 18, to derive it better from בּרַד, or the misunderstanding of a scribal. For according to the above examples, an association of מֹרָט with מֹרָט merely on the basis of the first two radicals would be quite in order, and this appears to be the case also in Josh. 7, 26.

2 According to the Coptic vocalization מֹרָט (S.A.) 'man' and מֹרָט (S.) מֹרָט (B.) 'tears', KWB, p. 101, the Egyptian מֹרָט would probably have been pronounced מֹרָט and מֹרָט respectively.
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The tale containing the narration of the wondrous birth of the three first kings of the 5th dynasty Weser-Kaf, Sah-Re, and Nefer-Ka-Re with nick-name Kaka (Lit. 44 f.). According to this narrative, Re sent the two goddesses Isis and Nephthys, the Birth goddess Mesekheten, the Midwife Kheket, and Khnum, the shaper of the human body in the womb (cf. above p. 153), to Red-Dedet, the wife of Re-Weser to help her in her confinement.

It reads: ‘Isis stood before her, Nephthys behind her, and Kheket hastened the birth. Isis said (to the first child): ‘Re not vigorous (wir = wār) in her womb by this thy name (m r-n k pay) Weser-Ref (wir'ry = r-n k)’. Thereupon details of the birth of the other two children are described. To the second child Isis says: ‘Set not thyself firmly (l’h = me) in her womb by this thy name Sahu-Re (l’h = m = y-q-wār)’, and to the third child she says: ‘Be not gloomy (khw = wār) in her womb by this thy name Keku (khw = wār)’.

In the first name the first component, wir, means ‘to be strong’, and thus the name Weser-Ref is explained by the fact that even in his mother’s womb he was strong and turbulent; l’h in the second name, Sah-Re, is associated with l’h ‘to settle, to cling to one place’, and Kaka is derived from khw ‘gloomy, dark’, although it is hardly connected with this root.

In all three cases each of the children is enjoined by the goddess not to render too difficult the delivery of the mother, and in accordance with the words uttered, receives his name: the first is told not to be too violent in his bursting forth; the second not to cling to his place and let himself be waited for too long; and the third not to become, by his worrying delay, a source of gloom in his mother’s body. As we see, the names of the three kings are explained in allusion to the words of Isis, acting as Hymn it is said that he is the god ‘who created man, and is the living mother of gods and men (maw.t l’h liy mtr w rm)’. The copyist of the story before us probably did not know the real name of this king. On wir and Ṣuṣu we shall have something to say elsewhere.

Ermann and also Blackman interpret l’h in the sense of ‘approach, come near’, and translate Lit. 45: ‘Draw not near in her womb, as truly as thou art called Sah-Re’. Ranke AOT 67, n. 1 leaves it untranslated. As, however, is clearly shown by many passages, e.g. Admon. 9, 6, and the examples given there by Gardiner, p. 68, l’h means ‘settler, squatter’ somewhat in the meaning of citizen, and l’h accordingly means ‘to settle, become domiciled, to remain in one place’. In this sense it is in my opinion used here as the basis of the pun in order to derive the name. Another question is what was really meant by Sahu-Re (l’h-r) and this is difficult to say. It is suggested that it means ‘Re landed’ as l’h ti means ‘to land (from a ship)’; which would convey that: Re landed from his sun-bark and appeared in the person of the child. Against this, however, is the form l’hwe; it may, therefore, possibly have meant ‘a settler, a citizen of Re’.}

3. ANECDOTAL INTERPRETATIONS.

(a) The Explanation of Customs and Usages.

The Abomination of the Ṣuṣu. In the same manner as for personal names, the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives also contain explanations of certain customs by an

1 It is striking that the name Ṣuṣu is motivated by the same idea of strength and energy as Weser-Kaf, and that Zeraḥ is assonant with l’h. Such legends and stories from the ancient history of Egypt were undoubtedly very popular, and possibly known also in Hebrew circles in Egypt. This might explain the features common to the Tamar story and the legend of the three kings. Whether the narrator confined himself to the interpretation of the name Peres because he came out first, or whether a similar motivation of the name Zeraḥ was originally included, but later omitted on Davidic dynastic grounds, because it was Peres that was David’s progenitor, are questions which will be discussed in another connection. Cf. above, p. 233 n. 2.

2 On the names Ṣuṣu and Ṣuṣu, cf. below, pp. 256 and 257. It should be noted how different in form and style, symbolic name-interpretations appear in the Prophetic writings, e.g. Is. 7. 14 and 8. 3-9. 5. This brief indication may suffice here, but we shall otherwise deduce from this difference the factors which necessarily refute the assumption that the origin of such name-interpretations in the Pentateuch is of late date. Likewise we shall have something to say concerning similar popular renderings of names among other oriental peoples.
A further clear connexion with Egyptian is to be found in the employment of the word ḫw, which can only be properly explained from the Egyptian. It is the equivalent of mît=nw supposed to be the 'lower portion of the leg', ḏg. WB. I, p. 99, but probably implying the whole leg, including the 'thigh', both of men and quadrupeds and birds. Thus ḫw is not the name of the nerve, but a designation of the portion of the body through which it runs; this is supported by the construction ḫw-nw in which, grammatically, the second element nw could not refer to the nerve itself, a difficulty which has always been felt, and now removed, by rendering it 'the nerve of the thigh', the most sensitive seat of the sciatic nerve. The phrase nw-nw ḫw ḫw 'on the hollow of the thigh' is meant to indicate the position of the nw, not of the ḫw, namely the fleshy portion of the thigh.

(b) The Motivation of Festivals and Ritual Institutions.

In Egyptian we find likewise many parallels to the motivation of the institution and naming of festivals. Thus in the myth of the Winged Sun 16, 2 ff. (= Roed. Urk. p. 129) the origin and name of a festival are motivated, just as the name ṛeḥ for the Paschal Festival, Ex. 12, 27, is explained by the fact that 'God passed over (ḏw) the houses of the Children of Israel when He slew the first-born of the Egyptians'; and the name ṛeḥ for the Feast of Booths Levit. 23, 42 ff. is interpreted by the fact that 'God caused the Children of Israel to dwell in booths (ḏw) when they went forth from Egypt'. In that myth the pursuit and overthrow of enemies by Horus and his companions at the waters of Per-Rerhehu (pr ṛeḥhu) are related, and the motivation for the celebration of the Feast of Sailing is given. It says:

p. 3, text from the N.K.: 'Then said Re to the gods: 'abominate the swine for the sake of Horus'. And so it came to pass that the swine was abominable for the sake of Horus by the gods that were behind him', i.e. in his suite. This seems to point to the fact that swine flesh was permitted before this incident with Seth was taken as a reason for the prohibition. That the Egyptians abstained from eating pork was still known at the time of Herodotus (ii, 47).

In Arabic ḫw is hardly genuine, and like many other words of a ritual and religious nature, probably were introduced into Arabic by Jewish converts. Our view is supported by the discussion by Mohommadan scholars whether this construction is in accord with the rules of the Arabic language. Cf. Lisan al-'Arab, vol. 20, p. 193 ff. We do not believe there is any connexion between ḫw and the Akkadian Nudu (Holms, Körperspiele im Assyrischen, p. 7).

As we shall presently see, this myth is of great importance for us. It was first published and elaborated by H. Brugsch in Abh. d. Ges. d. Wiss. Göttingen, 14 (1856), p. 173 only in transcription, but then also in hieroglyphic script by Ed. Naville, Textes relatifs au Mythe d'Horus (1878), pp. 12-19, and a revised translation is given by Roeder, Urk. p. 129 ff. The numbers of plates and lines refer to Naville.
This god sails (brny-nn) on this his water unto this day—there, where his enemies combined against him. And these events happened on the seventh day of the first winter month. And it proceeds: 'The seventh day of the first winter month shall be called Feast of Sailing (brny-nn) unto this day.'

Similarly the origin of certain ritual and worship arrangements on Festivals is explained in Egyptian. In the Himmelschuh plate A, line 24 ff. (= Roed. Urk. p. 144) it is related that the Majesty of Re said to the Goddess Hathor: 'Welcome in peace, thou Goddess Yamit (imy.t-nw-rw)!' Thus arose the virgins of Yamau (timu = nwn, name of a town). And the Majesty of Re said to this Goddess further: 'Let there be prepared for thee sleeping-draughts for the Festival of the Seasons', and let them be given also to the women slaves. So it arose that on the Feast of Hathor sleeping-draughts are given by all people to the women slaves since the first day,' i.e. since ancient times. Further it reads, the Majesty of Re said to the Goddess Sekhmet (ibml.t): 'Is there a suffering (mr-nn) of the burning sickness? Thereupon arose 'the two seasons by suffering' (mr-nn),

In a collection of sayings 'For the knowledge of the soul at the holy gate in the Beyond' (Sethe, ÄZ. 57 1922, p. 1 ff.), among other things the reason why the High Priest of Helipolis wore on his shaven head a wig like a woman—wherefore he was called 'The bewitched'—is derived from the fact that Re cheated a heavenly being called imy-ni (Pyr. 285 d; cf. for n-t also 268, 1464) at the moment when he 'had transformed himself into a bewitched woman'. Thus arose 'The bewitched of Helipolis' as title of the High Priest. ÄZ. 57, pp. 12, 13, 26 ff. and p. 211.

(c) Motivation of Place Names.

For the derivation of place names from various events, as in Gen., 50, 11, Ex. 15, 33, etc. (cf. above, p. 232) Egyptian parallels from the myths of the gods are also to be found. Thus e.g. in the Himmelschuh plate B, line 38 ff. (= Roed. Urk. p. 145), much is told about the journeys of Re in his flight to heaven from the rebellious men, on the back of Nut, the Goddess of heaven, transformed into a cow (above, p. 244), and certain names of stations are interpreted from episodes and sayings of Re during the journey.

1 On the use and meaning of this phrase, cf. below, p. 230 ff.
2 This seems to be the name of a mourning festival in remembrance of the illness of Re, or of a plague imposed by him.
3 This title also occurs in connection with priests of other places (Sethe, loc. cit.), but probably originated first in Helipolis, and then, like many other priestly titles, passed from there to other Temple centres.
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Although the text is corrupt, the names of the two best known places in the Beyond (above, p. 192) are preserved. It reads: 'This God (Re) said to Mut (= Nut, cf. above, p. 241); 'I have placed myself on (thry) back to obtain a lofty standpoint', and further: 'The Majesty of this God then bade: 'Remove me from them (the men) and let me mount into the heights', etc. The Majesty of this God gazed upon her, etc., whereasupon she (Mut) said: 'O that you would provide me with a multitude ('is'),' and thus arose the name of . . . (name illegible). His Majesty said then: 'Peaceful (ibpt-nn) is here the field', and thus arose (the name) 'Fields (ib.t) of offerings (ibpt-nn)'. Further Re said: 'I cause the herbage to grow (i) (ir-n-wn) thereon' and thus arose (the name) 'Fields (ib.t) of the bulrushes (ir-nw-nn)'.

This feature appears still more clearly and frequently in the myth of the Winged Sun (cf. above, p. 245, note 2). There it says 12, 2 ff. (= Roed. Urk. p. 121) that Nubia derived its name Wawah (aww.d-t-nw-nn) from the fact that the opponents of Re rebelled (ib.t-nn-nsau) against him; ibid. 13, 3 (= Urk. p. 122), it says that Deba (db-n-wn Edfu) derived this name from the fact that the Re said to Thoth on the occasion of a furious battle: 'This is a stabbing (db-n-wn) of mine enemies'; ibid. 13, 7 (= Urk. p. 123) the water Khenu (brm-nn) derived its name from the fact that Re said to the gods in the campaign against Seth: 'Let us sail (brn-nn) in our ship on the water'; ibid 14, 3 (= Urk. p. 124) the name of the town Dendae (dn.d-t-nw-nn) is explained by a pun on dtnw = rwn 'to destroy (i)', because Re told Thoth to destroy his foes; and ibid. 17, 5 ff. (= Urk. p. 125) the name of a sacred water in the region of Nehri (n.w-nb-nn) was called Mu-Heh (mwn-bh-nn) meaning 'Water of seeking', because there Re said to Horus: 'Didst thou not seek out (bhyn-nn) this water on account of the enemy?'.

1 It is probably an allusion to the origin of the stars from the body of the goddess Nut spread out as heaven (cf. Erman, Relig., p. 35 and above, p. 244, n. 1). The meaning is that Re casts a glance into the entrails of the goddess when she reaches the loftiest heights, whereupon she begs him to equip her with a multitude (i.e. of stars, not people, as assumed by Roeder loc. cit.).
2 The meaning of or is not given in Dg. WB. I. p. 32. Probably it here means 'to grow'.
3 In the following sentence: 'And Re said further: 'I will equip her with all things (ybr-n-nw) and so arose the ib.t-nw-nw-nw, namely the stars'; there is obviously a pun between ib.t 'things' and ib.t 'star' (a late mode of writing Dg. WB. I, p. 13), and the whole sentence relates to Mut and the origin of the stars. The lack of the expected ybr in front is probably due to an accidental omission, and ib.t 'stars' after pws is intended to explain the rare word ibbr. The word ibbr which already occurs in Pyr. and Totenbuch (in the form ibbr) may perhaps originally have been connected with ibbr 'to shine' (Dg. WB. I, p. 33), or was later so conceived.

To this category also belongs a special kind of honorific names, conferred in recognition of some glorious feat, or by which a solemn promise or some special occasion is perpetuated. The warrant for such names we find e.g. in Gen. 17, 4: 'Behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations.' Neither shall thy name any more be 

םֶרֶק, but thy name shall be אָשֵׁר, for a father of many nations פֶּרֶק-יְהוָה have I made thee'. Further Gen. 32, 29, the angel said to Jacob: 'thy name shall be called no more יָשָׁר, but יִשָּׁר, for thou hast fought (גָּדָל) with gods and with men and hast prevailed.' Similar conferment of names is to be found also in the Egyptian myth of the Winged Sun already quoted, e.g. 18, s (= Urk. 135), where Re says to Thot that Horus has been 'on the battlefield like a lion', whereupon Thot says: 'This god shall be called "Horus of Edfu, Lord of the Battlefield" unto this day'; or 19, (= Urk. 136), Thot says that the gaily-plumed Horus had beaten the enemy in this disguise, wherefore 'he shall be called the gaily plumed that arises from the horizon unto this day'. Like Horus, priests of important sanctuaries are distinguished by titles conferred on them in honour of Horus. Thus Re confers on the Priest of Horus in Per-Rerheu the title 'Great in Attack', because Horus 'carried out a great attack against the enemy', ibid. 15, 8 (= Urk. 128); or 17, 3 (= Urk. 132) the Priest of Horus receives from Thot the name 'Lord of Battle', because Re said to Thot: 'Horus shall be a lord of battle and forever slay his foreign foes'.

