

THE
UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE

NO. 3.—JAN.—FEB., 1898.

I.—LITERARY.

THE REV. ROBERT LEWIS DABNEY, D. D., LL. D.

Robert Lewis Dabney was born in Louisa county in Virginia, on the 5th of March, 1820, of good old Hanover lineage. In June, 1836, he entered the Sophomore class, half advanced, of Hampden-Sidney College. He completed the remaining part of the Sophomore, and the Junior course, and left the college in 1837. He then taught a country school for two years. In December, 1839, he entered the University of Virginia, from which he retired in July of 1842 with the degree of Master of Arts. He again taught a select private school for more than two years. In October, 1844, he entered Union Seminary in Virginia, took the full three years course in two years and was licensed to preach in May, 1846. He spent one year as a missionary in his native county, at the end of which time he was called to be the pastor of Tinkling Spring church in Augusta county. Here he performed for a considerable time the functions of the pastorate to a large church and those of the head teacher of a classical school. After a pastorate of over six years he was elected to the chair of Ecclesiastical History and Polity in his *alma mater*, Union Theological Seminary, which he filled until 1870. Meanwhile, in 1869, he had been appointed Adjunct Professor of Theology, and he was made full Professor in this department in 1870. He continued to dignify this important chair until 1883, when owing to bronchial troubles he was warned by his physicians to seek a milder climate. Accordingly he accepted an invitation to the chair of Mental and Moral Philosophy in the University of Texas, at Austin,

ISRAEL'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS CANAAN DURING THE EGYPTIAN SOJOURN.

PROF. W. W. MOORE.

In order to the fulfilment of God's prediction to Abraham (Gen. 15:13-16) concerning the settlement and sojourn of his descendants in Egypt, and their subsequent oppression and exodus, it was necessary that there should be very different political adjustments at the different stages of that history. We have seen in a former article (March-April, 1897) how the general movement of the Asiatic nomads upon Egypt, culminating in the Hyksos conquest, prepared the way for the first step towards the fulfilment of that prediction, viz.: the settlement of Abraham's descendants in an alien land. By these Shepherd Kings Jacob and his shepherd sons were cordially received, and as their vocation made them obnoxious to the native Egyptians who still occupied the upper part of the Nile valley, the Israelites were not sent into this remote interior but established in the frontier province of Goshen in the eastern delta. Let us next inquire whether by other political adjustments the way was prepared for the fulfilment of the second part of the prediction, viz.: the enslavement and oppression of Israel, and of the third part, viz.: their deliverance from bondage and their conquest of Canaan.

Observe then that this third point was kept steadily before their view as the great goal of their tribal history. Though settled in Goshen under the royal favor, and enjoying for a time great prosperity and increasing power, they were not allowed to forget the land of their fathers or to lose sight of the fact that they should ultimately return thither. The remembrance of these things was indispensable to the development under their changed conditions of a saving *esprit de corps* and the preservation of their individuality and solidarity as a nation amid the mixed races of the Delta.

There are various indications, in the Bible and also on the monuments, of this fact, that their settlement in Goshen did not involve any abrupt severance of their relations to that other land around which clustered all the promises of God to their race, but that, on the contrary, they had perfectly free

intercourse with it for some fifty years and at least occasional communication with it after that. There are hints of both hostile and friendly relations from time to time between them and the peoples then occupying Canaan and even intimations of their sense of proprietorship there and perhaps of premature attempts to make settlements in it.

That the Egyptians and Israelites had free access to Canaan in the time of Joseph himself is clear from the circumstances of the burial of Jacob and the princely pomp with which that long funeral procession carried the embalmed body of the father of the great prime minister from the green pastures of Goshen, across the wide stretch of desert, to the sepulchre at Hebron; for "there went up with him both chariots and horsemen: and it was a very great company," and for some days they remained at Atad making lamentation, while the Canaanites looked on with no thought of resenting the intrusion into their territory of this great body of Egyptian dignitaries and soldiers. It is evident then that at the burial of Jacob the way into Palestine was open. Not so however at the burial of Joseph some sixty years later. For he was buried (or at least embalmed and kept) in Egypt, not at Hebron. Evidently the road to Hebron was no longer open. The probable reason for this and the probable explanation of the fact that Joseph did not like Jacob order his body to be conveyed to Canaan forthwith, was that at the time of Joseph's death that "long and mighty war" for independence on the part of the native Egyptians which resulted in the final expulsion of the Hyksos was probably already raging and the hard pressed Hyksos could spare no troops for a military escort to Canaan such as had been furnished at the time of Jacob's burial. The Theban princes, the heirs of the native Egyptian Pharaohs whom the Hyksos had displaced and reduced to the position of subordinate rulers in the South, had never forgotten the alien origin of these Asiatic invaders nor lost the hope of regaining their ancestral rights, and at last they revolted from the Hyksos domination and began that "long and mighty war" just referred to which resulted in the expulsion of the Asiatic strangers from the delta, and the establishment of the eighteenth dynasty in undisputed rule over the whole of Egypt. This political revolution must have had at least a slight and temporary effect upon the Israelites in two ways: as regards their well-being in Egypt and as regards their communication

