

The Names of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt

Author(s): Lysander Dickerman

Source: *The Old Testament Student*, Feb., 1888, Vol. 7, No. 6 (Feb., 1888), pp. 181-185

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3157154>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Old Testament Student*

JSTOR

THE NAMES OF JACOB AND JOSEPH IN EGYPT.

BY LYSANDER DICKERMAN,

Boston, Mass.

According to the chronology generally accepted by scholars, Thothmes III. ascended the throne of Egypt about 1600 B. C., perhaps two hundred and fifty years before the exodus of the Hebrews. One of his first acts was to assemble his army on the eastern frontier of the Delta for an expedition into the land of the Retennu, that is, Palestine. Proceeding north, he made the base of his operations at Gaza, a city previously captured by his father. He met his enemy on the plain of Megiddo, later familiar to Barak, Deborah and Sisera, Ahaziah and Jehu, Elijah and the Shunamite, the scene of Josiah's death, and down upon which the boy of Nazareth must have often looked, from "the brow of the hill on which his city was built," with emotions akin to those with which the American boy to-day climbs Bunker's Hill or visits the tomb at Mount Vernon.

Fifteen successful expeditions this Pharaoh made into the very heart of Asia. He penetrated even to Mesopotamia. The victories he won during his twenty-third year, he caused to be engraved on two granite tablets found on the pylae of the temple of Amon at Karnak. The inscriptions on one tablet relate to his conquests in Ethiopia; those on the other, to his victories in Syria and Palestine. It is this second tablet that has for us a special interest. Its title is "A Collection of the Tribes of Upper Retennu, whom the King captured at Megiddo, and whose Children he led away as Prisoners to the Fortress at Suhan in Thebes." The tablet contains 118 names. In some cases these names clearly designated towns; but it is no unheard of thing for a tribe or clan to bear the same name as its capital city. One of these cities, the 42d of the catalogue, is called in the hieroglyphics TAANAK, reminding us of the *Ta'anak* of Josh. 12:21. The 28th is ASTARTU, the *'Ashtaroth* of Deut. 1:4. The 26th is KAANAU, doubtless the *Q'nah* of Num. 32:42. Then we have JOPOU, *Yapho*, and AINA, the Nain of Galilee, and BAARTU, Beyrout, and several other names not less familiar. About half of these names have been recognized.

These cities, and the tribes which occupied them, are not supposed to be parts of the kingdom of the Retennu; but, for mutual defense against the invading Egyptians, they rallied around the Retennu standard; some of them, perhaps like the modern Bedouin, wandering tribes with no fixed residence. Hence the impossibility of ever finding the sites of their supposed cities.

Among the names which have not been read with certainty are the 78th and 102d. These are respectively ISCHPAR and IAKBAAR. As early as 1860, Vicomte de Rougé, in the "Revue archéologique," proposed to substitute the Hebrew *b* for the Egyptian P in the first word, and to recognize in it the root *yashabh* "to dwell." Mariette-Bey, in his "Mémoire sur les listes géographiques de Karnak" (Leipzig, 1875), translated the word *shaphir*, Mic. 1:11, and supposed it referred to the *Σαφειρ* of which Jerome, in his "Onomasticon," says: "*Saphir villa in montanis sita inter Eleutherapolin et Ascalonem, in tribu Juda.*" M. Maspero in

his "Étude sur le papyrus Abbott" (Paris, 1871), incidentally mentions both these names merely as illustrating the use of AA for I in the Egyptian hieroglyphics. He gives as their Hebrew equivalent *Yashebh-'El* = "habitatio dei," and *Ya'aqobh-'El* = "sequens deum." Respecting the last, he asks: "May we suppose that the name of this place preserves the memory of the settlement of Jacob in Palestine?"

