

Determining the Precise Length of the Israelite Sojourn in Egypt

Douglas Petrovich

One of the oldest chronological disagreements in biblical studies involves the length of the Israelite sojourn in Egypt, which ultimately hinges on how the 430 years in Exodus 12:40–41 should be interpreted, and secondarily relates to the 430 years in Galatians 3:17. Some scholars have concluded that the Israelites resided there for 430 years before the exodus, while others are convinced that they lived there for only 215 years, with another 215 years devoted to the earlier patriarchal sojourns of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in Canaan. A third possibility is that the Israelites lived in Egypt for 400 years, with 30 years of prior residency in Canaan intended to round out the prescribed time. The present study aims to resolve this perplexing chronological dilemma, which greatly impacts one's understanding of biblical events and of how Hebrew history synchronizes with Egyptian history. The benefit of establishing the length of the sojourn in Egypt conclusively is not only to link these chronologies properly but to expose errant synchronizational constructs as untenable.

Keywords: sojourn, exodus, Israelite chronology, Egypt, textual variant

AMONG THE THORNIER disputed issues related to biblical chronology is the length of time that the Israelites resided in Egypt before the exodus. Yet not everyone is convinced that a lengthy Israelite stay in Egypt during the second millennium BC reflects actual, historical events. To cite merely one Egyptologist, Redford (1997, 63) referred to the themes of the sojourn and the exodus, which allegedly were “embellished” in the Pentateuch, as largely belonging to the realm of folklore, declaring that they do not in any way help to establish the date or historicity of the exodus or the true nature of the sojourn.

Despite this pessimistic critique, the themes of the sojourn and exodus described in the Pentateuch not only represent genuine history, but when *properly* synchronized with Egyptian chronology, they can be verified convincingly with archaeological and epigraphical evidence (Petrovich

2016b, chaps. 1–2; forthcoming). As Falk (2018, 200) correctly summarized, albeit from the perspective of the late-exodus view, the current state of the evidence points toward the plausibility of the exodus narrative, strongly suggesting the reliability of the exodus account as a historical event.

The question that remains for those who accept a literal sojourn in Egypt is whether its duration consists of 430 years, known as the long-sojourn view, or 215 years, which its advocates call the short-sojourn view. The idea of splitting the 430-year sojourn of Exodus 12:40 into a 215-year period from Abram’s migration to Canaan until Jacob’s relocation to Egypt, and a 215-year period from then until the exodus, was in vogue over 2,000 years ago, then repopularized late in the 19th century (Dillmann 1880, 120; Propp 1999, 415–16).

At least three specialized studies on this topic were published in the 20th century, all of which concluded that the long sojourn fits the biblical and historical data better.¹ Yet the current study is justified for two reasons: (1) The short-sojourn view recently experienced a resurgence in popular support by at least one radical chronological revisionist (Rohl 2015, 78–79) and one late-exodus advocate (Hoffmeier 2007, 225–47). (2) At present, more evidence can be

Douglas Petrovich is professor of biblical history and exegesis at The Bible Seminary in Katy, Texas. He also serves as epigrapher for the Shiloh Excavations in Israel. His PhD from the University of Toronto includes a major in Syro-Palestinian archaeology, a first minor in ancient Egyptian language, and a second minor in ancient Near Eastern religions.

brought to bear on the subject, both exegetically and historically, than was available or constructed previously.

The question is whether the short-sojourn view's renewal is worthy of support from those engaged in the fields of biblical and ancient Near Eastern historical studies. In short, these efforts to infuse new life into the short-sojourn view should not persuade the careful student of biblical history to abandon the long-sojourn view. As a result, the goal of the present work is to demonstrate from exegetical, text-critical, and historical data that the interval for the Israelite sojourn in Egypt before the exodus is precisely 430 years, as opposed to roughly 215 years.