5. Egyptian Parallels to Narrative Style and Form.

The above examples, derived from ancient myths, and woven into later magical and necrological texts, show how early this mode of substantiating names, usages, customs, festivals, and places found entry into Egyptian literature, and how closely it was always associated with the stories of the gods. Of these stories, however, the myth of the Winged Sun is most instructive for us, not only on account of the many parallels that it presents, as we have seen, to name interpretations in the Pentateuch and elsewhere in the Bible, but also on account of the matter-and narrative style.

1 The text of this story is carved in hieroglyphic writing in the Horus Temple of Edfu, together with graphic representations of the fight between Horus and Seth. While the inscription is from the Ptolemaic period, the version used is, however, from the New Kingdom, and this, too, was composed of much more ancient elements. Cf. above, p. 245, n. 2, Brugsch, loc. cit., p. 211 and Roed. Urk. p. 120.

It tells of the conquest of Egypt by Horus, the first king on earth (cf. below, p. 280f.) and the destruction of Seth together with all his supporters who had rebelled against Re to seize the rulership of the world. It belongs to the many Horus stories, the chief purpose of which was to set forth the conquest and seizure of all Egypt by Horus as the legitimate ground for theexclusive right of the Egyptian kings to own the whole land, nay, the whole earth for all time as his successors.

The campaign, in which Horus was accompanied and supported by Re and Thot, began in Nubia, on the southern border of Egypt, and extended through the whole of Egypt to the extreme north-east, on the Red Sea, where all his enemies were finally beaten and cast into the sea. In the course of the narrative places and rivers are mentioned at which decisive battles took place, and which consequently received from the victorious gods memorable names, motivated in each case by a certain incident or pronouncement during the combat. The conferment of such names, and the specific manner of their motivation are of the greatest interest for us, inasmuch as they are equally typical for the account of the conquest of Egypt by Horus and his followers in primeval times as for the Biblical narratives of the conquest of Canaan, first by the patriarchs, in the Pentateuch, and then by the Children of Israel, in the early historical books of the Bible. The content of the story of the Winged Sun throws a sidelight on the account of the conquest of Canaan, and it gives us an insight into the composition of the narratives describing the battles, wanderings, and Odysseys of the forefathers of Israel. Once this form and style had been adopted in the Pentateuch, they became the model for subsequent Hebrew writers in recording the early period of Israel's settlement in the Promised Land down to the times of the kings.

Of equally great interest is the story of the Winged Sun from the purely literary point of view. For the way in which the narrative is developed, and more particularly the manner in which the conferment of names and their motivation are woven in, betrays an extremely striking similarity to these parts of the Pentateuch and the historical books in which the conquest of Canaan is recounted. What, however, is most remarkable is the persistent repetition in both of the phrase 'unto this day', the Hebrew וַיֵּלֶד עֵשֶׂב coinciding literally with the Egyptian r mn hrw pn. Not alone in its construction, but also in the choice of the occasions on which this phrase is used, the coincidence between the Egyptian and the Hebrew is
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so striking that one cannot avoid the impression that both the composition
and style of the Hebrew narratives of the conquest of Canaan were
influenced by similar Egyptian stories of the conquest of Egypt by the
god.

6. Use of the Phrase 'Unto this Day' in Hebrew and Egyptian.

We proceed to select from the many passages with the phrase 'unto this
day' and also without it in such as best illustrate the relationship in
subject-matter and similarity in phraseology in the Hebrew and Egyptian
texts.

Gen. 32:24: 'And Jacob went on his way, and the angels of God met
him. And Jacob said when he saw them: This is a host (גר額) of God;
and Jacob called the name of that place בֵּית-אֵל (the two hosts)."

Gen. 32:31: 'And Jacob called the name of the place בֵּית-אֵל (Face
of God), for he said I have seen God face to face and my life is
preserved.'

Gen. 33:17: 'And Jacob journeyed on to Succoth and built him an
house and made booths (בֵּית-אֵל) for his cattle; therefore he called the
name of the place בֵּית-אֵל (Booths).'

Num. 13:25: 'And they came unto the brook of Ehron, and cut down
to thence a branch with one cluster of grapes (רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים), and they bare it
together upon a staff; ... That place was called בֵּית-אֵל (Brook
of the cluster) on account of the cluster of grapes (רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים) which the
Children of Israel cut down from thence.'

Num. 21:3: 'And the Lord hearkened unto the voice of Israel and
delivered up the Canaanites; and they annihilated (רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים) them together
with their towns, and called the name of the place רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים (annihilation).

Cf. also Judges 1, 17.

Further, with the phrase 'unto this day':—

Gen. 26:28: 'And it came to pass the same day that Isaac's servants
came and told him the well which they had digged, and said unto
him, we have found water. And he called it וָאָדֶנ (Seven); therefore
the name of the city is וָאָדֶנ "Well of Seven" unto this day.'

1 Here we confine ourselves to these general indications. On another occasion we shall
illustrate this influence more extensively.

2 We give here approximate translations of these names to demonstrate the play upon
words, this being the essential point, and not their original meaning.

3 That in this and the following passages the subject in רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים refers to the
preceding persons is shown below, p. 257.

4 On the meaning of this name, cf. below, p. 265.
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In Josh. 5, 9 it is said with reference to the circumcision of the Children of
Israel: 'And the Lord said unto Joshua, this day have I rolled away
(גרף) the insult of Egypt from off you. Wherefore the name of the place
is called ברַע (The Rolling) unto this day.'

In Josh. 7, 25 f. Joshua says to אָבָנ (Abinadab) who had sinned in connexion
with the booty at Jericho: 'Lo! thou hast troubled us (רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים); may God
trouble thee this day. And all Israel stoned him ... And they raised over him
a great heap of stones unto this day. Wherefore the name of that place
was called רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים "Valley of Trouble" unto this day.'

 Judges 18, 12 says of the Tribe of Dan: 'And they went up and encamped
(רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים) in Kirjath Jearim in Judah; wherefore they called that place רָפִים
"Camp of Dan" unto this day.'

In 2 Sam. 6, 18, it is narrated that 'Uzza fell dead to the ground because
he had touched the holy Ark of the Covenant; it proceeds: 'And David
was displeased because the Lord had made a breach (רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים) upon 'Uzza, and
he called that place רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים "Breach of Uzza" unto this day.'

With these passages may now be compared the following from the myth
of the Winged Sun:

Pl. 12, 2 ( = Roed. Urk. 121) the beginning of the narrative of the campaig
of Horus of Edfu: 'His Majesty (Re) was in Nubia and his army
was with him without number. Then they (the inhabitants of the land)
began to rebel (רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים) against their lord; the land is therefore called
Wawat (רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים—Rebellion) unto this day.'

1 What is meant is, that by this act the ground was cut out from under the Egyptians, who
trumped the Children of Israel with contempt as inferior and impure because they were
uncircumcised. Elsewhere our view will be more fully substantiated.


3 The reference to the place name רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים, Ex. 20, 29, is undoubtedly derived from an old
source in which an account was given of the first period of Israel's settlement in Canaan in
the same style and form as in ancient historical narration. Instead of רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים
merely רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים.

4 This phrase reads גָּד-וגו or גָּד-וּב ב (Gen. 26, 25), literally 'It is said' or 'It is said to
him (Gen. 26, 25), i.e. 'It, be, or she is called,' whereas the name follows and then ב-וּב,
the same name (Gen. 26, 25), i.e. 'on this account, therefore.' So in our passage: גָּד-וגו is רָפִים.
It is said land (Gen. 26, 25) to this account, i.e. 'is therefore called Wawat,' or Brugel, Gebl. Stamm 13, 12
i.e. 20th century. It is said land (Gen. 26, 25) to this account, i.e. 'is therefore called Wawat,' or Brugel, Gebl. Stamm 13, 12
"Camp of Dan" unto this day.'

5 In such connexion with the Egyptian בר-וּב, so that similarly רֹאשׁ-גֵּרְשִׁים corresponds in such connexion with the
Egyptian בר-וּב.
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Pl. 13, 5 (= Roed. Urk. 122): he says to Horus after seeing his fallen foes: 'This is a place of agreeable life (nḏm 'nh-nw' wās). Therefore, the palace of Horus of Edfu is called nḏm 'nh-nw' wās (Agreeable Life) unto this day.'

Pl. 13, 6 f. (= Urk. 122 f.): Re said to the gods in his suite: Let us voyage (ḥv‫ן‬‫י‬‫ו‬‫ו‬‫ו‬) in our ship on the water, for our heart is joyous on account of our enemies that lie on the ground. Therefore, it is called ḫmḥ = wnn (The Voyaged) unto this day.'

Pl. 14, 3 (= Urk. 124): 'Horus of Edfu instituted a great slaughter būt-‫מ‬‫י‬‫ו‬‫ו‬‫ו‬ among them (the foe). Re said: Remain standing, Horus of Edfu, that I may see thee. Therefore, this is called place ḫmāt of Re (b.-‫נ‬‫ו‬‫ו‬) unto this day.'

Pl. 15, 7 f. (= Urk. 128): Re says to Horus when he had brought him the foe with a spear through the throat: 'How great was the attack (ḥnḏn) which thou didst carry out; thou hast cleansed (tāb caus. of bā = ḫnḏn) this place.' Re then said to Thoth: 'The palace of Horus of Edfu shall therefore be called Lord of the clean (b = ḫnḏn) places unto this day; and the priest of this sanctuary shall, therefore, be called ḫnḏn 'The Great in wrath' unto this day.'

Pl. 15, 10 f. (= Urk. 128): Horus, the son of Isis, cut off the head of his enemy (Seth) and those of his companions in front of his father Re and in front of the entire great company of gods. He dragged him by the heels round his domain and stuck his spear in his head and in his back. Re said to Thoth: 'Behold, the son of Osiris has dragged (ḫw-‫ו‬‫ו‬) the wretched one round his domain. Thoth spake: Therefore, shall the territory be given the name of Dragging (Ḫw-‫ו‬‫ו‬) unto this day.'

'These examples may suffice to show how closely the usage and the mode of applying the phrase nḏm ḫw ḫw conform to the Egyptian r m ḫw ḫw, and how similar in style and form are the Biblical and Egyptian narratives of the conquest and occupation of their Lands of Inheritance. In both
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cases old names and pre-existing places are brought into connexion with new events, and newly conferred names of conquered localities are interpreted according to memorable incidents.

A common feature in the naming of places is the mention of the new name as existing, even before it was conferred. Thus in the instance of Gen. 33, 17 we are told that Jacob came to Sukkōth as if it was already known by that name, and only subsequently we learn that it received this name because Jacob built booths (hāwâh) there; similarly in Num. 13, 23 we are told that the spies reached the Valley of the Cluster (Elīdō), and only then is it said that this place was so called, because there they cut a cluster of grapes (yânhâh), cf. also 2 Chron. 20, 26. Similarly in the myth of the Winged Sun, pl. 17, 6 (= Urk. 132) Re said to Horus that the number of his ships on the Demit-water was very great, and only then are we told that by the god's command 'the name of this water shall be called Demit (ḏmīt)' .

Another common feature in the course of the narrative in Hebrew and Egyptian is the exact localization of a place immediately after the motivation of its name, thus e.g. in Gen. 16, 14: it is said, after the motivation of the name of Hagar's well, 'behold it is between Kādeš and Bāred'. Further, Judges 18, 12 it is said of the camp of the Danites near Kirjath Je'ārīm: 'Therefore they called that place “Camp of Dan” unto this day. Behold it lies behind Kirjath Je'ārīm.' Exactly similar indications are given in the myth of the Winged Sun, 17, 5 (= Urk. 133): 'Re said (to Horus): “How wonderfully beautiful (ṣfryy-‫ו‬‫ו‬‫ו‬‫ו‬‫ו‬) is the abode ( łatwo) in which thou hast settled . . . .’ Thoth said, “The palace in this place shall, therefore, be called ‘Beautiful Abode (Balōt-‫ו‬‫ו‬‫ו‬‫ו‬) unto this day’; it lies south-west of Ne'ērēh (nērēh) at a distance of four leagues.'

In all these cases we have to do not merely with invented place-names, or with ritual institutions and festivals created by the fancy of priests hermeneutics or arbitrary juggling with words, but with real existing places

4 Similarly, though in more general terms, Gen. 50, 11: ‘Wherefore the name of it (the place) was called ‘The Mourning of Egypt’;—which is beyond Jordan’; Judges 15, 10: ‘Wherefore it was called its name ‘Well of the Caller’;—it lies in Laḇi—unto this day’; a Sam. 21, 15, 16, 16: ‘And the name of the place was called ‘Plot of the Rocks’ which is in Gibeah.” Originally there must have been a pun between yâhâh ‘plot’ and ṣfryy ‘be divided’.

5 The passage reads: hâm-‫ם‬‫י‬‫ו‬‫י‬‫ו‬‫ו‬ hâf ḫw ḫw ‘ādōb ḫw ḫw, the latter two words furnish a more precise designation.
7. The Meaning of 'Unto this Day'.

In all the above passages and many others which could be cited, our phrase reads, as stated, \( r \, mm \, hruw \, pn \) 'unto this day', generally interpreted as meaning 'unto the present day, till to-day' from the standpoint of the writer or narrator. Equally general is the view that in all these cases of conferring names, these motivations are later interpolations in the original narrative by priests or scribes for certain motives, and are, therefore, to be regarded as parenthetical glosses which do not belong to the original text.

The view that \( r \, mm \, hruw \, pn \) means 'till the present day' is not tenable, because in many passages of the myth of The Winged Sun and many others, it cannot possibly have been so meant. Thus e.g. Winged Sun, pl. 14, 13 (= Uruk. 126): 'Thot said to Re: Therefore he shall be called Horus, Winged Sun, Great God, Slayer of Foes, First of Henu' unto this day' \( (r \, mm \, hruw \, pn) \); pl. 18, 5 (= Uruk. 153): 'Re said to Thot: Let us hasten through the whole land and hasten through the whole sea. Then spake Thot: The sea shall be called 'Sea of Hastening' unto this day' \( (r \, mm \, hruw \, pn) \).