The "Revue Egyptologique," nominally for 1885, but not received by subscribers in Boston till May, 1887, contains a letter from William N. Groff, of the College of France, to his illustrious teacher, Prof. Eugene Revillout, which makes the startling announcement that *Ya'aqobh-'El* and *Yashebh-'El* are no other than the tribes of Jacob and Joseph, and that Thothmes III. captured these tribes at Megiddo, and led them as prisoners of war to Thebes, about one hundred and fifty years after the death of Joseph, and two hundred and fifty years before the exodus. Granting the correctness of this theory, we find on the pylae of Karnak the earliest mention in history of these biblical tribes.

In the establishment of this theory, M. Groff has to meet three difficulties, as follows:

First, the Egyptian SCH, equivalent to ψ , stands in the name of Joseph where we should expect an S, equivalent to σ . In the solution of this difficulty he remarks that we probably receive the name from the Ephraimites, sons of Joseph, who used the soft instead of the hard S, contrary to the general Palestinian custom, as is evident from the test to which the Gileadites put them in pronouncing the word *Shibboleth* (see Judges 12:6) while, possibly, the Egyptian scribe wrote the name as he heard it from the Gileadites, and as it may have been generally pronounced, viz., *Yoseph*. According to this hypothesis, the original and true name of Rachel's oldest son is found on the tablet of Karnak, and not in our Hebrew Bibles. It may also be said that the Babylonian and Assyrian custom conformed to that of the Gileadites; and, moreover, it must be born in mind that in the time of Thothmes, Egyptian scribes were not so exact as they were later, in the time of Ramses II. Both Mariette and Brugsch have admitted that the scribe did not always seize exactly the sound of foreign proper names. He transposed letters and even syllables, suppressed final letters, affixed others, and substituted for the true articulates those which more or less resembled them.

Secondly, the change of AR into 'El, e. g., the Hebrew *Ya'aqobh-'El* for the Egyptian IAKBA-AR. In making this change, M. Groff is sustained by the opinion of Vicomte de Rougé, written in 1860, when he had no theory to maintain. In the ancient Egyptian language L and R were used interchangeably, or rather there was no L, but in spelling foreign names R was used in its stead. Thus we read on the monuments BAAR for *ba'al*. De Rougé also says that 'El was used for the deity in all Palestine, in a general way, but that its use could not possibly have reference to the family of Jacob. To this M. Groff replies that it is precisely under the protection of the god 'El that we should expect to find the biblical tribes of Jacob and Joseph. It is possible that the compound word expresses, and was intended to express, the salutary influence of God in preserving the tribe. Thus *Ya'aqobh-'El* may mean "El is a supplanter," that is, he protects his subjects from their enemies; and if *Yoseph-'El* is the correct reading, it may mean "El adds" to the tribe; i. e., causes it to grow.

Here M. Groff rests his argument. In addition, it may be pertinent to remark that it was common to end Hebrew proper names in 'El. These names fre-

quently follow the form of the third person singular of the Imperfect: e. g., 1 Chron. 4:16, *Y'halel-'El* "he who praises El;" *Yisra-'El* "El fights;" *Yishma'El-'l* "El hears;" *Y'chezqE-'l* "El makes strong;" *Y'rachm-'El* "El loves." We also find in Gen. 46, verse 10, *Y'mu-'El* "El is light; verse 14, *Yachl-'El* "hoping in El;" verse 24, *Yachts-'El* "El allots." In 1 Chron. 7:6 is the name *Y'dhi'a-'El* "known of El." In Josh. 18:27, *Yirp-'El* "El saves." In Neh. 11:15, *Y'qabhts-'El* "El gathers" or holds together, i. e. the tribe. Josh. 19:14, *Yipp'tach-'El* "El will free." In these words and many other of kindred formation it is impossible not to see an allusion to the deity. That *'El* thus used, is allied to *'Eloach* and *'Elohim*, and was employed to express the protecting power of God throughout the period during which the Hebrew language was spoken, is believed by many eminent scholars. Why may not Jacob-El and Joseph-El have been thus used? It is quite possible that some names which at one time had the *'El* affixed, dropped it in pronunciation and in writing, and retained it only in thought. This is quite probable with regard to such names as *Yig'al*, Num. 13:7, "he avenges;" *Yaphlet* "he saves," 1 Chron. 21:32; and *Yanoach* "he lets rest," 2 Kings. 15:29. Why not suppose that *Ya'aqobh* and *Yoseph* and *Yitschaq*, as tribal names are abbreviated forms of the original Jacob-El, Joseph-El and Isaac-El?