The means to accomplish this task is to perform a study on the four most relevant biblical texts that are connected to the length of the sojourn: Exodus 12:40–42, Genesis 15:13, Galatians 3:15–18, and Acts 13:17–20. One scholar wisely noted that the declarations of Scripture must provide the primary evidence for determining the date of the exodus (Benware 1993, 263), which is true because the Hebrew Bible's chronological passages are clear and precise in their expressions of datable events, and because these datable events can be synchronized confidently with numerous moments in ancient Near Eastern history.

These declarations of Scripture become the primary evidence for determining not only the date of the exodus but also the length of the Egyptian sojourn. Testimony obtained through archaeology, epigraphy, and other subfields of ancient history thus becomes secondary evidence, which should be consulted only *after* proper dates are established and accurate synchronisms are achieved. Thus, the last step for accomplishing the present task, as contained in the "Final Thoughts" below, is to plot the proper period of the sojourn onto a timeline and demonstrate how it fits with the physical evidence related to ancient history.

Interpretive translations of relevant biblical passages are provided before treating the texts, which include additional wording for clarification. The study begins with Exodus 12:40–42, which must be treated first because it represents the crux passage: the foundational text to which the other passages relate secondarily. The reason for its elevated status is that the conclusion of the sojourn and the moment of the exodus are recorded by a firsthand witness, notably Moses, the author of Exodus (Exod 24:4; Deut 31:9; Josh 8:31; Mark 7:10; Acts 3:22; Rom 10:5). Exodus 12:40 and verse 41 each explicitly enumerate "430 years" as the length of the sojourn.

Genesis 15:13, which can be called the predictive passage for the sojourn, will be treated second. This verse fore-

shadows both the beginning and the end of the sojourn, offering its own number for the length of time that Abraham's descendants would reside in a foreign land: 400 years. This apparent discrepancy—430 versus 400 years—impacts both the short- and long-sojourn views, without discrimination, so the variance between the two numbers must be resolved no matter how one interprets the 430 years of Exodus 12.

Galatians 3:15–18 was written well over a millennium after the crux passage (Exod 12:40–42), so it will be called the first consequent passage for the length of the sojourn. While Galatians 3:17 also includes a reference to 430 years, a difficulty arises over what event inaugurated this extensive span of time: the promise given to Abraham (if not its ratification), or the confirmation of the Abrahamic covenant offered to Jacob in the year that he immigrated to Egypt. The answer to this question has a profound impact on the length of the sojourn.

The second consequent passage, Acts 13:17–20, does not include the number 430 for the time of the Egyptian sojourn, but it does state that three different events total about 450 years when added together: the sojourn, the forty years of wandering in the desert, and the conquest of the seven nations—which culminated in the parceling out of the promised land to the Israelite tribes. This period of roughly 450 years fits the long-sojourn view perfectly but effectually cripples the short-sojourn view.

Interpretive Translations of Relevant Biblical Passages

Exodus 12:40–42 (crux passage).

Now the residing of the sons of Israel *during* which they resided in Egypt *is* 430 years. So it happened at the end of the 430 years—and it was on that very day—*that* all the armies of He-who-is went out from the land of Egypt. It *was* a night of vigil belonging to He-who-is, in order to bring them out from the land of Egypt. This *was* the night belonging to He-who-is, a vigil for all of the sons of Israel for all of their generations.

Genesis 15:13 (predictive passage).

Then he [God] said to Abram, 'Know for certain that your descendants will be strangers in a land not belonging to them, and they [the Israelites] will serve them [the Egyptians], and they [the Egyptians] will afflict them [the Israelites]: *all occurring over a period of 400 years.*

Galatians 3:15–18 (consequent passage 1).