As will be seen, the words of Thot have a jussive character and can only be understood as an injunction of future validity. The same applies to the passages cited above from pl. 13, 5 and 15, 17. Brugsch, Reodor, and others have attempted to evade the difficulty by translating the phrase \( r \, mm \, hruw \, pn \) in such passages not as in all the other numerous instances by 'unto this day' but by 'from this day onwards', which, however, is in obvious conflict with the meaning of \( r \, mm \, unto \) and the whole construction of the phrase. For the use of \( r \, mm \) as preposition 'until', derived from the literal meaning 'to remain', is always employed in the sense of 'down to, until', and cannot be arbitrarily inter-

---

1. Cf. Brugsch loc. cit., pp. 182, 183, 186, 187, 190, where the names of towns, rivers, sanctuaries, and districts interpreted by similarity of sound are localized, and the feasts mentioned are also identified.

2. This is the ordinary form; the fuller, but rarer, reads: \( r \, mm \, hruw \, pn \), Wext. 7, 5, elsewhere also \( r \, mm \) 'till to-day' \( Ag. \, WB., ii. 43 \). But \( r \, mm \) is not as late as the Greek period, as there stated (p. 64), because it already occurs in Pala. Brit. Mus. 164, 101, Sittaouph. d. Eurl. Ak., 1914, p. 1010 (a reference which I owe to Dr. J. Polonsky). Cf. also Erman, Gram. § 456 and Gardiner, Gram. § 180.
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related to a day in the most distant future in the divine calendar of
millions of years. It is possible also that originally it was taken literally
in the sense of 'that it remains this day', meaning that it may last and be
rendered eternal on this day for all time. This meaning seems to emerge
from a passage in an old text of the 12th dynasty (Brit. Mus. 1164, 101 f.),
where our formula actually reads 'To-day' (mym) instead of 'this day' (hrw pn).
The text refers to a 'contract' which a testator concluded with the priestly
'reader' for the dead order that in all ceremonies and in the tomb might be
carried out on particular festival days, and in order, as the 'contract' goes
on to say, that 'my name may be beautiful and my memory endure r mm
mym unto to-day'. Here the phrase can only be conceived as an injunction
for the remote future, i.e. that my name may be rendered enduring to-day
for all time.

Whatever the original meaning of the phrase may have been, for us the
fact is of importance first that 'unto this day' indicates no limitation of
time from the standpoint of the speaker, and secondly that all passages
dealing with the conferment of names belong inseparably to the original
narrative, because they form an essential, if not the most essential, element
of the narrative.

All that we have said with regard to r mm hrw pn applies in every respect
also to ḫn ḫn ḫn. Both in the Pentateuch and elsewhere there are
passages where the phrase cannot possibly be interpreted otherwise than as
a stipulation for the far future. Thus e.g. Deut. 10, 8: 'At that time the
Lord separated the Tribe of Levi, to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the
Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister to him, and to bless in His
name unto this day.' Similarly Deut. 11, 4 where, referring to Pharaoh and
his host, it is said how the Lord 'hath destroyed them unto this day'. Here
it can only mean 'for ever and ever'. This applies in much stronger
measure to Josh. 9, 27, where it says of the Gibeonites 'And Joshua made

1 'This is supported by the fuller formula r mm m hrw pn literally 'to remain on this day',
cf. above, p. 254, n. 2.
2 H. G. Lange, Silisiusch. der Berl. Ak., 1914, p. 1010 also takes it to be a prognosis for
the future and thinks in the use of 'till to-day' the writer placed himself in the
position of the reader for all times. But here it seems really to mean literally 'to remain
to-day', i.e. 'that it may become lasting to-day'.
3 It should be noted that the annihilation exclusively relates to the Egyptian army, not,
however, to the whole of Egypt as empire and land and, therefore, has only in mind the
events at the Red Sea. It is only in connexion with the wonders (v. 3) that 'Pharaoh and
all his land' are referred to. This deserves emphasis especially with reference to Spiegel.
OLZ, 1925, 481, who seriously suggested the phrase is to be taken as a date for the com-
position of Deuteronomy after the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses about the year 525 B.C.
Cf. Erweiterung, p. 33 f.
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them that day bakers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation
and for the altar of the Lord unto this day in the place which He should
choose'.

In this passage the case is clear: 'unto this day' undoubtedly is an integral
part of the text, and the decree of Joshua looks from his own time to
a future day, when the choice of the holy place should have been effected.
Equally clear is this meaning in passages which speak of an act or event
completely in the past, as, inter alia. Josh. 7, 6: 'And they rose over him
(the stone 'Akhan) a great heap of stones unto this day'; or Josh. 8, 28
'And Joshua burnt the town of 'Ayy and made it an eternal heap of desola-
tion unto this day. And the king of 'Ayy he hanged on a tree ... and they
raised upon him a great heap of stones unto this day'. The same applies
also to many other passages, e.g. Gen. 26, 32; Deut. 2, 25-3, 14 (= Judges
10, 4), 34, 6; Judges 1, 21, etc. But also in the sense of permanent validity
it occurs, exactly as in Egyptian, in passages like Gen. 47, 26: 'And Joseph
made it a law unto this day', i.e. for ever. In the prohibition of the sinew
of the hollow of the thigh, Gen. 32, 25, it has even the significance of a
command, and must therefore, read: 'Therefore the Children of Israel
shall not eat of the sinew ... unto this day', i.e. for all time. Similarly
1 Sam. 5, 1 reads: 'Therefore neither the Priest of Dagon nor any visitors
to Dagon's sanctuary shall cross the threshold of Dagon in Askud unto this
day.'

The use of ḫn ḫn ḫn agrees further with the Egyptian insomuch as it is
an integral constituent of the original narrative, and must, therefore, have
belonged ab origine to the text. For just as in Egyptian, so also in the
Biblical narratives, the motivations of the names conferred are not mere
plays upon words by later scribes, but were, from the first, conceived as
perpetual memorials of notable episodes. And just as in Egyptian where it is
the conquering gods or the heroes of the combat who comment upon and
interpret the events to motivate the names of places, the institution of
festival and the like, so also in the Bible the same role is to be assigned to
the persons chiefly concerned in the events and episodes. This especially
in the narratives concerning the periods before and during the conquest
and settlement of Canaan, as well as in the subsequent tribal chronicles, in
order that the names of places and certain institutions might derive their
sanction from the importance of the event and the authority of these who
proclaimed them. Accordingly a phrase like ḫn ḫn ḫn is not to be taken

A parallel is provided by the excavation of the Tensa Canal at its junction with the sea
by the Egyptian priests, because at this point Seth had thrown Osiris in a box into the
sea, Plutarch, De Iside, chap. 13. Moreover the threshold was not avoided as holy, as is
maintained, but as a spot foul and horrible.
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related to a day in the most distant future in the divine calendar of
millions of years. It is possible also that originally it was taken literally
in the sense of 'that it remains this day', meaning that it may last and be
rendered eternal on this day for all time.1 This meaning seems to emerge
from a passage in an old text of the 11th dynasty (Brit. Mus. 1164, 107),
where our formula actually reads 'To-day' (myr) instead of 'this day' (hrw pn).
The text refers to a 'contract' which a testator concluded with the priestly
'Reader' for the dead in order that 'all ceremonies in his tomb' might be
carried out on particular festival days, and in order, as the 'contract' goes
on to say, that 'my name may be beautiful and my memory endure r mn
myr unto to-day'. Here the phrase can only be conceived as an injunction
for the remote future, i.e. that my name may be rendered enduring to-day
for all time.2

Whatever the original meaning of the phrase may have been, for us the
fact is of importance first that 'unto this day' indicates no limitation of
time from the standpoint of the speaker, and secondly that all passages
dealing with the conformation of names belong inapposably to the original
narrative, because they form an essential, if not the most essential, element
of the narrative.

All that we have said with regard to r mn hrw pn applies in every respect
also to מנהנ ינש יני. Both in the Pentateuch and elsewhere there are
passages where the phrase cannot possibly be interpreted otherwise than as
a stipulation for the far future. Thus e.g. Deut. 10, 8: 'At that time the
Lord separated the Tribe of Levi, to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the
Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister to him, and to bless in His
name unto this day.' Similarly Deut. 11, 4 where, referring to Pharaoh and
his host, it is said how the Lord 'hath destroyed them unto this day'. Here
it can only mean 'for ever and ever.'3 This applies in much stronger
measure to Josh. 9, 27, where it says of the Gibeonites 'And Joshua made

1 This is supported by the fuller formula r mn m hrw pn literally 'to remain on this day',
2 H. O. Lange, Sitzungsber, der Berl. Ak., 1914, p. 1020 also takes it to be a prognosis for
the future and thinks that in the use of 'till to-day' the writer placed himself in the
position of the reader for all times. But here it seems really to mean literally 'to remain
to-day', i.e. 'that it may become lasting to-day'.
3 It should be noted that the amaluation exclusively relates to the Egyptian army, not,
however, to the whole of Egypt as empire and land, and therefore, has only in mind the
events at the Red Sea. It is only in connection with the wonders (v. 3) that 'Pharaoh and
all his land' are referred to. This deserves emphasis especially with reference to Spieg.
OLZ, 1925, 481, who seriously suggested the phrase is to be taken as a date for the com-
position of Deuteronomy after the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses about the year 525 B.C.
4 Cf. Erdwissenschaft, p. 33 f.
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them that day hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation
and for the altar of the Lord unto this day in the place which He should
choose.'

In this passage the case is clear: 'unto this day' undoubtedly is an integral
part of the text, and the decree of Joshua looks from his own time to
a future day, when the choice of the holy place should have been effected.
Equally clear is this meaning in passages which speak of an act or event
completed in the past, as, e.g., Gen. 2, 16; Josh. 7, 26 'And they rose over him
the stone and built an altar and a great heap of stones unto this day'; or Josh. 8, 26
'And Joshua burnt the town of Aabb and made it an eternal heap of desolation
unto this day. And the king of Aabb he hanged on a tree ... and they
raised upon him a great heap of stones unto this day'. The same applies
also to many other passages, as e.g. Gen. 26, 33; Deut. 2, 22, 3, 14 (= Judges
10, 4); Judges 1, 19, etc. But also in the sense of permanent validity it occurs, exactly as in Egyptian, in passages like Gen. 47, 26 'And Joseph
made it a law unto this day', i.e. for ever. In the prohibition of the sinew
of the hollow of the thigh, Gen. 32, 35, it has even the significance of a
command, and must therefore, read: 'Therefore the Children of Israel shall not eat of the sinew ... unto this day', i.e. for all time. Similarly
1 Sam. 5, 5 reads: 'Therefore neither the Priest of Dagon nor any visitors
to Dagon's sanctuary shall cross the threshold of Dagon in Adbin unto this
day.'

The use of ינש יני agrees further with the Egyptian inasmuch as it is
an integral constituent of the original narrative, and must, therefore, have
belonged ab origine to the text. For just as in Egyptian, so also in the Biblical
narratives, the motivations of the names conferred are not mere plays
upon words by later scribes, but were, from the first, conceived as per-
petual memorials of notable episodes. And just as in Egyptian where it is
the conquering gods or the heroes of the combat who comment upon and
interpret the events to motivate the names of places, the institution of
festivals and the like, so also in the Bible the same role is to be assigned to
the persons chiefly concerned in the events and episodes. This especially
in the narratives concerning the periods before and during the conquest
and settlement of Canaan, as well as in the subsequent tribal chronicles, in
order that the names of places and certain institutions might derive their
sanction from the importance of the event and the authority of those who
proclaimed them. Accordingly a phrase like מנהנ ינש יני is not to be taken

1 A parallel is provided by the execution of the Tanis Canal at its junction with the sea
by the Egyptian priests, because at this point Seths had thrown Osis in a box into the
sea, Plutarch, De Iside, chap. 13. Moreover the threshold was not avoided as holy, as is
maintained, but as a spot foul and horrible.

L 1
8. The Name יְהֹוָה.

(a) Meaning of the Name.

That יְהֹוָה is not a Hebrew name, but is of Egyptian origin, is now generally agreed. It has been identified with mf, and derived from the root mf 'conceive, give birth' (AG WB, ii, 137 f.), in the sense of 'child, son of so-and-so'. This explanation was originally furnished by Lauth, ZDMG. 25 (1865) 139, and was adopted by later Egyptologists like Lepsius, Chronologie, 326, Ebers, Durch Gessen, 552, Brugsch and especially Spiegelberg, ZDMG. 53, 633 f. who sponsored this interpretation, supporting it by several examples from the New Kingdom to which the period of the Exodus is nearest. As a proper name this mf is generally regarded as an abbreviation of a theophoric name consisting of two elements, the first of which is the name of a god, like Ab-mose (P- mf), 'Son of the Moon', Thut-mose (dhuty-mf), 'Son of Thoth', or Ramenes (r-mf), 'Son of Re'. In the case of יְהֹוָה it is assumed that the heathen god-name was eliminated for monothestic reasons, retaining only the second

1 The fact that in passages like Ex. 20, 6; Gen. 48, 15; Num. 23, 20; Judges 19, 30 'unto this day' is similarly limited in point of time merely strengthens the view as to the indefiniteness of this phrase everywhere where it is used alone without reference to the past.

2 Josephus Ant. ii, 9 f and Contra Ap. 1, § 31 attempts to explain יְהֹוָה from mf (= Egypt. mw) 'water' and lw (= Egypt. lW) 'saved' but this cannot be supported from the Egyptian, and is, indeed, untenable on the ground that such a name-formation, as already observed by Lauth ZDMG. 25, p. 141, is unthinkable in Egyptian. For the same reason we must also reject the Coptic etymology אֱוָֽאָָּו a-fā as advanced by Jablonski, Oopasiria, i, 152 f. Moreover it is not the Hebrew but the Greek form Nāvēs adopted by the LXX on which Josephus' etymology is based.
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element mf. According to others (Naville, Pithom, p. 7, and Gardiner, J.E.A. 5, 221) יְהֹוָה is not an abbreviated theophoric name due to monotheistic tendencies, but signifies merely 'boy, child', whereby the anonymity of the founding was to be emphasized. But even on the first assumption it is not necessary to take for granted a tendentious abbreviation of the original theophoric name, as among the Egyptians themselves the abbreviated 'pet' form mf, derived from similar theophoric names, was common.