The third difficulty which M. Groff seeks to remove is that AR, equivalent to *'El*, stands for the deity in the Egyptian hieroglyphics without a divine determinative. To this he replies that the Egyptians, when referring to the APURIU = עפריה—supposed by M. Chabas and others to be the Hebrews—a name found in the monuments of the 13th, 19th and 20th dynasties, and perhaps twice in this very list of Thothmes III., viz., Nos. 53 and 54, sometimes spoke of the great God of this tribe, and strangely enough never once followed it by the divine determinative, as they always did the names of Egyptian gods. Did the Egyptian scribes know that this being, unlike all other divinities, could not be represented by any symbol or figure of any kind?

It will be asked: How this discovery, if it be valid, can be made to harmonize with the biblical story? It has always been a mystery that so large a population of Hebrews, foreigners, and of a kindred race with the Hyksos, were suffered to remain in the Delta after the Hyksos were expelled. In order to meet this difficulty, Lepsius supposed the migration of Jacob into Egypt to have occurred after the expulsion of the Hyksos; long enough after to allow the fear of another hostile invasion to die out, but not long enough after for the prejudice against wandering shepherds to become extinct. His dates are:

The expulsion of the Hyksos about....	1591 B. C.
The coming of Jacob about.....	1414 "
The exodus about.....	1314 "

This reduces the Hebrew sojourn in Egypt to one hundred years. The mooted question whether they remained there "four hundred and thirty years to a day," or only two hundred and fifteen years, did not trouble him in the least.

Ewald, whose timidity was not the cause of his death, conjectured that only a small number went to Egypt with Jacob, but that, after the expulsion of the Hyksos, Joseph summoned the whole tribe from Canaan to Goshen that they might be ready to defend Egypt against other foreign invasions, should such occur. This conjecture would not account for the fact that Hebrew tribes were found in Palestine a hundred and fifty years after the death of Joseph.

From the last chapter of Genesis, it is clear that, before the exodus, the Hebrews were divided into only two tribes. It is believed that several generations intervened between the death of Joseph and the coming of Moses. Who knows what happened during the life of those generations? The Bible does not answer this question; only the monuments of Egypt speak; and it is proposed to infer from those monuments that the Israelites were not all in Egypt during the whole period from Joseph to Moses; that they went up to Palestine, were caught in arms against "the Alexander of Egypt," were made captives of war and were brought back to Thebes. M. Groff significantly asks: "Have we here a lost page of the Bible?" He might also ask: Does this confederacy of the two tribes with the Retennu, in arms against Egypt, explain the enmity of the Pharaoh who knew not Joseph?

It will also be asked how scholars have received this supposed discovery. M. Ernest Renan announced it in one of his lectures before the College of France and also in the *Revue des deux Mondes*; and M. Oppert announced it in the *Académie des Inscriptions*. Prof. Revillout refers to it in the *Revue archeologique* in terms of commendation. Miss Amelia B. Edwards, in the Academy says: "This discovery is of extreme importance, and M. Groff is to be congratulated on the completeness with which he proves his claim."

In *The Contemporary* for September, 1887, Mr. Reginard Stuart Poole endeavors to prove the great age of the Pentateuch from certain agreements between the biblical narrative and the Egyptian monuments. After speaking of the detection by M. de Rougé of JAAKAB-AR in the list at Karnak, he says: "An Egyptologist of the French school, M. Groff, has recently developed this argument, and also traced the name of Joseph in the list, in the parallel form ISCHP-AR. From this it would appear that about a hundred and fifty years after the rule of Joseph began, the tribes of Jacob and Joseph took military service out of Egypt, and with the enemies of the Egyptians. * * * * Thus the Egyptian monuments, while they contradict our ill-formed notions, bring out with startling novelty, the true features of the Bible story."