with Palestine. With the downfall of the Hyksos of course the special influence of Joseph at court came to an end, and in his dying words, to his people, "God will surely remember you and bring you up out of this land unto the land which he swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob," and "ye shall carry up my bones from hence," he seems to recognize in their changed relations to the crown a sort of foreshadowing of the eclipse predicted to Abraham when his seed should be enslaved and afflicted in a land not theirs. That however was still far in the future. The disadvantage involved in the mere withdrawal of royal patronage was a very different thing from the savage oppression visited upon them several centuries later. These peaceful shepherds in Goshen were probably not molested by the victorious Egyptians who drove out the Hyksos. They were simply no longer court favorites. The other way in which the overthrow of the Hyksos affected the Israelites was in the temporary interruption of their communications with Canaan. When the Hyksos were driven back into Asia, from whence they had come, we know from the nature of the case that they must have established and fortified themselves for a time at least in Palestine; and this is exactly what the historian Manetho says they did, so that, with the native Pharaohs in possession of Egypt and the expelled Hyksos in possession of Palestine, and the two at war with one another, it is easy to see why the country was no longer open to residents in Egypt.

In a generation or two, however, the victorious native Pharaohs had not only restored free communication with Palestine, but had gained absolute control of the country and converted it into an Egyptian province. Recognizing the importance of subduing thoroughly the hostile peoples of Western Asia who hung continually like a threatening cloud upon their exposed frontier, equipped as never before for foreign conquests with the chariots and horses introduced into Egypt by the Hyksos themselves, and influenced in general by an outburst of military activity similar to that which followed the expulsion of the Moors from Spain, the Pharaohs of the celebrated 18th dynasty made one campaign after another in Asia, carrying everything before them, and eventually laying the boundaries of their empire on the very banks of the Euphrates.

And it was after Syria had been thus subdued in general and the country reopened to them that the Israelites began to

assert their claim to their ancestral possessions in Palestine and perhaps to effect some settlements there long before the exodus of the main body of the nation from Egypt. There are, as already stated, both monumental and scriptural intimations of such movements on the part of the Israelites of the sojourn and of such a claim to Palestinian territory based upon a title inherited from Jacob and Joseph themselves. One of the most interesting of these intimations is found on the walls of the temple of Thotmes III, at Karnak, where he recorded the names of the places in Palestine which he conquered (1480 B. C.) some two hundred years after the settlement of the Israelites in Goshen. Among these names we find in south Palestine a "Jacob-el" and in central Palestine a "Joseph-el," which seem to be reminiscences of those patriarchs.* That their names should have clung to any possessions which they may have acquired in Palestine is of course not unnatural, and that they did acquire such possessions there is clear not only from the statement that Jacob, on his arrival in Canaan, "bought the parcel of ground, where he had spread his tent," east of the city of Shecem, from the children of Hamor, for an hundred pieces of money (Gen. 33:19), but also from his statement to Joseph near the end of his life: "Behold, I die: but God shall be with you, and bring you again unto the land of your fathers. Moreover, I have given to thee one portion (Heb. Shecem, shoulder, mount) above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorite with my sword and with my bow." (Gen. 48:21-22). On examining the Karnak list for some indication of the geographical position of "Joseph-el," we find that the names preceding it in the list lead us eastward from Joppa and the interior cities of the maritime plain to the foot of Mount Ephraim, and that the next name, the one immediately preceding "Joseph-el" is "Har," which apparently corresponds to the הַר אֶפְרַיִם or Mount Ephraim of scripture, the name by which this central ridge, the choicest part of Joseph's inheritance, was afterwards commonly known. Had the great prime minister then taken some steps in his own lifetime to make good his title to the territory allotted him by his father, and had he thus attached his name to the locality where Thotmes found it two