The identification of יְהֹוָה with mf though very far-fetched has, nevertheless, the appearance of being in order. But apart from objections advanced by some scholars and several difficulties that we do not deem necessary to specify the whole explanation of יְהֹוָה from mf 'conceive, bear', or from mf 'boy, child' fails to the ground in view of the fact that the very name Ramesses, in which mf is held to be of the same root as יְהֹוָה, is transliterated twice in the Exodus narrative 11, 11, and 12, 37, not as we should expect by יְהֹוָֽה, but by בֵּית יְהוָֽה. Now it is unthinkable that the same Egyptian word mf could be reproduced at one time as יְהֹוָֽה and at another as בֵּית יְהוָֽה, not only in two different vocalizations but also in two sibilants 꽉 꽊 and 꽊 which etymologically and phonetically are quite different.

All these difficulties and complications are removed by identifying the name יְהֹוָה with two Egyptian elements lying ready to hand, which exactly correspond in sound and yield a meaning in accordance with the whole
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spirit of the Moses story. The first element me (מ) means 'water',
but stands here metaphorically for 'seed' in the sense of 'child, son';
and the second element le (ל) means 'pond, lake, expanse of water'
and is applied here to the Nile which was called by the Egyptians also L. Thus ניל
means simply 'Child of the Nile'.

Reading the story, we get, indeed, the distinct impression that it was the
intention of the narrator to convey that the choice of me-le as the name of
the boy was to preserve the memory of his being found in the River Nile.
It is this feature which is emphasized in the name, and nothing appears
more plausible and adequate than the interpretation of me as 'Child of the Nile'.
To the Hebrew narrator the Egyptian signification of ניל was quite familiar.
He knew that נ meant the River Nile, and this he faithfully
reproduced in מ 'out of the water', for, as a matter of fact, the
Egyptians called their river also 'the water', an expression, as we have
seen above, p. 63, n. 3, repeatedly reproduced in the Exodus narrative by מ.
In the rendering of נ by מ 'The Water' in the sense of 'River Nile'
the narrator sought to retain in Hebrew the Egyptian idiom as he conceived
it in the mouth of the Egyptian-speaking daughter of Pharaoh when ex-
plaining the name. In the Hebrew motivation of the name by the words
מ the there are two factors present: In the association of the Egyptian name נ with מ 'The Water', i.e. River Nile, is the primary meaning of the boy's name as explained by the Egyptian Princess; and in the linking of מ with the Hebrew word מ 'draw out' or

E.g. naustr 'divine water' of Os-and so = 'divine son'. Cf. א. ג. W.B., ii, 52. Precisely the metaphorical use of this word in connexion with divine beings makes it plausible that the daughter of Pharaoh should apply it to the foundling as being a gift of the Nile god.

1 By נ the Egyptians denoted both lakes (e.g. the Bitter Lakes) and also ponds, ponds, canals, as well as all waters generally; likewise too especially broad expanses of the Nile, as, e.g. at Faiyum (N Axel = the great lake). The Hebrew pronunciation נ for N is supported by the Coptic m (Copt. m, L. m, m, and K.M. 185). This form N is also preserved in the name N (also N) by which the Bitter Lakes are still called. This is, moreover, the same name as בוב in Josh. 13, 1, 22, 3, and Jer. 2, 18, i.e. Lake of the Pharaoh (N B). The vocalization N is, however, not to be explained by the fact that the Hebrew punctuators saw in נ a Hebrew word akin to נ 'black' and accordingly rendered it in Hebrew form, but rather regarded it as a faithful rendering of the name נ as the Hebrews in the time of the Prophets heard it from the lips of Egyptians in a vernacular version. As a matter of fact a later Egyptian spelling נ points to a pronunciation of N (cf. Gardiner, Sinuhe, p. 253, n. 2). It is noteworthy that N is today still living among the Bishari Bedouins in Egypt, south of Assuan, in the form of N, possibly denoting the large expanse and accumulation of waters at the edge of the Waqin (cf. Hess, Zeitsschr. f. Kolonialre., ii, p. 216, also above, p. 50, n. 3 and p. 185, n. 3). As will be seen, this form reveals the palatable terminal N as in נ, which, moreover, also still lurks in the Coptic form.
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'escape' lies the secondary interpretation added by the Hebrew narrator: himself. He knew quite well that originally between נ and נ there was no association of meaning any more than there was e.g. between the Babylonian name נ (cf. above, p. 232) and the Hebrew word מ (Gen. 21, 1). Nevertheless it suited him to be able to find a word like נ which in meaning and sound was admirably appropriate for interpreting the alien name נ in the spirit and savour of the Hebrew language without obliterating the original Egyptian signification of the name. That in assonant motivation of names little regard is paid to etymological exactitude we have sufficiently seen from all the examples of such name-derivation cited above.

In further illustration and support of our identification of נ with the Egyptian נ we would add that נ figures as a component in a whole series of Egyptian theophoric names. Thus, e.g., נ מ-ש 'Amon-in-the-Lake'; נ מ-ש 'On-the-Lake'; נ מ-ש 'Over the crocodile god' in the Lake'; and on the Lake', מ-ש 'Horus of the Lake' or 'in, on, the Lake'; also in female names: נ נ-ש 'Nab (?) on her Lake'; and generally, 'God in, or on, the Lake' מ-ש; also in abbreviated form with the omission of the name of the deity, e.g. 'N-א-ש 'The Precious One on the Lake'; נ-ש 'He on the Lake', and many others. All these examples furnish us with undeniable support for the identification of נ with מ; and the frequency

1 We merely assume that the root נ is of Hebrew origin, although it is exemplified in no other Semitic language in the meaning 'draw out, rescue', and even in the Bible only occurs elsewhere in a Sam. 22, 17 = Ps. 18, 17, where the text is later than our passage and even seems to be dependent on it. On the other hand we should not omit to mention that the Egyptian mn, also m (different from m) means 'bring along', said also of persons, etc., W.B., ii, 135, so that ultimately נ might likewise be an Egyptian loan-word with the above meaning. Be it as it may, for the real explanation of the name נ stress is laid on נ and not on the verb נ.

2 Cf. A.B. 69 (1907), p. 95; Die theoph. Persamen. p. 254; and 274. In the Berlin, A.B. Namen-Wörterbuch, still under issue, will be found many other examples of such names.

3 In the water' would better apply to the crocodile god Sobek than 'on the water'. The name m-א-ש, Hoffmann, loc. cit., p. 25, would probably mean 'The beautiful (god) of the lake'. It should further be observed that the crocodile god also occurs as component in several theophoric names, e.g. מ-א-ש 'He that appears (or has appeared) on the waters', in which he also frequently occurs as component in abbreviated names, e.g. מ-ש 'He that is found under the water', or מ-ש 'He be found in both waters'. With regard to the name מ-ש, the dual form מ is noteworthy because it reveals the same formation as מ-ש. All these names allude to the appearance of the gods when, on particular occasions, they are called on a bank in solemn procession on the Nile or on a canal or lake near a temple. Possibly the choice of such a name may be explained by the birth of the child on the festival of the god concerned, in the sense that the arrival of the child is regarded as the appearance of the god after which it is named.
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spirit of the Moses story. The first element me (me) means 'water', but
stands here metaphorically for 'seed' in the sense of 'child, son';1 and the
second element le (le) means 'pond, lake, expanse of water' and is applied
to the Nile which was called by the Egyptians also le. Thus me
means simply 'Child of the Nile'.

Reading the story, we get, indeed, the distinct impression that it was the
intention of the narrator to convey that the choice of me-le as the name of
the boy was to preserve the memory of his being found in the River Nile.
It is this feature which is emphasized in the name, and nothing appears
more plausible and adequate than the interpretation of me as 'Child of the Nile'. To the Hebrew narrator the Egyptian signification of me was
quite familiar. He knew that me meant the River Nile, and that this he faithfully
reproduced in waw (p) 'out of the water', for, as a matter of fact, the
Egyptians called their river also 'the water', an expression, as we have
seen above, p. 63, n. 3, repeatedly reproduced in the Exodus narrative by waw.
In the rendering of me by waw 'The Water' in the sense of 'River Nile'
the narrator sought to retain in Hebrew the Egyptian idiom as he conceived
it in the mouth of the Egyptian-speaking daughter of Pharaoh when expla-
nining the name. In the Hebrew motivation of the name by the words
waw waw (p) 'draw out' there are two factors present: In the association of
the Egyptian name me-le with waw 'The Water', i.e. River Nile, is the
primary meaning of the boy's name as explained by the Egyptian Princess;
and in the linking of waw with the Hebrew word waw (p) 'draw out' or
waw (p) 'draw out'.

1 E.g. me ntr 'divine water' of So and so= = 'divine son'. Cf. Az. WB, ii, 32. Precise
ly the metaphorical use of this word in connexion with divine beings makes it plausible
that the daughter of Pharaoh should apply it to the foundling as being a gift of the
Nile.

2 By le the Egyptians denoted both lakes (as e.g. the Bitter Lakes) and brooks, ponds,
canals, as well as all waters generally; likewise too especially broad expanses of the Nile, as
e.g. at Fayaum (P=or 'the great lake'). The Hebrew pronunciation waw (p) for le is supported
by the Coptic сук (Bu) and Gr. and L. сук (Bu). This form le is also pres-
served in the name лем (le). by which the Bitter Lakes are still called. This is,
moreover, the same name as лем (le) in Josh. 13, 1, 18, 3, 3, and Jer. 2, 3, 18, 18, i.e. 'Lake of
Horus' (le-de). The vocalization υ is, however, not to be explained by the fact that the
Hebrew punctuators saw in υ a Hebrew word akin to waw (p) 'black' and accordingly
rendered it in Hebrew form, but rather regarded it as a faithful rendering of the name le-
le, as the Hebrews in the time of the Prophets heard it from the lips of Egyptians in a
vernacular variation. As a matter of fact a later Egyptian spelling й points to a pronunciation
υ (cf. Gaden, Stimme, p. 223, n. 2). It is noteworthy that le is today still living among
the Bithaina Bedouins in Egypt, south of Assuan, in the form of й (ltan), denoting the
large expanse and accumulation of water at the edge of the Wadi (cf. Hess, Zeitfr. f.
Koloniafr., ix, p. 215, also above, p. 59, n. 2 and p. 16, n. 3). As will be seen, this form
reveals the palatalized terminal й as in υ, which, moreover, also still lurks in the Coptic
form.
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with which P appears as a name-component leaves no doubt that a name
like "Asil could only have originated and been understood in an Egyptian
environment.1

(b) Form and Meaning of the 'Ark' in the Bulrushes.

In conjunction with the interpretation of Moses' name we will attempt
also to explain the story of the ark in the bulrushes by defining the nature
of the ark and analysing the motives of Moses' mother in selecting an ark
of this kind.

We must ask: What sort of 'ark' was denoted by "Asil, and how did the
mother imagine the rescue of her child by using just this particular ark?

It has long been established that "Asil is the Egyptian gh3.t or bh3 = ma[a],
and the word has been already fully discussed above, p. 205 ff. But whereas
it is applied to 'ship', in the flood-story, Gen. 6, 14 ff., gh3.t is used here in
its real meaning of coffer, chest, holy shrine, coffin. Such a chest generally
had the form of a divine shrine (Nasa), and served as housing for images
of gods which were dedicated to the temples. Of the numerous shrines which
have been preserved several are in stone of different qualities, while others
are in plain wood, according to the prominence of the deity represented and
the pecuniary means of the donors.2 The simpler ones chiefly comprise
the shrines given by humble people, in the form of a longish chest with a
small door in the upper portion for the front of statues of gods about the
size of a child. Such chests or arks were to be found in all the Egyptian
temples from the earliest to the latest times, and they were duly noted by

1 We should not omit to mention that one might be tempted to interpret the first com-
ponent D in D' as the Egyptian preposition m, i.e. 'in, from, out of', so that D' = m-D'
would mean 'out of the water', and more closely corresponding to the expression ד' ד'.
But in this case the phonetic explanation of 'D would be possible only by assuming a
pronunciation "m for the preposition m. This, however, lacks proof, and isolated cases
like and in K42, K42 in Copitic and Demotic (cf. Steinmuller, Kopt. Gram., § 329,
Spiegelberg, Demot. Gram., § 290) do not suffice. Moreover, we have the fact that since
the Amarna period, towards the end of the 18th dynasty, the preposition m in front of
names must have been used terminally, as it exchanged with n, which is only possible in
a closed syllable (cf. Frida Behn, Gram. d. Texte aus El-Amarna, Berlin, Ditz, 1924, 9). In
adhering therefore to our interpretation of D' = m-D', because it is in every respect
unobjectionable and completely intelligible, we nevertheless do not exclude the possibility
of a pronunciation "m for the Egyptian preposition m, for the reason that the Copitic forms
must have some ground, and possibly originate from vernacular Egyptian.

In many passages the form can be recognised from the determinative gh3, where it looks
like a Nas, a square box, or like the above described chest, the same determinative being used
as for chest, chapel of the gods (khq, khq).
As will be seen, the narrative reflects ideas and conditions only conceivable in an Egyptian milieu, while the use of the Egyptian word ḫw provides the key to the understanding of the whole episode. As it has become customary to invoke the legend of the birth and exposure of Sargon I, King of Akkad (2600 B.C., cf. KB, iii, i, p. 100, AOT, p. 234; Rogers, p. 153), with our story, it is necessary to emphasize that in essence and character, as well as in content and form, it is completely different from the Moses narrative. In the case of Sargon, his mother, in contrast to the mother of Moses, exposed the child to drown it! Moreover there is a notable difference in language and local colour. In the case of Sargon everything is Babylonian: the 'ark' is the basket-shaped boat Kappu, the material is derived from the Babylonian reed mur, and was pitched with the asphalt ḫadi commonly used in Babylonia. In the case of Moses there is no trace of these things. Here everything is Egyptian: ḫw is in meaning and form Egyptian, and the material is of the Egyptian papyrus reed ḫw = bmr (Papyrus Niloticus). Thus it is not, as is frequently

1 Characteristic for the retention of the Egyptian mode of speech is the added demonstrative pronoun h3 in the words of Pharaoh's daughter: h3 gpr inh. 'One of the Hebrew children is this!' Ex. 2.6, in the sense of the Egyptian ps, for the special emphasis of the subject, cf. Ehrman, Grm. 473, and Gardiner, Grm. 128. Generally the Hebrew in such cases uses the h3 but here the narrator was concerned to reproduce this sentence as uttered by an Egyptian, in the Egyptian construction. Cf. above, p. 6. As we shall elsewhere this use of h3 is not exceptional.