Brethren, I am speaking according to mankind, yet no one nullifies or adds anything to a related-to-mankind covenant having been confirmed. Now the promises [plural] were spoken [by God] to Abraham and to his seed [(singular) Jacob]. (He [God] does not say [to Abram in Gen 17:19], “and to *your* seeds [I will give this land],” as *referring* to many [seeds to whom God will give this land], but *rather* to one *seed*: “and to your [one] seed,” who is Christ[*“I will give this land”*].) So this I [Paul] am saying: the law having come 430 years after [the promise was confirmed to the singular seed, i.e., to Jacob at Beersheba (Gen 46:1–4),] does not revoke *the* covenant having been confirmed beforehand by God, so as to nullify the promise. For if the inheritance *derives* from law, *then* it no longer *derives* from promise. Yet God graciously gave it to Abraham by means of promise.

Acts 13:17–20 (consequent passage 2).

The God of this people, Israel, called out our fathers and uplifted the people within the sojourn in the land of Egypt, and with an uplifted arm he led them out from it. Then *for* about 40 years of time, he endured them in the desert, and having overthrown seven nations in the land of Canaan, he parceled out their land as an inheritance, *all occurring over a period of* about 450 years. Then after these things, he gave *them* judges, until Samuel, [the] prophet.

Crux Passage for the Sojourn’s Length: Exodus 12:40–41

The crux passage for the length of the Israelite sojourn in Egypt is Exodus 12:40–41, a worthy distinction because its temporal measurement is placed squarely within the passage that treats the events of the sojourn’s completion in real time. Moreover, the human leader of the Hebrews, Moses, wrote the narrative in Exodus (e.g., Exod 17:14; 24:4; 34:27), including that the sojourn in Egypt equals 430 years, emphatically adding how this residence lasted 430 years *to the very day*.

The historicity of Moses was confirmed extrabiblically by the presence of his name on Sinai 361, an inscription dating to the reign of Thutmose III (ca. 1506–1452 BC) or Amenhotep II (ca. 1455–1418 BC) (Petrovich 2016b, 158–72, 234), based on ceramic evidence in the mines where Sinai

361 was discovered (Petrie 1906, 131; Gardiner 1916, 13; Petrovich 2016b, 189). The explicit statement of Moses that Israel remained in Egypt for 430 years strongly supports the long-sojourn position (Merrill 2008, 93) despite the claim that the lack of a satisfactory explanation for the number “430” lends toward taking it as an exaggeration (Durham 1987, 172). Yet an alternative view has led to the presence of a textual variant in Exodus 12:40, namely that the sojourn lasted only about 215 years, although often this variant reading is embraced seemingly just to accommodate a scholar’s overall chronological scheme for biblical history of the second millennium BC.

For example, David Rohl (2015, 78) has declared it to be clear from the witnesses to the textual variant that the Egyptian sojourn was around 215 years, which allows his “new chronology” scheme to reduce datable periods of Egyptian history in the chronological timeline by radical amounts. Clearly, a detailed resolution of this textual variant is necessary to settle the question of the sojourn’s length conclusively, as the resolution of this variant should shape one’s view of early Israelite chronology, despite Hoffmeier’s (2007, 226–30) claim that because several options exist for how the text reads, there are numerous biblical chronologies.

This illustrates the danger of uncritically embracing the views of Egyptologists and archaeologists who do not specialize in biblical exegesis or lower (textual) criticism along with their own area of specialization in ancient history. The cart should not be trusted to pull the horse. The issue must be solved within the disciplines of biblical studies first, because there cannot be two or more lengths of the sojourn, two or more exodus dates, or two or more exodus pharaohs. As Benware rightly cautioned, the declarations of Scripture must provide the primary evidence to determine these events, and only then can ancient historical evidence be consulted to add flesh to the skeletal structure.

Explication of the Textual Variant: Geographical Extent of the Sojourn

The discipline of textual criticism must be consulted to resolve this variation, and its results should be trusted, assuming that the degree of certainty of its conclusion is high enough. While the variety of readings found in various manuscripts suggests that the total number of textual variants is slightly more numerous, the data essentially presents only two opposing views: (1) The 430-year sojourn described in Exodus 12:40 encompasses the patriarchal residence in

Canaan and the Israelite residence in Egypt, implying that the residence in Egypt lasted only about 215 years. (2) The 430-year sojourn described in Exodus 12:40 encompasses only the Israelite residence in Egypt.