*This probability has been weakened somewhat by the discovery of the names "Jacob-el" and "Joseph-el" in Babylonian contract tablets of the age of Abraham.

centuries later? Be this as it may, we have in the 1st book of Chronicles two very striking indications of the feeling of ownership with which the children and grandchildren of his son Ephraim regarded the country. In 1 Chron. 7:20-24 we read that certain sons of Ephraim, during their father's lifetime, made a warlike expedition into Canaan, in which they lost their lives, at the hands of the Gathites, and that, years afterward, when this disaster had been apparently retrieved so far as control of the country was concerned, Ephraim's granddaughter,* Sheerah, built three cities in the hill-country of Palestine. The passage reads as follows: "And the sons of Ephraim; Shuthelah (and Bered his son, and Eleadah his son, and Tahath his son, and Zabad his son, and Shuthelah his son), and Ezer and Elead, whom the men of Gath that were born in the land slew, because they came down to take away their cattle. And Ephraim their father mourned many days, and his brethren came to comfort him. And he went in to his wife, and she conceived and bare a son, and he called his name Beriah, because it went evil with his house. And his daughter was Sheerah, who built Beth-horon the nether, and the upper, and Uzen-sherah." Prof. W. H. Bennett, the author of one of the most recent commentaries on The Books of Chronicles (Expositor's Bible) says that, "Taking these words literally, Ezer and Elead were the actual sons of Ephraim; and as Ephraim and his family were born in Egypt and lived there all their days, these patriarchal cattle-lifters did not come down from any neighboring highlands, but must have come up from Egypt, all the way from the land of Goshen, across the desert and past several Philistine and Canaanite towns. This literal sense is simply impossible. The author from whom the chronicler borrowed this narrative is clearly using a natural and beautiful figure to describe the distress in the tribe of Ephraim when two of its clans were cut off, and the fact that a new clan named Beriah was formed to take their place." That is to say, the events did not occur in the lifetime of Ephraim and his wife, as the record says they did, but *after the conquest of Canaan by Joshua*, hundreds of years later. Adopting Prof. Bennett's phrase, we beg leave to say that this figurative sense of his is "simply impossible," for the reason that Joshua himself is in the same narrative said to have been a

*It is not clear whether she was Ephraim's daughter or granddaughter. The precise relationship does not affect the point in hand.

descendant of this Beriah at a remove of seven or eight generations (1 Chron. 23:27). If Beriah was a Benjamite clan which avenged the defeat of Ezer and Elead and was therefore reckoned as one of the clans of Ephraim, at or after the time of Joshua, how could Joshua be called a descendant of Beriah seven or eight generations after that time? In other words, how could Joshua have been born as an infant in the line of Bériah eight generations after the time when as a man he had conquered Canaan?

Adhering then to the liberal truth of the narrative, and remembering that Ephraim was not only the son of the great prime minister of Pharaoh, to whom Israel had given a special portion of the choice hill country of Palestine, but also the son of a very noble Egyptian lady, and that consequently his immediate descendants must have been persons of eminent position and considerable power even after the change from the Hyksos to the native dynasty, and bearing in mind the fact that the Babylonian empire, which had once dominated Palestine, was now on the wane, as we shall presently see, and that the Egyptians were beginning to make incursions into Syria, we must say there is to our mind nothing improbable in the statement that the sons of Ephraim made such an expedition to Palestine and that the grand-daughter of Joseph and Asenath had possessions in the hill country of Canaan and built there the cities mentioned. It is even stated that the family of Shelah, the son of Judah, made conquests in the territory of Moab, and, as if to prevent any one from supposing that remote descendants of Judah in a later time are referred to, it is added that "the records are ancient" (1 Chron. 4: 22). In all these ways then Divine providence kept the eyes of the Israelites turned towards Canaan. It had been promised to them in the covenants with Abraham. Thither they had carried the body of Jacob for burial. There Joseph had apparently laid claim to his patrimonial estates, and his grand-children in the line of Ephraim had occupied and fortified them. And thither, according to prophecy, the whole nation was eventually to return.

But not only was Israel thus continuously prepared for the land, so to speak, and kept in an expectant attitude towards it, but the land was also prepared for Israel. And in this likewise the hand of God was plain, as we shall see later—so plain that no unbiassed mind can fail to see that He was directly ordering the political adjustments of the time in such a way as to effect the fulfilment of His prediction to Abraham.