2 It should be incidentally observed that in Post-Biblical Hebrew ḫw was originally used for the holy Ark of the Torah scrolls, and later extended to mean a praying-desk, e.g. Be’er- haqash, 34a, Rdt Haltünd, 32 b, etc. Levy, Neuhöf, W.R. s.v. In Berdî Ñabbi, sec. 32 ḫw ḫy means a boat (not a box, Levy ibid.) open on both sides, i.e. flat, as is proved by the variant ḥm ḫy 'cocking ship'. Rassam.getDescription. Rabba, sec. 4.

3 This kind of boat is still retained for local ferry traffic on the Tigris in the original form and even the Akkadian designation bûs (L) is still in use.

9. The Name of the Town TextChanged

In the case of this name also the Egyptian provides us with an explanation of its motivation. There are two versions: according to one, in connexion with Abraham, Gen. 21, 28 f., the name ḫw ḫl lit. 'the well seven' is derived from the number of the seven sheep which Abraham presented to Abimelech; according to the second, in connexion with Isaac, Gen. 26, 32 f., it is no longer brought into relation with the number of sheep, but interpreted as follows: 'And it came to pass on that day that Isaac's servants came and told him concerning the well which they had digged, and said unto him: We have found water. And he called it seven', whereupon the remark follows 'Therefore the name of the city is ḫw ḫl unto this day'. Here, clearly, the connexion between 'seven' and the discovery of water is suggested, whereby 'seven' is conceived as the name of the well, which, however, is not interpreted symbolically as in Gen. 21, 28 f., but anecdotally, as in the case of the other wells (Gen. 26, 20-2). The choice of the number seven as the name for the well must accordingly

4 On ḫw and the use of papyrus reeds for light stuffs, cf. above, p. 206, n. 1. According to Porcher, De Isra, chap. 18, the Egyptian boatmen were fond of using this reed because they believed that it afforded protection against crocodiles, since Isis had journeyed in a papyrus boat in the search for the remains of Osiris in the Nile. This popular conception might also have influenced the choice of ḫw for the ark, a feature which would admirably suit the Egyptian background.

5 This example is the best illustration of the insight displayed by those Egyptologists who maintain that the Moses story, as indeed the whole of the Joseph and Exodus narratives, were composed in Palestine many centuries after the Exodus, suggesting that the Egyptian influence is due to mere literary intercourse, and could even be ascribed to commercial relations with Egypt. Some of them even suggest that the Hebrew narrator had picked up all these Egyptian elements from his acquaintance with some Egyptian mercenaries who served in a Hebrew army, or from a Hebrew who returned home from a long sojourn in Egypt! Cf. Spiegelberg, Z. für Sem., vol. vii, p. 109 f.
GENESIS STORIES AND NARRATIVES OF THE PATRIARCHS

10. The Names

In view of the numerous examples of Egyptian orientation in the interpretations, the question arises whether some of the names from pre-Egyptian epoch in the Pentateuch may not reflect the meaning of similarly sounding Egyptian words with which they were associated, in order to interpret the names retrospectively, following tendencies that arose later in the Egyptian epoch. We have primarily in mind names like ÏÎ and ÏO in the saying of Noah, Gen. 9, 25 f., the cursing of Canaan, the son of Ham, and the blessing of Shem, the ancestor of Israel, wishes and hopes anticipated that can only have been formed through the later history between Israel and Canaan. Seeing that Canaan is condemned to be a curse to his brethren and that the dwelling of the divine presence is to be in ancient towns which have received an Arabic form, thus e.g. Nîhâ (nîhâ) from 'Áqir (qâr) from ʼÁqir, Kânîn (kânîn) from ʼÁqir, ʼAqîr, Mîhôd (mîhôd) from ʼÁqîr, mention merely the best known.

1 Whereas in the Abraham narrative, Gen. 21, 28 f., the old interpretation of the name of the town has been preserved, here the new explanation under Egyptian influence is shown.

2 On a visit to this town, some of these wells were shown to me. The present interpretation of the name as 'Well of the Lion' is derived merely from the Arabic sound of the phonetic ï||, which is only a corruption of the old ï||, like many other names. 

3 This is not the place for raising the question of the origin of certain pre-patriarchal names: whether they came down to the Hebrews in their present form, or were invented by them at the beginning of their literary activity on the ground of events with which these individuals were associated.

4 The functions of the ʼim as priest, cf. inter alia Erman, Relig., pp. 131 and 136. The so-called Horheb (hôr-ḥeḇ), who occupied a high rank as precentor-priest and 'Scholar in the writings of God', as well as other high priests, were likewise designated as ʼim. Cf. Ex.-Gr. 160 and 139.

5 That Canaan is mentioned by name, though not Israel, is quite natural, because Canaan in the conception of the author of the narrative already existed when the episode occurred, whereas Israel came on the scene much later, and, therefore, could only be alluded to in the blessing of Shem.

6 As a rule it is the first-born son of the legitimate wife. Accordingly the patriarch Abraham was called not the 'father of Ishmael' but the 'father of Isaac' (cf. Gen. 21, 12). For this custom among the Arabs, cf. Goldscheider, Mukh. Studien i, 197.

7 I remember an incident in which a sanguinary quarrel arose among Bedouins of a South
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tents of Śen, the question arises whether the emphasis of just these two features may not be reflected in an association of the names Ham and Šen with like-sounding Egyptian words, even though originally no connexion existed between the two names and Egyptian words, and this association was only inherited for the purpose of interpretation. It is indeed a very surprising fact that Ham—on means in Egyptian 'serf, servant, slave' (Er. Gr. p. 109), and Im—Šen is the designation for a priest of high rank. In the first case, it is therefore very likely that the author of the narrative associated the name Šen with the Egyptian Im—on serf, in order to indicate the predestination of Canaan as the serf of Israel in the very name of his father Ham; and in the second case Egyptian Šen—on priest served him as basis for the name Šen, in order to anticipate in the name the inspiration that 'God might dwell in his tents', which, of course, only relates to Israel, in whose midst a permanent abode for God was to be erected. Both names were thus interpreted in the sense of the Egyptian words Im and Šen as indicative of the situation of their descendants: Canaan the son of the despised Ham was to be the most wretched of serfs; Israel, the most distinguished among the descendants of the exiled Šen, was to be the chosen of the eternal God as the custodian of his sanctuary, or, as later more comprehensively expressed, 'a kingdom of priests and holy people' (Ex. 19, 6). That Ham, Gen. 9, 22, is described as 'father of Canaan' is in accordance with an ancient Semitic custom which still survives throughout the whole of the East, whereby a man of some distinction or notoriety is called by the name of his oldest son 'father of so-and-so'; but sometimes, however, by that of a younger favourite child or rascally son, to signify honour or abuse. When, in our case, Ham is not called father of Kûlah, after the

10. The Names Šep, Šən, and Šin. In view of the numerous examples of Egyptian orientation in these interpretations, the question arises whether some of the names from the pre-Egyptian epoch in the Pentateuch may not reflect the meaning of similarly sounding Egyptian words with which they were associated, in order to interpret the names retrospectively, following tendencies that arose later in the Egyptian epoch. We have primarily in mind names like Šep and Šen. In the saying of Noah, Gen. 9, 25 f., the cursing of Canaan, the son of Ham, and the blessing of Šen, the ancestor of Israel, wishes and hopes anticipated that can only have been formed through the later history between Israel and Canaan. Seeing that Canaan is condemned to be subject to his brethren and that the dwelling of the divine presence is to be in the tent of the lion, the name Šen has in Hebrew a particular meaning. The name Šen is commonly found in the form Men (1 Sam. 17, 51), and the Old Testament text includes a number of examples: Gen. 13, 17; 21, 33, in which cases the name is often used as a proper noun. It is also found in the form Menahem (21, 33), which is a corruption of the old Menahem (Menahem), which is the name of an Egyptian word meaning 'peace'. The name Menahem is also found in the form Mena (21, 33). The name Menahem is also found in the form Menahem (Menahem), which is the name of an Egyptian word meaning 'peace'. The name Menahem is also found in the form Mena (Menahem), which is also the name of an Egyptian word meaning 'peace'.

1 Whereas in the Abraham narrative, Gen. 21, 28 ff., the old interpretation of the name of the town has been preserved, here the new explanation under Egyptian influence is to be noted down.
2 On a visit to this town, some of these wells were shown to me. The present interpretation of the name 'Well of the Lion' is derived merely from the Arabic sound of the words, which is only a corruption of the old Men Menahem, like many other names of ancient towns which have received an Arabic form, thus e.g. Nīde (Ninud) from ager (aiger), Aīn (Ain) from ibn (abn), Mībahat (Mibaahat) from mubhāh (mubahah).
3 mention merely the best known.

1 This is not the place for raising the question of the origin of certain pre-patriarchal names: whether they came down to us in their present form, or were invented by them at the beginning of their literary activity on the ground of events with which these individuals were associated.

2 On the functions of the Im as priest, cf. inter alia Erman, Relig., pp. 151 and 156. The so-called Hereth (Hereth), who occupied a high rank as preacher-priest and scholar in the writings of God, as well as other high priests, were likewise designated as Im. Cf. Ex. Gr. 240 and 130.

3 That Canaan is mentioned by name, though not Israel, is quite natural, because Canaan is the conception of the author of the narrative already existed when the episode occurred, whereas Israel came on the scene much later, and, therefore, could only be alluded to in the blessing of Šen.

As a rule it is the first-born son of the legitimate wife. Accordingly the patriarch Abraham was called not the 'father of Ishmael' but the 'father of Isaac' (cf. Gen. 21, 13). For this custom among the Arabs, cf. Goldzieher, Muh. Studien 1, 267.

I remember an incident in which a sanguinary quarrel arose among Bedouins of a South
name of his eldest son, but father of Canaan, Gen. 10, 6, after the name
his youngest, this is done intentionally to denote Canaan, in connec-
tion with the event related, as the unworthy son of a dishonoured and de-
plorable father, and this explains why Canaan of all the sons of Hám was
made a target for Noah's curse.

The establishment of the fact that Hám is intentionally described as
a 'father of Canaan' enables us also to understand the much contested word
Hám 'his youngest son' (9, 24), which cannot possibly refer to Hám's
youngest son of Noah, as he was not his youngest, but his second son.
These words in reality have been displaced and properly belong after
Hám 'curse be Canaan' (verse 25). Accordingly the original text would
read: 'And Noah knew what his son had done to him and he
Cursed be Canaan his youngest son.' That Hám is really stood
this place is most clearly indicated by הָיוּ, which, like יִשָּׁה דָּבָר 25, can
apply to Kőh and the other brothers of Canaan, Gen. 10, 6, but only
Shem and Jäpheth, the brothers of Hám, and primarily to Shem, as the
story is only told for the purpose of justifying the condemnation of Canaan
to servitude for a long time before Israel existed. But the reference of the pronoun
suffix in יִשָּׁה is only tenable if הָיוּ précédise. Only by
a restatement of הָיוּ in its right place does the text become intelligible
and the whole pronoun becomes perfectly clear, in the light
of ancient Oriental customs and thought.1

On similar grounds one may perceive an association of the name
with Egyptian. There can be no doubt that the second component
means 'father', and that the whole name is to be understood as 'son of
father'. But as in this event the first component, א, would have been
taken for 'son', and this word in such a meaning does not exist in
Semitic language, the possibility remains that in א we have a play on
an Egyptian word א' 'child' and א, 'son' (cf. above, p. 206, note 1), where
א obtains its simple explanation as 'child of the father'. Herewith
the obvious intentionality of the Moabites as the foes of Israel
is very clearly brought out in the name of their progenitor.2

Palestinian tribe because one of them mockingly apostrophized another, who was
'a father of Hamath', as 'father of Tadil'. Tadil happened to be the name of a young
man who, on account of frequent thefts, had fallen into disrepute, and also had a bad name
as a coward.1

The misplacement was probably caused by the homoeoteleuton וְיָדָה.
1 How the pun of א with א (Gen. 9, 25) is to be understood, I am unable to say.
2 The name Ammon, the second son of Lot, can be interpreted as reflecting a
meaning, but as it would entail a discussion of matters which do not belong here,
revert to it another occasion.

CHAPTER VII.

A. EGYPTIAN LOANWORDS AND EXPRESSIONS.

As in the section on the Joseph and Exodus narratives, so in this section
too, not all Egyptian elements have been exhausted. Apart from the word
בֵּין 'water-skin' Gen. 21, 14 f. 19, already recognized by others as the
Egyptian word בֵּין 'hide, skin', Ember, AZ. 49 (1911), 91, Er.-Gr. 136,1
there are still words, expressions, and phrases always regarded as typical of
the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives, which, on closer examination,
are found to be Egyptian borrowings or reveal peculiarities of construction
or style modelled on Egyptian.3 From these we propose to select here
a few particularly instructive instances and phrases of which many are
contained in the patriarchal narratives, and which, besides the already
discussed interpretation of names, provide a further illustration of Egyptian
influence even in the narratives of the forefathers of Israel, emanating from
the pre-Egyptian epoch.