Advocates of the 215-year Egyptian sojourn include the following: Tertullian (*Answer to the Jews* 2; *ANF* 3:153), *S. Olam* 3 (210 years), Bishop Ussher (1660, chap. 8), James Murphy (1866, 134) (210 years), George Bush ([1859] 1993, 150), James Hoffmeier, (2007, 226), Robert Anderson and Terry Giles (2012, 81), and David Rohl (2015, 78–79). Supporters of the 430-year Egyptian sojourn include Hippolytus (*Expository Treatise against the Jews* 6; *ANF* 5:200), Jack Riggs (1971, 32), Willem Gispén (1982, 128), Paul Ray (1986, 246–47), Eugene Merrill (2008, 92–96); William Propp (1999, 365), Douglas Stuart (2006, 305), Andrew Steinmann (2011, 68–70), Richard Hess (2018, 187), and Rodger Young (2018, 47).

Technically, the variety of readings for this textual variant could warrant more than five views for the proper reading of the text, but the present study will not treat every conceivable variant independently, for two reasons. First, variant readings often spawn further variations, and all of the spurious readings in Exodus 12:40 probably derive from one non-original variant. Second, the primary goal here is to determine whether some part of the pre-Egyptian sojourn in Canaan is included in the 430 years of Exodus 12. The method for resolving this textual problem will be to present the case for each view—first with external evidence, and second with internal evidence—then the case against each view (see Petrovich 2017, 1–10, to see this structure in brief).

The Case for the Sojourn's Inclusion of Egypt and Canaan

The first variant reading for Exodus 12:40 is that the sojourn described here includes the residence of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in Canaan, plus the Israelite stay in Egypt. This variant is supported by the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint (LXX),² Syriac manuscripts (Syro-Hexapla), and Josephus (*Ant.* 2.15.2, §318). The LXX (Rahlfs and Göttingen) reads ἡ δὲ κατοίκησις τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἦν κατώκησαν ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν γῆ Χαναάν ἔτη τετρακόσια τριάκοντα, “And the residing of the sons of Israel *during* which they resided in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan *is* 430 years.” The Samaritan Pentateuch reads וּמֹשֶׁה בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֲבֹתָם אָשְׁרָ יָשְׁבוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם וּבְאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה, “Now the residing of the sons of Israel and their fathers *during* which they resided in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt *is* 430 years.”

One advocate of the Egypt-plus-Canaan view stated that the LXX presumably was translated from an original Hebrew text of the Torah during the third century BC (Rohl 2015, 78), inferring its quality on the basis of its antiquity. The Samaritan Pentateuch also is an important ancient witness to a form of the text that once enjoyed widespread use, as shown by its many agreements with the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Samaritan Pentateuch was written in a special script that derived from an archaized form of the Old Hebrew script of the Hasmonean period (Würthwein 1995, 45–46), and the use of this archaic script in the Samaritan Pentateuch—whose *Vorlage* may predate the Babylonian captivity—could imply a much greater antiquity for the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Plus, the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch form a double tradition that preserves a reading often considered as superior to that of the Masoretic Text (MT) (Ray 1986, 233–34), including the textual variants in the genealogies of Genesis 11 (Petrovich, n.d.; Sexton and Smith 2016, 45–49). Josephus even notes explicitly that the Israelites lived in Egypt “215 years only, after Jacob entered Egypt” (*Ant.* 2.15.2, §318). Thus, “215 years” actually appears in an ancient source, one that must be consulted for the resolution of the variant. For this reason, many scholars are comfortable counting 215 years from the time that Jacob and his sons entered Egypt until the deliverance under Moses (Bush [1859] 1993, 150).