In the succeeding number of *The Contemporary*, Mr. W. Robertson Smith thus refers to Mr. Poole's argument: "In his eagerness to defeat the critics at all hazards, he (i. e., Mr. Poole) permits himself to present as his last piece of Egyptian evidence, a supposed discovery, which, if it is correct, places in the hands of the extreme critics, a weapon to overturn the whole history of Israel in Egypt. It appears that about 1600 B. C., two or perhaps three centuries before the date which Mr. Poole assumes for the exodus, King Thothmes III., in a battle near Megiddo, defeated a confederacy of various Palestinian districts, two of which bear in the Egyptian account the names Ya'cbar and Yshp'r. As the Egyptian R often stands for the Semitic l, it is proposed to read these words, 'Ya'cob-el and Yoshep-el.' * * * * Now even as Mr. Poole interprets the thing, it is surely a very strong argument against the antiquity of the Pentateuch that it knows nothing of so important an incident. If the Hebrews were in arms against the Egyptians two hundred years before the exodus, it is evident that the whole story in Exod. 1 rests on extremely defective information, and has little historic value * * * * and the leap at once to the conclusion that the biblical Jacob is meant * * * * is a step that shows much more courage than prudence."

Almost contemporaneous with the publication of M. Groff's discovery, an article appeared in the *Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, by Prof.

Eduard Meyer, of Breslau. Prof. Meyer is not confident about the identification of ISCHPAR with Joseph; thinks it open to grave philological objections; far too grave to allow a sober historian to build on it. But, supposing that the Jacob and Joseph of this Egyptian monument are the same Jacob and Joseph whom we read of in the Bible, he is unable to resist the conclusion that the sons of Jacob never were in Egypt, and that the name Jacob originally belonged to a Palestinian tribe, one of many out of which the later nation of Israel was formed. He is confident that the people who in the eleventh century B. C. had 40,000 warriors, according to the Song of Deborah (Judges 5:8) could not, three hundred years before, have been only two out of one hundred and eighteen tribes occupying unknown districts. A German might be staggered by such growth, but no American will be.

Thus it will be seen that this discovery, interesting as it certainly is in every one of its details, like many other recent "discoveries," furnishes no formidable weapon for partisans of either side. It is hardly possible to read the 102d name in the list without thinking of Jacob. The 78th may be the name of Joseph. The change of SCH into D is not an insurmountable difficulty; a small matter in comparison with the change of $\theta\upsilon\chi\omicron\tau$ into *Sukkoth*, which certain scholars have swallowed with avidity, displaying marvelous powers of deglutition. But suppose these names are unmistakably the names of Jacob and Joseph, the question then arises: What Jacob and what Joseph? The supposition that there was not a tribe left in Palestine bearing the name of Jacob after the patriarch migrated to Goshen is wholly gratuitous. That these names in the list of Thothmes refer to tribes who, or whose ancestors, were ever in Egypt is possible, but is not proven. Archæologists are prone to forget that they, just like other men, are bound to respect the laws of evidence. In this case the proof that we must revise our interpretation of the Book of Exodus is not conclusive. "The trumpet gives an uncertain sound;" indeed it is not certain whether it be a trumpet. An argument drawn from this so-called discovery, like multitudes of arguments employed in apologetics, in consequence of its weakness, must do more harm than good. If the Bible, in its laws, history, biography, poetry, prophecy and gospel be not, of all books, man's best aid in the attainment of personal righteousness, all the "discoveries" ever made and yet to be made, will not save it from neglect and scorn. If it be such an aid it needs no discoveries to prop it up, or to commend it to those who are crying out for the living God. Its own inherent practical worth is its best defense.