1. פִּינָה

שֹּׁפֶר Gen. 8, 21 and many other passages for want of a better etymology is
generally derived from פִּינָה 'rest', despite the impossible form פִּינָה, and we
are still left without a clear conception of what the word really means.
In reality it is the Egyptian נָחַה (נָחַה), a quite common word for 'eternity'
used in profane and especially in sacred writings in connexion with
sacrifices, libations, offerings, holy foundations, and in benedictory formulas
for the eternal salvation of a god, a king, or a dead person.2 The customary

1 Cf. e.g. Mennephtah 6 (AZ. 34, 8), where it is said of the fleeing warriors that they emplunged
their water-skins (בֵּין) in order to get away more quickly. It should be noted that the
word פִּינָה only occurs in the narrative of the Egyptian woman Hager.
2 The suggested identity of פִּינָה 'to be pregnant' with the Egyptian form, Er.-Gr. 9, put
forward by Sethe, Verb Glossar 101 and others, is doubtful; it is rather a borrowing from
the Akkadian כָּדָע, Del. WB. 130, even if it is not a common Semitic word. פִּינָה 'water
tough', Gen. 30, 39, 41, Ez. 2, 16 can just as well be the Akkadian כָּדָע 'water gutter',
Del. WB. 603, as also the Egyptian נָחַה 'water trench', Ember, AZ. 40, 93; cf. COPIC
papré, KWB., p. 107. It cannot be said with certainty whether it belongs to the Semitic
borrowings in Egyptian, nevertheless it is noteworthy that it occurs in this meaning only
in Genesis and Exodus. In the last resort it might belong to Canaanite words which were
current in Hebrew and Egyptian in identical meaning. Cf. above, p. 100 and below, p. 206 f.
3 Cf. e.g. Pap. d'Orb., viii, 1: 'I will not again be with thee till eternity (ר נָחַה)'. Pyr.
sacrificial formulae thus means 'savour for eternity' or 'eternal savour'. It was particularly because of the use in Egyptian of ṣnh in ritual matters that ṣnh was thought suitable to be used in kindred sacrificial texts, and this is the explanation of its appearance as a specific expression in the terminology of the sacrificial cult in the Pentateuch. It should be emphasized that ṣnh is typical for the Pentateuch, where it occurs no less than forty times, and is not to be found in any other Biblical book, with the exception of Ezekiel (four times) 6, 13, 16, 20, 28, and 20, 41. The Prophet being prone to employ archaic expressions and phrases from the ritual texts. This word remained, like other Egyptian borrowings in the Pentateuch, peculiar to ancient use, and did not pass into the ordinary literary language.1

In Gen. 26, 12 ṣnh is linked up with the 'value, market price', arbitrarily extended to the idea of quantity, ṣnh ṣnh being interpreted as 'hundred-fold', a signification which ṣnh nowhere reveals, and which also presents grammatical difficulties, as in this case it should have been expressed adverbially, quite apart from the fact that in Hebrew the phrase should be ṣnh nakan. (Deut. 21, 17). Just as little is the meaning 'measure' for ṣnh probable, and even if it were connected with the Post-Biblical ṣnh, it would furnish the idea of a vague measure, whereas ṣnh ṣnh palpably meant to convey a quite clear conception of the quantity grown from the seed.2 As a matter of fact this word can only yield a satisfactory meaning by taking it as a loan word from the Egyptian ᵣnḥ ('granary' or 'barn'), and the text simply states that the harvest

412 a: 'The life of the (dead king) N.N. is eternity (ṣnh)'; 412 c: 'The faveour of W. is among the king, on this earth for evermore in eternity (ṣnh)'; 177 b: of the offerings and libations for the dead king: 'Give him of thy good bread (ḳh·ḥm·ḥq) of everlastingness (n ḫḥ) of the breath (ḥḥ·ḥḥ) of eternity (n ṣnh)'; similarly Vogelhong, Bauer B. 2. 126, p. 290: 'Verse 2: will eat thy bread (ḳh·ḥm·ḥq·ḥḥ) of the thorn (ḥḥ·ḥḥ) of eternity (n ṣnh)'; cf. further T. Pop. Arq. chap. 17, 1, 29 (= Budge, Dead, i. 86): Eternity (ṣnh) is the day, everlastingness (ḏḥ) is the night'; in the Hymn to Re (= Budge, Dead, i. p. 11, 1), Re is called 'Lord of Eternity (ṣnh ṣnh), Lord of Everlastingness (ḥḥ ḫḥ)'; Litany to Osiris, i. 5 = ibid. chap. 15. Osiris is 'Eternity (ṣnh) and Everlastingness (ḏḥ)'; ibid. i. p. 172, chap. A. 7, the dead says: 'I have been given boundless eternity (ṣnh); I inherit eternity (everlastingness (ḏḥ) is my portion'.

1 When treating the sacrificial and ritual terms in the Pentateuch we shall revert to class of words, and explain also the relation between Ezekiel and Leviticus. ṣnh article occurs only Gen. 8, 31 and with suffix only Levit. 26, 31; Num. 8, 2, Ez. 20, 43.

2 This ṣnh 'barley' of the LXX has here no meaning and is based on a pure reading of the Hebrew is unquestionable.
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patriarch in the very first year filled one hundred granaries or barns.3 It should be pointed out that ṣnh is only used here in connexion with seed and harvest, and also belongs to those Egyptian borrowings which disappeared early from literary usage.4

3. ṣnh.

In Gen. 27, 40 the word ṣnh is an old crux interpretum, as it cannot be satisfactorily explained from kindred Hebrew roots. If, however, it is associated with the Egyptian ṣnb, ṣnb = Jsḥ, we obtain the meaning 'to be firm, strong, powerful'. Our passage would, therefore, read: 'And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; but when thou becomest strong thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck'.

4. ṣnh, ṣnb, and ṣnh ṣnb.

In Gen. 35, 17 it is related of the dying Rachel that she called her newborn child ṣnh ṣnb, and that the father called it Benjamin ṣnb. It is in the general view that ṣnh means 'Son of my sorrow'. This is an assumption built upon another assumption, as, for lack of a plausible etymology, ṣnh Deut. 26, 14 is called into service, being taken to mean 'mourning'. But quite apart from the fact that the interpretation of this passage is very questionable, it appears strange that the dying mother and not, as one would expect, the unhappy father should give the child a name in which grief at the tragic fate of its mother is expressed. This is all the more strange

1 Cf. Ammosepes, viii, 6 (of the violent one): 'His granaries (ḳn·ḥm pl. from ṣnh) shall be destroyed, his possessions taken from him of his children'; further xii, 1: 'Better is a butler (ḳn·ḥm) that the god gives them, than five thousand by violence; these remiss not a single day in barn (ḳn·ḥm) and granary (ḳn·ḥm)'. That Hebrew ṣnh is a loan word from ṣnh is generally recognized. Cf. above, p. 76, note 1.

2 The expression for harvesting used here is ṣnb 'find'. Significantly enough the same expression in the same sense as ṣnh here also occurs in the passage cited from Ammosepes, in conjunction with seed and grain, namely viii, 17 f.: 'Pough up the fields, then shalt thou find thy need and receive the bread of thine own threshing floor'. Like many another saying therein, this too probably goes back to a much older source. The resemblance between many sayings in Ammosepes and in older Egyptian Wisdom Books seems to justify the assumption of common older sources.

3 Cf. ṣnb also rod, ḥv. II, 410 f., Copiec ṣhb (B), ṣhp (B), e.g. in Gardiner, Atonum, on q, q: 'He banishes thirst from thee so that thou becomest strong (rod) and art not weak (ḳn·ḥm)'. Another word that might come under consideration is rd 'to grow, bloom, flourish'; ḥv. II, 463, so that in our ṣnh both words might lurk with equally suitable meaning, but ṣnh seems to us to be preferable.

4 The same meaning is to be found in Jerem. 2, 31: 'We are strong with God'; likewise also Hosea 12, 1: 'Strong with God and faithful to his holy ones'. As to ṣnh, Ps. 55, 3 it is from another stem with different meaning.
as the name given to the child by the father—far from having any reference to the mother’s death—suggests the idea of vigour and energy. We must, therefore, look for another meaning in ונש.

Now the same word ונש occurs in the Pentateuch also in Gen. 49. 3 and Deut. 21. 17. As in these passages the meaning of ‘mourning’ is out of the question, it is interpreted according to the context as ‘strength, manliness’, especially as it is applied to the first-born. This expression is also to be found in Ps. 78. 51 and Ps. 105. 26, where, as should be observed, it has reference to Egypt. This point is of significance because it shows that ונש must somehow be connected with Egyptian conceptions. Taking up this clue we find that in Egyptian ונש (wenn) means ‘to be, to exist’, ונש ‘he that exists, used for ‘man’; ונש as abstract ‘the existing’ is used as an expression for ‘all being’, often also ונש נבש for ‘everything that is, all that are’. Of special importance for us is the use of the substantive plural ונשא for ‘beings’, which from the earliest times is applied to gods and divine beings, and from the 18th dynasty onwards also to men.\textit{Ag. WB.}, 1, p. 308 ff.

From all this it appears that in ונש we have the idea of being, of existing, and this is the meaning also of ונש in which the word won is reproduced. It expresses ‘being’ and in this sense ונש in Gen. 35. 18 is to be understood, and to be rendered ‘son of my being, of my existence’, whereby the dying mother conveys the idea that in the child she is leaving is incorporated her whole personality, her own ‘ego’, as would be said to-day, and that it will be to the father as substitute in her place. Now in this light the name given to the child by the father appears as a pendant to that given by the mother: he selects the name ונבש ‘son of the right’, to symbolize the position occupied by his favourite wife as his right hand, his main support. The same is implied also in Gen. 49. 3 and Deut. 21. 17, where the first-born is described as ונבש, i.e. the choicest of the father’s sons.

1 The word is written ונש and also more fully ונש, so that the primary form may as well be read.\textit{inform.}; as read.\textit{gen.}. In the first case will be pronounced as won for which the Hebrew would have put ונש. A fuller discussion of this word will be found in\textit{Ershoherung}, p. 32 f.

2 Of gods it is already employed in Pyr. and is found elsewhere in Books of the Dead; of men, as a rule, it is regarded as a choice expression,\textit{cf. e.g. Berg, Buch d. Einfahg.,} p. 374. 8: ‘Thy name remains in the mouth of the beings (wenn-w) for men.

3 Of course, Benjamin must be regarded as the original name, as he is never called ‘Ben-

4 On the much discussed passage\textit{Num. 33. 27-30} we will not say anything about the word\textit{Num.}, which can only mean ‘son of the right hand’. It is hardly to be doubted.
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being, the most appropriate expression for the first manifestation of his strength.\textit{1}

Similarly in Deut. 26. 14, ‘\textit{טָמִים} is to be interpreted as ‘in my being’, ‘during my existence’ meaning ‘in my lifetime’, as the Egyptian ונש is also used in such a case.\textit{2} Here the countryman solemnly proclaims that he has given the portion of his harvest due to the Levite and the poor, during the whole period of his existence, throughout his whole life, that he has never enjoyed it himself, but always surrendered it according to precept.\textit{3}

As to Ps. 78. 51 and 105. 26, \textit{טָמִים} is of great interest in that it is used successively like the Egyptian \textit{טָמִים} (subst. plur.) when it is employed just as \textit{טָמִים} here (also subst. plur.) in relation to a place or land, namely in the sense of ‘inhabitants’.\textit{4} In Ps. 78. 51 reads: ‘And he smote all the first-born in Egypt, the choicest of the inhabitants in the tents of H\textit{âm}’; and in Ps. 105. 36 reads: ‘And he smote all the first-born in Egypt, the choicest of the inhabitants in the tents of H\textit{âm}’.
their land, the choicest of all the inhabitants. In both passages it is emphasized that even the most distinguished among the Egyptians were smitten by the plague, as it is said, Ex. 11, 5: "from the first-born of Pharaoh to the first-born of the maid servant behind the millstones", cf. above, p. 83.

This phrase was undoubtedly taken over by the Psalmists from old poetical descriptions of the Exodus. The old poets, like the author of Gen. 49, 3, who used  מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer well that the Egyptians applied the word  מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer to people of high dignity and distinction. This old meaning still lurks in מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer of the Psalms, where it is employed ironically in reference to the most distinguished inhabitants of Egypt who could not escape the divine judgement.

5. מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer for "Generations".

The peculiarity of מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer, literally "births", plural of מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer, a feminine noun built from בָּרֹות "to give birth", is: (1) it is typical of the lists of the first generations and the patriarchal families; (2) that in Gen. 2, 4 it is applied to the creation of heaven and earth, and (3) that it is employed as a heading to genealogical tables in Genesis, apparently being a specific expression for chronology.

Now in Egyptian there is an analogous feminine formation מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer, "birth", from מִיָּהּ to bear, and: (1) it is used as a collective word for "children, descendants", both in reference to men, and also to kings and gods (Aa. 140, 420, e.g. מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer-ךָ children, descendants of Horus; (2) it belongs to archaic speech, is peculiar to the ancient stories of the gods and Books of the Dead, and is later replaced by מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer masc. plural of מִי "child" (ibid. 139 f.), so that e.g. for "children of Horus" the fem. plur. מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer was no longer used, but the masc. plur. מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer hr.

We thus have in מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer both in form and usage an exact parallel to מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer, likewise used collectively for "children", in the sense of "generations". We now understand why it appeared suitable to be set as a caption at the head of genealogical tables. But מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer also follows the Egyptian in that it is confined to writing, and was later replaced by מִי תּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer "children of", exactly as in Egyptian מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer was substituted for the archaic מִתּוֹלֵTokenizer.

Here too, we have an example of the predilection shown by the author of the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives for adopting expressions peculiar to the early history of the Egyptians and the myths of their gods, a tendency to which reference has already been made elsewhere. The very fact that מִתּוֹלֵ StringTokenizer is restricted to those parts of the Pentateuch is a further proof that they belong to the oldest chronological records in Israel. This is supported by the fact that, especially in reference to the patriarchal and tribal families, in chronicles likewise מִתּוֹלֵTokenizer was only used in reference to the older tribal families, and this because the chronicler clung to the expression which he found in the ancient records.

From the Egyptian מִתּוֹלֵTokenizer it may perhaps also be possible to explain the use of מִתּוֹלֵTokenizer in Gen. 2, 4, as מִתּוֹלֵTokenizer is used in the sense of "creations", not only of divine creatures. Thus here מִתּוֹלֵTokenizer would simply mean creations, and the text would read: "These are the creations of heaven and earth when they were created". That this sentence forms the conclusion of the first account of the creation, as is maintained by some Biblical critics, is by no means proven. Quite the contrary, this sentence stands, like the first verse of Genesis, as heading for the subsequent account, which begins here with מִי תּוֹלֵTokenizer. It is only by taking this as a self-contained heading, and regarding מִי תּוֹלֵTokenizer as the beginning of the new narration that the text becomes intelligible. It reads: "These are the creations of heaven and earth when they were created. On the day when the Lord God had made earth and heaven no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no grass of the field had yet grown, for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth and there was no man to till the ground."