Regarding internal evidence that supports this variant, the 215-year sojourn is attractive to many scholars because it accommodates the “fourth generation” of Genesis 15:16 more comfortably (as noted in Steinmann 2011, 68; Merrill 2008, 94). The LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch challenge how 430 years can account for the mere four generations from Jacob’s arrival in Egypt to the exodus, while a 215-year Egyptian sojourn easily accommodates four generations.

The reading of the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch aids the proponents of the “new chronology” view, who need a short sojourn in Egypt to help them shrink Egyptian history of the second millennium BC significantly and to defend their chronological scheme. Rohl (2015, 79) concluded that by adding 215 years to an exodus date of 1447 BC (his date), the starting date for the Israelite sojourn is approximately 1662 BC, which he connected to the reign of Amenemhat III of Dynasty 12.

Finally, the 430 years in Galatians 3:17, which connects to the 430 years in Exodus 12:40–41, allegedly points to a shorter sojourn (Anderson and Giles 2012, 81; Rohl 2015, 79; Murphy 1866, 134), as Paul apparently wrote of God’s

promises to Abraham as having been fulfilled with the writing of the law at Mount Sinai, some 430 years after the patriarch's time, not from Jacob's arrival in Egypt (Rohl 2015, 79).

The Case for the Sojourn's Inclusion of Egypt but Not Canaan

The second variant reading for Exodus 12:40 is that the sojourn described here includes only the Israelite stay in Egypt. This variant is supported by the MT (notably the Leningrad Codex), the Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q14Exod) (Ulrich and Cross 1995, 113–17), Targum Onkelos, the Samaritan Targum, Syriac manuscripts, rabbinical sources of the LXX,³ the Armenian version, the Bohairic version, the Vulgate, the Peshitta, and Josephus (*Ant.* 2.9.1). The MT reads וּמֹשֶׁה בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יָשְׁבוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה, “Now the residing of the sons of Israel *during* which they resided in Egypt *is* 430 years.” The reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls (with vowel pointings added) is וּמֹשֶׁה בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יָשְׁבוּ בְּאֶרֶץ-מִצְרַיִם שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה, “Now the residing of the sons of Israel *during* which they resided in the land of Egypt *is* 430 years.”

The MT also can boast of great antiquity and high quality. While the oldest extant manuscript of the MT formally dates only to about AD 1009, it represents an underlying Hebrew text that goes back much further, since the MT derives from the sopherim—specifically the tannaim of the first century BC to the third century AD—who transmitted the text with great care. Moreover, the MT repeatedly has been demonstrated to be the best witness to the original text, so any deviation from it requires justification (Würthwein 1995, 116; Riggs 1971, 24). Nonetheless, even the best manuscripts and textual families contain errors.

The discovery of Cave 4 at Qumran in August 1952 produced not only the most voluminous number of Dead Sea Scrolls among all of Qumran's caves but also a witness (4Q14Exod) to this textual variant in Exodus 12:40 that dates to the first century BC and affirms the reading in the MT. The text of 4Q14Exod, however, reads “in the land of Egypt” rather than the MT's “in Egypt.” The absence of “in the land of Canaan” in the Dead Sea Scrolls' text strengthens the reading of the second variant significantly, especially since the writing of the Dead Sea Scrolls dates to a time when the LXX was revered highly in Jewish society. Jewish writers in antiquity, such as Philo and Josephus, considered the LXX on equal footing with the Hebrew text (Dines 2004). The addition of “in the land” probably represents a

compromise by 4Q14Exod's scribe, who seemingly harmonized his text to match the LXX here.