6. מִי "Thought, Plan,"

We have already observed above, p. 152 f. that מִי, like Egyptian מִי is the technical expression both for potter's work and also for "forming and

As indicated by the paragraph at the end, some correction had to be made by the copyist, and this is actually the case, as the original text must have had מִי. That the end of verse 4 reverses the usual order of "heaven and earth" with "earth and heaven" is quite natural here, because in this account only the earth is dealt with, in contrast to the first account which deals first with the creations of heaven, and then with those of the earth.
B. ANALOGOUS PHRASES IN HEBREW AND EGYPTIAN.

We proceed now to discuss a few further phrases or expressions which have a pronounced Egyptian colouring.

1. 'Bone of my Bones'.

Gen. 2, 23 וְיָנָבָנָבָא יִֽבְנָב אָפּ בָּנָא 'bone of my bones', i.e. limb of my limbs (cf. above, p. 70) has its analogous usage in the Egyptian m h₂ w² bmn² 'as one limb with its so-and-so', i.e. 'from his very body', e.g. Urk. iv, 385: 'I am verily as one limb with him (m h₂ w² bmn²-f)', i.e. with my father Amon, or ibid. 385: 'Son of Amon whom Mut bare to him, as one limb with his creator (m h₂ w² bmn²-f)', i.e. with Amon who engendered him. A still closer parallel is Merihark, Recto 132 (Lit., p. 83) where it says of men that they are images of Re, 'gone forth from his limbs (pr m h₂ w²-f)²', i.e. as children of his own body. The emphasis 'this time yhr 76 is this bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh' is to stress the contrast with the animals which were created from earth and animated by Adam (cf. above, p. 149 f.). It should further be noted that in Egyptian also 'flesh and bones' (twt b) are conjointly used for 'body'.

2. The Earth 'Opens her Mouth'.

Gen. 4, 11 says that the earth 'opened her mouth' לַיְבָנָב לַיְבָנָב to swallow up Abel's blood. This may be compared with Ammenemope, x, 20 with reference to the riches of the ungodly: 'They are not there, the ground has opened its mouth (sm µ bs nfr nfr-f), received, and swallowed them; they are drowned in the nether world'. A closer parallel is contained in Lacau, Textes Reliq. Rec. 30, p. 68 (also in the Book of the Dead) of the nether world: 'The earth hath opened her mouth (sm ti nfr-f); Geb (the earth god) hath flung open his jaws'.

1 Cf. above, p. 143 f. and 144, n. 2 on the conception that a corporeal son is the image of his father. It is in this sense that Gen. 5, 3 is to be understood.

2 I regard ḭb as wrongly written for ḏb 'to go in, to enter', used here as causative in the sense of 'introduce' (Af. Wb., i, 231). At the beginning of x, 1, mns ḏf, not mnis-afd should be read, taking as supplementary of ḏf (cf. such mode of writing, Af. Wb., i, 383), ḏf belongs together with ḏf and refers to ḏf. Thus the whole reads: 'He brought them in, swallowed them, and caused them to sink in the nether world'. It is a picture of the voracious one that opens his mouth, introduces the food greedily and hastily into his mouth in order to swallow it as quickly as possible. That in Ammenemope very old material is employed has already been noted above, p. 271, n. 2.
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The same expression also occurs in Num. 16, 39, though in 16, 38 we used, in this passage the agreement with Ammennopis is still more literal, and is the more significant inasmuch as also here through the ‘mouth of the earth’ Krs this and his followers were drawn into the abyss. It is very remarkable that all the other passages, not merely those in the Pentateuch, Num. 26, 10. Deut. 11, 6, but also Ps. 106, 17 refer exclusively to the Krs story.1

3. Euphemistic use of ‘r.t’.

The euphemism ג"פ ‘to know a woman’ (sexually) Gen. 4, 1, 17, 24, 16, 38, 46 and (of men) Gen. 19, 5, was also current in Egyptian, the verb used being יָדָה ‘know, recognize’, e.g. Masaua d’Ami, 4, 2.

Guard yourself against a harlot to know her in body (רת הוא מ’גכיה).’ (Lacau, Textes Relig. Rec. 26, 68 B: ‘His wife whom he loves and who he knows (רתשא פ)’; similarly it is said of men, Pap. d’Orb. 3, 6, ‘...desired to know him (רתשא) as one knows a young man (מ’ר את)’...of men among themselves, Pap. Kahun, Horus and Seth, 2, 4, where Horus says that Seth desired ‘to know’ him (מ’ז)2. The same euphemism contained in the name applied to the town (רמש רפ עם) ‘House of the knowing of Isis (by Osiris)’ Dendera Mar. Dend. iii, 79, 1, 16 b.

Although the Egyptian and Hebrew completely coincide in the use of this euphemism in all cases, it might equally well be adopted from Akkadian, for also the Akkadian יד=גי was customarily used for sexual knowledge, thus Hammurabi § 130, of the woman ‘who knows no man’ (א openid la idatama), which completely coincides with גי יתור. But should, however, be noted that in Akkadian for this euphemism the word lamatu=גי seems to have been more frequent and general than יד in Hebrew, cf. Hammurabi, § 154 which speaks of a man who ‘knows daughter’ (מיטאטוילמ) and §§ 155, 156 of the ‘knowing (lamatu) of the woman’.

1 In Is. 5, 14 the reference is to the ‘mouth of the other world (Ps. 141, 7), not the earth in Is. 45, 8, the earth opens its furrows, not its mouth, which is merely the way annihilation.

2 In addition to the passages cited, it occurs in Num. 31, 17 f.; Judges 11, 39, 46, 21, 11 f.; 1 Sam. 1, 10, and 1 Kings 1, 4, 6.
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Now it is very remarkable (1) that יד, so far as I can see, only occurs in the passage mentioned and only in conjunction with ה乙烯ר = ויד, and (2) that the use of יד סדר = יד סדר is only to be exemplified from the time of Hammurabi. The conclusion would, therefore, seem to be justified that יד was later replaced by לאמ = לאמ and fell out of use. As there are examples of the use of this euphemistic phrase also in Sumerian, it must belong to the more archaic linguistic stock, and therefore, either to the old Akkadian, or to the phrases and expressions, which, in Hammurabi and in old Babylonian, go back to the Sumerian. In any case the fact is of importance that the employment of יד belongs to an older period of the Akkadian, and likewise that similarly in Hebrew it is restricted to the Pentateuch and the older Biblical writings (Judges, 1 Sam., and 1 Kings). All these factors support the view that in Hebrew also יד יתור and יד יתור belong to the eldest period, irrespective of whether the phrase ultimately goes back to Akkadian or to Egyptian.1

C. EXPRESSIONS ORIGINATING IN EGYPTIAN MYTHS.

In the Genesis stories there are a few passages in which expressions are remarkably reminiscent of Egyptian expressions from myths of analogous content. On closer examination they convey the impression that they are remnants of stories originally composed in Hebrew and inspired by Egyptian mythology; stories of which the main elements have been either deliberately eliminated or accidentally lost. The most characteristic of these remains are the following examples:


Gen. 6, 1–14 reference is made to the union of the ‘children of the gods’ ירבו, with the daughters of man, and in conjunction therewith the ירפ, the mighty men of primeval times ירפ ירבו, are mentioned. Here the text is obviously not in order; it seems to be a fragmentary story, mutilated, or purposely abbreviated. In any case it is difficult to follow the course of the narrative and still harder to establish a connexion between the ‘children of the gods’ and the ‘mighty men of primeval times’. There are, however, some expressions here so typically Egyptian

1 Elsewhere we shall have more to say on similar expressions and phrases which occur both in Egyptian and in Akkadian.
kings to succession to the throne of Horus, upon whom sovereignty over the whole earth was bestowed by the Earth-god Geb, and all the other gods (Erman, Relig. 41). For our purpose, however, it is of essential importance that it is stated (Gen. 6, 4) of the 'children of the gods' that they 'engendered numerous children in this land (i.e. earth)', even after men had already been created.' Like man, the 'children of the gods' also formed families (严格的 or generations (mstw = מְשַׁבְּרָה cf. above, p. 274), and it was these generations of the gods which, in the long primeval period, exercised rule over the whole earth and mankind. The characteristic feature of the 'children of the gods' is, therefore, that side by side with men, and simultaneously, they lived, engendered, and fought for their hegemony on earth. To this class of demi-gods belonged also the דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא, who intermingled with the daughters of men.

As to דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא 'the mighty men of primeval times' it is bearing in mind the fierce struggles at the very beginning of the dominion of the 'children of the gods' on earth and their mighty feats, notably the battle of Horus against Seth, as told in several, though fragmentary, myths, of various versions, that one can understand the connexion in our story of the children of the gods' and דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא 'the mighty men of primeval times'. In this allusion we have only remaining the original story in which such struggles were recounted in far greater detail. These mighty men also belonged to the circle of 'the children of the gods' with the difference that they are called דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא, it being expressly stated that they were on earth at the time when the intercourse of דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא with the daughters of men was going on and also beyond that time. The text, as we have it, leaves no doubt on this point, for it states literally: 'The דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא were on earth in those days and also after that time, the children of the gods, came unto the daughters of men, and they bare children unto them'; and it proceeds: 'these (namely the דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא are the mighty men that were of primeval time, the men of renown

1 In the Apophis Book, 27, 5 (= Uruk, Roed. 188 f.) it is said after the birth of the 72 children of Geb and Nut: 'Their children are numerous in this land' (מַשַּׁבְּרָה תָּבֵא יֵשָׁבָא). In the same book, 29, 3 f. (= Uruk. 111), probably emanating from another source, is said, in somewhat altered form: 'Their children created numerous creatures (יִגְּרֹ א יֵשָׁבָא) this land (נֶפֶשׁ) creature of children (יִגְּרֹ א יֵשָׁבָא מַשַּׁבְּרָה) creatures of these children (יִגְּרֹ א יֵשָׁבָא מַשַּׁבְּרָה מַשַּׁבְּרָה), i.e. children and grandchildren, cf. also Apophis, 26, 34. In all these myths the propagation of the 'children of the gods' is represented as proceeding on the same natural lines as among human beings. In Apophis, 27, 3 f. (= Roed. 188) it is even expressly stated that the children of Nut, that they were born after man had been in existence.  

2 The passage as it stands is quite correct, and it is precisely by reversing מַשַּׁבְּרָה יֵשָׁבָא, the later gloss, as some critics do, that the text is brought out of its correct grammatical construction.

EXPRESSIONS ORIGINATING IN EGYPTIAN MYTHS

The author is concerned to emphasize the fact that the דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא were already on earth at the time of these episodes, and that even after the propagation of the דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא they still remained on earth דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא, and this is stated in wording similar to that we have quoted from the Egyptian myth. The דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא are thus neither identical with the דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא, nor can they, as has been suggested, have proceeded from the union with the daughters of men.

2. The Meaning of דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא

The whole nature of the narrative and the characterization of the דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא as the 'mighty men of primeval times' convey the impression that the דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא were conceived as a distinct class of daring warriors and mighty fighters who, by fabulous feats of arms, became the embodiment and model of heroism. The close relationship of our passage with the Egyptian in language and matter leads to the assumption that in דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא we may have an imitation of an Egyptian word, derived from a root with meaning 'to fall' similar to that of דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא. As a matter of fact דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא or דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא (Ex. Gr. 131) is a regular expression for conquered foes and rebels, especially of high rank. This is formed from דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא 'to fall', and דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא which means 'the fallen one' is applied to the enemy fallen in battle, and extended generally to foe and rebel. It thus becomes evident that דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא, derived from דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא 'to fall', means the 'fallen one', and is a literal reproduction of דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא 'the fallen one'. The דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא are the enemies of the gods who, like Seth and his companions, filled the whole primeval world with fear and terror; they are the rebels who waged mighty battles against the great gods until they were repelled and annihilated. While, however, the Egyptians attached a feeling of hatred and abhorrence to the 'fallen', and דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא became a term for the odious adversary, for the Hebrews, דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא lost its original meaning: it did not refer any longer to the hated rebels, accursed foes of the gods, but rather to the mythical figures of terror and heroism, to the mighty fighters that in primeval times battled for world dominion, and gained for themselves everlasting renown, becoming דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא 'men of name', everlasting. They were conceived as giants of monstrous strength and enormous size, of whom fabulous stories of terrifying deeds were told. Thus דְּגָבָא יֵשָׁבָא became an expression for heroes and giants, and was subsequently applied to men of unusual stature and awesome

1 Note the expression מַשַּׁבְּרָה יֵשָׁבָא 'in the land' here, and in the above cited myth מַשַּׁבְּרָה יֵשָׁבָא 'this land'. It is indicative of the close relationship of Hebrew and Egyptian in linguistic usage that מַשַּׁבְּרָה יֵשָׁבָא is employed just like מַשַּׁבְּרָה for the whole earth. Whereas, however, the Egyptian said מַשַּׁבְּרָה יֵשָׁבָא 'this land' because he regarded מַשַּׁבְּרָה as the whole earth, the Hebrew spoke in general terms מַשַּׁבְּרָה יֵשָׁבָא or מַשַּׁבְּרָה מַשַּׁבְּרָה. Cf. above, p. 84.
And not only from the point of view of such general considerations, but even from the purely linguistic standpoint the question arises: in what other surroundings, and in what other time could Egyptian elements have penetrated into the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives in such abundance? From what other environment and what other time is it possible to explain such an intimate and close familiarity of the author, not merely with the Egyptian language, but also with the literary background of the Egyptian myths and tales which, as we have seen, exercised such a decisive influence on the composition of the Genesis stories, and to a certain extent also on the patriarchal narratives? Finally when and where else could the authors have obtained such a thorough insight also into the tendencies of the various Egyptian theological schools, that it was of determining, if not of fundamental importance, in his treatment of the mythological material akin to the Genesis stories? Can all this have been an epoch when the Hebrews were not so thoroughly familiar with the Egyptian language and so completely saturated by the Egyptian mode of thought? Only here, indeed, could the long process of remoulding the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives have taken place before they received the definite stamp of the Egyptian orientation; only here were all the conditions present for a progressive development of the Canaanite dialect retained by the Hebrews in Egypt, into separate independent Hebrew idiom, whereby the way was paved for the literary fixation of the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives so that, once having attained their full maturity, they emerged as a new and splendid creation of the Hebrew genius in the Hebrew language.