Regarding internal evidence that supports the variant without “Canaan,” there is no compelling reason to suspect any form of intentional or accidental error on the part of a Hebrew scribe as the reason behind the potential omission of וּבְאֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן (“and in the land of Canaan”) in the texts underlying the reading of the MT and Dead Sea Scrolls in Exodus 12:40. Propp (1999, 365) noted that the absence of “Canaan” is preferable because, while one easily can imagine the pristine text as having undergone progressive expansion, it is more difficult to account for the MT's text as having been abbreviated here.

However, Mitchell (2017, 1) proposed that a scribal skip could have taken place either from confusion over the beginning letters (homoiarcton), confusion over the ending letters (homioiteuton), or a mistake of sight or sound. Confusion of sound is unlikely unless evidence is presented to prove that a previous exemplar was read aloud at some point in the transmissional process. Homoiarcton (“a similar beginning,” meaning an omission of intervening text due to the skipping of the copyist's eye from one beginning to a similar beginning) also is unlikely, because the only word that would appear twice in the text of the LXX's *Vorlage* is בְּאֶרֶץ.

With this error, the resultant text would read, “the residing of the sons of Israel during which they resided in the land of Canaan,” or “the residing of the sons of Israel during which they resided in the land of Egypt,” neither of which is the reading in the MT. Another problem with this option is that the second בְּאֶרֶץ is prefaced by a *wāw* conjunction: וּבְאֶרֶץ, a dissimilarity between the two that cannot be accounted for satisfactorily by homoiarcton.

The only accidental error of sight that warrants serious consideration is one of omission, notably parablepsis (“looking to the side,” meaning that a scribe accidentally skipped from one place to another), facilitated by homioiteuton (“a similar ending,” meaning an omission of intervening text due to the skipping of the copyist's eye from the ending of one word to a similar ending on another word). Yet confusion due to homioiteuton is highly unlikely here, for a number of reasons.

First, the Hebrew text behind the LXX probably would have read בְּאֶרֶץ-מִצְרַיִם, “in the land of Egypt,”⁴ thus including אֶרֶץ between the בְּ preposition and מִצְרַיִם, and the absence of אֶרֶץ cannot be accounted for in the MT's reading בְּמִצְרַיִם (“in Egypt”). Second, if the eye of the scribe of the

underlying text of the LXX would have finished copying a set of words by ending with יָשְׁבוּ (or יָשַׁב if the omission was pre-850 BC), “they resided,” then returned with his eyes to the last letters of what he had recorded (i.e., בוּ or שַׁב), there is no matching letter-combination to which his eyes mistakenly could have returned on his exemplar.⁵

Or, if—after writing יָשְׁבוּ or יָשַׁב on his new copy—his mind would have prompted him to look for the letters בָּא in בְּאֶרֶץ־מִצְרַיִם when he returned to his exemplar, his eyes only could have taken him to בְּאֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן, “in the land of Canaan,” meaning he mistakenly would have written וּמֹשֶׁה בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “Now the residing of the sons of Israel *during* which they resided in the land of Canaan *is* 430 years.” This error obviously did not produce the reading in the MT or the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Third, if an omission allegedly was caused by single-letter homoioteleuton from confusing paleo-Hebrew מ (*mem*) in מִצְרַיִם (“Egypt”) with נ (*nun*) in כְּנָעַן (“Canaan”), meaning that the scribe’s eye accidentally went from the final letter in “Egypt” to the final letter in “Canaan” when he returned to his exemplar, one would have to overlook how the scribe must have read the initial *mem* in “Egypt” correctly as an actual *mem*, and not a *nun*.

Another problem is the need to suggest that the scribe did not view the conspicuous toponym as a whole (word), while recording it and returning his eyes to it on his exemplar, which is unlikely. Such an error here is conceivable but highly improbable. Since none of these forms of accidental error of omission due to sight seems viable in Exodus 12:40, the notion of the spurious rise of the shorter reading in the textual traditions of the MT and Dead Sea Scrolls is difficult to sustain.

If an accidental error cannot account for the absence of “Canaan” in the MT and Dead Sea Scrolls, perhaps an intentional error was committed. To date, no scholar has ventured to suggest a logical explanation for why a scribe would have omitted “the land of” (before “Egypt”) and “and the land of Canaan” from his text purposefully, if “Canaan” is original and the LXX preserves that reading in Greek. Since there is no logical explanation for an accidental error of omission, the burden of proof falls on the proponents of the longer reading to offer a compelling reason for an intentional error of omission—or actually two errors for the MT, if counting them separately.

Within the context of Exodus 12:40, it certainly would be more natural to reckon the time of the exodus in terms of the overall length of the Israelites’ stay in Egypt rather than adding the previous period in Canaan to the sojourn (Riggs

1971, 24). After all, the entire story from the beginning of Exodus focuses on the Israelites’ stay in the foreign land of Egypt, not their earlier residence in Canaan under the patriarchs. Moreover, Canaan is the promised land, and thus their homeland. Egypt represents foreign soil, signaling an anomalous era for them.

The outstanding event for the Israelites is the anticipated and promised return to their homeland, making the purpose of this counting of their foreign sojourn to distinguish it from earlier life lived in their native habitation. Adding the residence of their forefathers in Canaan to this time span only would de-emphasize the force of the point being made by the author, an oddity that interferes with the flow of the Pentateuch. Plus, there is only one mention of the land of Canaan from the beginning of Exodus until Exodus 12:40, where God—speaking privately with Moses—mentioned Canaan as the land connected to his covenant with the people (Exod 6:4).

There is one more argument related to the context of Exodus 12:40 that supports an Egypt-only sojourn and profoundly damages an Egypt + Canaan sojourn. The people named here who were involved in the sojourn were not called “Hebrews” or even “sons of Abraham.” Abram expressly was designated “the Hebrew” in Genesis 14:13, but never was he called an Israelite. In fact, the name “Israel” first appears when God wrestled with Jacob and renamed him this, because Jacob had striven with God (Gen 32:28).

Therefore, the sojourning of those who are indicated as the “sons of Israel” in Exodus 12:40 only could have begun with Jacob’s offspring, not with Abraham, not with Isaac, and not even with Jacob. Any interpretation of the verses in Genesis that places the starting point before Jacob had children is inconsistent with the text. For those who maintain that the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch are correct in adding Canaan to the place of sojourning, the time that Jacob and his family spent in Canaan before entering Egypt must be included in the 430 years. Adding that time, which equals about 34 years (Steinmann 2011, 76), still leaves 396 years for the Egyptian sojourn, an unacceptable length for short-sojourn advocates.

For this reason, the Egypt-plus-Canaan sojourn view is necessarily impossible unless its proponents desire to alter the length of the Egyptian sojourn from 215 to 396 years, which is highly unlikely for the chronological revisionists because their entire scheme would be dashed if required to add 163 years to the Egyptian sojourn. Even if short-sojourn advocates can accept an Egyptian sojourn long beyond 215 years, the responsibility falls on them to identify an extraor-

dinary event during the lifetime of Jacob's sons or progeny that inaugurated the 430 years of Exodus 12:40.

The Hebrew text underlying the LXX almost certainly represents the original spurious variant because the reading in the LXX, which places Egypt before Canaan, can explain the rise of the reading in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Conversely, the reading in the Samaritan Pentateuch, which places Canaan before Egypt, cannot explain the rise of the variant in the LXX. After all, the chronological order of the locations where the Israelites resided was Canaan first, then Egypt. A scribe who saw in his exemplar that his forefathers resided in Canaan (first) and (then) in Egypt would not "fix" the text by altering the wording to state that they resided in Egypt (first) and (then) in Canaan.