Moreover, from the character of the name-interpretations fully discussed above, it became perfectly clear that this literary fashion in Hebrew can only have arisen in the Egyptian epoch of Israel, because it was only for that epoch that appreciation of and understanding of this typically Egyptian mode of playing on words can be presumed. The circumstance further that such interpretations are already applied to the names of the earliest ancestors of mankind beginning with Adam and Eve, and then pervade the whole patriarchal history, reveals the further relationship with the Egyptian. It is so far as similar name-interpretations and puns are applied to the first gods, and are just as typical for the stories of the gods in primeval times as in the narratives of the ancestors of Israel. It cannot be sufficiently emphasized that this fashion of punning name-interpretation belongs to the earliest period of Egyptian sacred literature, and is of more frequent occurrence in the Pyramid texts than in those of any later period. In later texts, even so late as of the Ptolemaic period, almost all such puns are new creations, but hark back directly to the earliest mythological writings.

Even in fanciful tales and folklore, as e.g. in the story of the birth of the three kings (cf. above, p. 242), such name-interpretations relate to figures from the earliest period of Egyptian history, just as in the history of Israel they chiefly occur in the narratives of the earliest period. This parallel phenomenon may provide a further important element for determining the date of composition of the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives.

2. Significance of Sumero-Akkadian Reminiscences.

If, through the penetration of Egyptian influence, we are able to assign an approximate date to the literary fixation of the Genesis stories and patriarchal narratives at one end, other indications of a linguistic nature may be derived from the Babylonian reminiscences which render possible the delimitation of a date at the other end. For there are words and forms of names which carry us back to that early time when a portion of the Genesis stories in their original Babylonian framework became known to the ancestors of the Hebrews before they had left their Mesopotamian home, and which, despite all later developments in language and modification in the contents of these stories, yet survived from that early period and were preserved in their original signification and form.

By a close study of Sumerian and of old Akkadian, which under Hammurabi superseded the use of the Sumerian language, it becomes clear that in the Genesis stories, and notably those of Abraham, some place and personal names are not only of genuine Akkadian, but even of earlier Sumerian origin. Thus e.g. in Gen. 11, 31§ Josh. 24, 16 is the Akkadian name sarigi, and ḫnw is the Akkadian name nafiru or naphiru, and ḫnw occurs as the first component in some Akkadian personal names such as tarḫu-nazzi and tarḫu-unduraba, name of a king of the Hittite land Arzawa. Even the name of the first patriarch, in its original form ṣmaj, is considered to be identical with the Akkadian name ḫbarna. On the other hand ḫnw, Gen. 4, 18 ff. 5, 25 ff. is the Sumerian name hmg, cognomen of Ea the god of heaven, as patron of song and music. This is very significant as this agrees with the fact that ḫnw was father of ḫnw described as 'the father of all such as handle the harp and organ' (cf. Langdon, Sum. Epic of Paradise, e.c., p. 52). Of special importance is the Sumerian origin of ḫnh, Gen. 11, 1 See introduction, p. xxiv, n. 1, on the conventional use of Akkadian as a linguistic term.

Although Akkadian of a thoroughly Semitic character had already asserted itself in Assyria under the rule of Sargòn I, about the twenty-sixth century B.C., Sumerian still remained in use in Babylonia until it was abandoned under Hammurabi about the twentieth century B.C. From then onward Sumerian was forced by Akkadian more and more into the background, until it became entirely forgotten.
From this it will be perceived that 𒈹𒈹 coincide not with the later, but the earlier Akkadian form, and it is, therefore, obvious that it can only go back to a time when the old form was still current in Akkadian itself. True, it is difficult to determine the exact point of time when the form 𒈹𒈹 was abandoned and replaced by the shorter form 𒈹𒈹, because it is almost always written ideographically, not phonetically, and the only passages in which it appears phonetically occur in syllabaries which it is difficult to date. But one thing is certain and that is that 𒈹𒈹 is the oldest form, and that it goes back to the Sumerian 𒆜𒆜, the first element of which, 𒆜, means 'river, stream'. This alone proves that 𒆜 in 𒈹𒈹 was original and essential, because this syllable means 'stream', and it could only have been dropped later, at a time when in Akkadian the feeling for the meaning 'stream' in 𒆜 had become lost. Seeing that Sumerian, as we have observed, had already fallen out of use by the time of Hammurabi in the twentieth century B.C., and probably shortly after ceased altogether to exist as a living language, the abbreviation of 𒈹𒈹 to 𒈹 was already carried out by the nineteenth or eighteenth century B.C., in any case more than 1000 years before the Babylonian exile (586 B.C.). In such circumstances the form 𒈹𒈹 cannot possibly have been adopted by the Hebrews as late as at the time of the exile, because in Babylonia itself it had passed into desuetude many centuries before. As for such an adoption no other period in Israel's history than that of the first patriachs can come under consideration, it may be taken for granted that 𒈹𒈹 can only be a reminiscence from the time of the patriarchs.

The case is still clear in the form 𒈹𒈹 for the Chaldeans, Gen. 11, 31, where 𒈹 occurs for the later 𒆜 which arose in consequence of the transmutation of 𒆜 into 𒆜. As the transmutation of 𒆜 into 𒆜 before goes back to the time when the Arameans pronounced it with h. For the history of word borrowings it is of interest to observe that whereas the form 𒈹 diqat or diqat reached the Arameans, Syrians, Jews, and Arabs through living intercourse with the peoples of Mesopotamia, it came to the Greeks through the Persians in the corrupt form ἴδρα, and was Hellenized as ἴκα. Small as they appear, such clues serve as real searchlights for the discovery of cultural migrations ab origine.

There can be little doubt that the Sumerians were conscious that in the first element 𒆜, the meaning 'river' was present. They used it as component in the same way as in e.g. 𒆜-𒆜 'great river' and other similar words, cf. Delitzsch, Sum. Gloss., p. 24. Whether this is also the original meaning of ἴδρα, or whether we have in ἴδρα the element of a pre-Sumerian name is a question which cannot be discussed. For us it is only of importance that the Sumerians regarded 𒆜 as river. Perhaps ἴδρα or ἴδρα was the real name of the river, before which 𒆜 was placed, so as more clearly to denote it as a river, thus 'River ἴδρα' like 'River Pour' for the Euphrates. The interpretation proposed by Delitzsch, loc. cit. ἴδρα 'flowing river' is highly improbable.
dental in Assyro-Babylonian took place between the eighteenth century B.C., when Sumerian yielded to Akkadian, and the fifteenth century B.C., during the reign of Ashur-uballit; it may be regarded as certain that the form has passed out of use by the fifteenth century B.C.1 We have thus in the time of Ashur-uballit the terminus ad quem, after which the adoption of the form בִּשְׂרַפְּלָא in the narrative of the patriarchs is hardly thinkable, and the leads us back directly to the time of the migration of Abraham from פִּנְדָג לַיְלָה; 'City of the Chaldeans' as the Chaldeans were called when פִּנְדָג was still in current usage.1

The two forms פִּנְדָג and פִּנְדָג bear a clear indication of the time when they were introduced into Hebrew. They furnish us with positive evidence that the patriarchal narratives follow an ancient tradition emanating from the pre-Egyptian epoch in Israel, and can be regarded as distinctive marks that this was the time when the patriarchal narratives began to take shape, until they were written down in the form in which they have come down to us.3

4. Canaanite Reminiscences as Indications of a pre-Egyptian Tradition.

Besides the evidence adduced from the Akkadian, we may draw attention to another class of words which equally comes under consideration as time-determining signposts for a pre-Egyptian tradition of the patriarchal narratives. As in the Joseph and Exodus stories (cf. above, p. 99), so also in the patriarchal narratives words are to be found which appear in the Egyptian documents of the New Kingdom and earlier as foreign Canaanite words. On that account they are of great significance because they were taken over by the Egyptians at a time when they stood in immediate contact with the inhabitants of Canaan, and consequently have in Egyptian the form and meaning which they had before and about the time of the Exodus. The striking feature in these words is that one of them occurs only in Gen. 14, 14 for the men that accompanied Abraham on his campaign against the kings. There it has distinctly a specific meaning referring to a class of persons who were particularly suitable to participate in the campaign. Now in some Egyptian texts of the New Kingdom relating to campaigns in Palestine and Syria, the word ברק-דר, the word ברק-דר appears as a Canaanite loanword in the sense of 'confederate, supporter, ally', and remarkably enough it refers only to princes and chieftains. It is very frequently employed in a maledictory formula launched against the Canaanite and Syrian enemies of the Egyptians, in which invariably it follows the name of the leading princes. From the many examples cited by Seth in 'Achtung feindlicher Fürsten', Abh. d. Berl. Akad. Nr., 5, 1926, we select the following: p. 45 ff. the curse is pronounced against the 'ruler יִמָּר (? יִמ) of יִקְנָה (? יִק) and all the allies (ברק-דר-דר) that are with him'; p. 46 against 'קָנָה (? קָנ), 'ruler of יִקְנָה and all the allies (ברק-דר) that are with him' and against 'קָנָה (קָנ) or יִקָּנ (קָנ) and יִקָּנ (קָנ) the rulers of יִקְנָה (? יִק) and all the allies (ברק-דר) that are with them'; p. 47 against יִקָּנ (קָנ), יִק (ק) or יִקָּנ (ק) 'ruler of יִקְנָה and all the allies (ברק-דר) that are with him ', etc.

It is this meaning of allies, followers, supporters, which is to be assigned to ברק-דר: It refers to Abraham's allies 'אָטָר, אָטָר, and מֶמֶר, who, in v. 14, expressively mentioned as being covenanted with him and in v. 24 as having gone with him on his campaign.1

1 That יִמָּר יִמ, v. 14 'those born of his house' is not identical with יִמָּר יִמ has often
assuming different authors and various periods of composition, but
by the thematic character of the Pentateuchal sections concerned, and
Egyptian background to which they are akin. Thus in narratives
popular content, like the Joseph and Exodus stories, current speech
and common conversational terms are reflected, so much so, that some Egyptian
borrowings are not reproduced in the old classical form, but in the new
Egyptian or vernacular form; in the Genesis stories, however, in which
views and thoughts concerning higher problems like the creation,
destiny of mankind, the moral basis of a world-order are set forth, we
behold more the speculative and scholarly character in style, speech, and
composition, to such an extent that from certain expressions cast in an
Egyptian mould (cf. above, p. 155 f.) even the attitude taken by the author
towards divergent Egyptian theological schools is visible.

If such conclusions in themselves are of significance for an appreciation
of the language and the literary form of the two Pentateuchal books,
dealt with in this volume, they will prove to be of still greater importance
and significance for the solution of problems affecting the composition
of the Pentateuch, as will be shown in the course of later investigations.

1 This will be illustrated elsewhere by many examples from other portions of the
Pentateuch. Attention may here be drawn merely to the classical form ʿārā, which does not reveal its
classical form ʿārā, but the neo-Egyptian form ʿārā, as survives in the doubtless genuine pronunciation in Coptic ʿārā (cf. above, p. 137 and p. 50, n. 1). Moreover ʿārā is
the neo-Egyptian ʿārā, ʿārā, and is closest to the Coptic form ὧν (above, p. 98).
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 130 131</td>
<td>122 134 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>140 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>1 31 140</td>
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<td>2 5 114 156 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 157</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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- 137: Gen. 1 136 137
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- 208: Gen. 208
- 219: Gen. 219
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<table>
<thead>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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Note.—Readers who would consult the English Bible are reminded that in some parts the division of chapters and verses differs from the Hebrew. In some English Bibles the divergences are indicated on the margin. Special attention should be paid to references from Exod. 7 and 8 as in the English Bible chap. 8 begins with 7. 26 of the Hebrew.

2. INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS.

B. refers to the index of titles and functions; C. to phrases; D. to proper names; E. to proper names with play of words; * indicates the Egyptian origin of the word; ** the Akkadian origin. For these loanwords, cf. the special indexes of Akkadian words, p. 209 f. and of Egyptian words in the hieroglyphic Appendix, p. 146.*

A. Single Words and Idiomatic Expressions.

ץ cf. C. 10 23 23x 24x 23c
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ץ 85x 85x
ץ 1156 17x 158 138x
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ץ 120 145f. 149f. 211
ץ 23 240
ץ 111 145f. 156f. 166
ץ 168 231f. 240
ץ* 271 273c.f.
ץ* 15 181 123 134
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ץ 79 99
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ץ 159 257 278. 281 83 83x 119 127
ץ 283 283x 126 126
ץ 154x
ץ 99
ץ 86 95
ץ 283x
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ץ 283x
ץ 57 126 131 132x.f.
ץ 28
### INDEX OF ARAMEIC WORDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אָרְא</td>
<td>114a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֶּן</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּנָי</td>
<td>23f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוּג</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כַּפֶּל</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חַלָּת</td>
<td>17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דֹּאמֶים</td>
<td>227a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDEX OF ARABIC WORDS AND PROPER NAMES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أمل</td>
<td>159a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أمن</td>
<td>117a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إيض</td>
<td>128a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ä</td>
<td>264a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نافعة</td>
<td>70a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>«</td>
<td>159a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proper names also with lamed: uššu 278, harrû 115, šerû 109, jamar 112, mishûr 108, milû 35, &laquo; 112, nai 114, &laquo; 115, &laquo; 109, &laquo; 109, &laquo; 108, &laquo; 106, &laquo; 106, &laquo; &laquo; 264a.
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Proper names.

Abardma ḫuṣu (f) 287
Abardma ḫuṣu (f) 287
Abardma ḫuṣu (f) 287

Urū ṣu 205

bāb-šu ḫuṣu 232 230 263

harrāru (Sum. garan) ḫuṣu 288

bēš-harrāru ḫuṣu 288

idišlat (early-Akkad. from Sum. 288 idigna), idišlat (Babyl.) 288 idigna, idišlat (Babyl.) 288

DIGLAT (Assyr.) ḫuṣu 288 idigna, idišlat (Babyl.) 288

IŠGA 288

IŠGA 288

HIEROGLYPHIC APPENDIX

(A) A SELECTION OF EGYPTIAN REFERENCES.

(B) EGYPTIAN LOANWORDS AND PROPER NAMES.

(C) PROPER NAMES WITH PLAY ON WORDS.