However, if a scribe saw in his exemplar that they resided in Egypt (first) and (then) in Canaan, which is the opposite of chronological order, he definitely would be prone to fix the perceived chronological error in his exemplar. For this reason, Propp (1999, 365) referred to the Samaritan Pentateuch's reading as more logical than the LXX's reading. Moreover, the presence of "and their fathers" after "the sons of Israel" in the Samaritan Pentateuch must have been added to alleviate the problem that the sojourns of Abraham and Isaac in Canaan were excluded from the sojourn of Exodus 12:40 in the LXX, given that these patriarchs predated the sons of Israel.

Therefore, the reading in the LXX almost certainly led to the reading in the Samaritan Pentateuch. This progression points instructively to the most important canon of textual criticism: prefer the reading that best explains the rise of the other readings (Petrovich 1998, 143), as the reading from which the origin of the other readings most easily can be explained is most likely to be original (Nestle 1901, 157). Black (1980, 35) referred to this as the basic principle of internal evidence.

The Case against the Sojourn's Inclusion of Egypt and Canaan

The first type of evidence to be evaluated for Canaan as original to Exodus 12:40 is external evidence. While the LXX undoubtedly was translated from a Hebrew text of the Torah, there is no way to demonstrate that its underlying Hebrew text reflects an *original* text of the Torah, or that its quality is inherently superior to the earliest exemplars that underlie the readings in the MT. Plus, Thiele ([1983] 1994, 90–94) has shown the LXX to be inferior to the MT in chron-

ological matters, although he primarily focused on the era of the Israelite kingdoms.

While the Samaritan Pentateuch's use of a script from the Hasmonean period may reflect origins dating to the second century BC, making the Samaritan Pentateuch an important witness, the fact that its archaized form of script is similar to the Hebrew script predating the Babylonian captivity has no bearing on whether the Samaritan Pentateuch predates Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of 587 BC.⁶ The Temple-façade coins of the Bar Kokhba revolt (AD 132–135) also feature the archaic script, but no numismatist who studies ancient coins would assert that these or any other coins with archaic script were minted before 587 BC.

Although at times the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch undoubtedly preserve the original wording of the Hebrew text, their joint preservation of both correct and spurious readings suggests that their early ancestry may be somewhat interconnected, thus casting doubt on complete independence in their transmissional lines. Plus, the proto-Samaritan Pentateuch modernized and popularized the proto-MT during the second century BC, in the process removing historical difficulties and harmonizing parallel passages (Gentry 2009, 24). As for the shared reference to Canaan in Exodus 12:40, Cassuto ([1967] 1997, 86) judged that the added words in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX are mid-rashic exegesis and not part of the original biblical text. The Samaritan Pentateuch's text almost undoubtedly was harmonized with the LXX here.

As Carpenter (2016, 474) keenly observed, the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch reverse the order of Egypt and Canaan in their texts, which reveals no insignificant difference. The former reads, "in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan," while the latter reads, "in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt." The same reversal in order is found within various rabbinical writings from antiquity (Tov 1999, 3–5), which strongly implies the likelihood of the spurious nature of the variant in either form, given the flippancy with which the order was preserved and the inability for either reading to account for the rise of the variants recorded in the MT and Dead Sea Scrolls.

Carpenter (2016, 474) correctly noted that the addition of *αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν* ("they and their fathers") after "*during* which they resided in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan" in Alexandrinus's version of the LXX accentuates the chronological dilemma. Namely, this manuscript states that the time their fathers spent in Canaan was added to the time the Israelites spent in Egypt. While Alexan-

drinus's addition cannot be viewed as original to the LXX, one may grant that its text states explicitly what is only implied in earlier versions of the "and Canaan" variant.

Vaticanus's text also strays from the standard reading of the LXX, adding *πέντε* ("five") after *τριάκοντα* ("thirty"), which alters the length of the sojourn to 435 years. While Vaticanus often is the most reliable of the mostly complete Greek uncial Bibles of the early centuries AD (Zuntz 1953, 83; Petrovich 1998, 93), here its text represents yet another spurious addition to the original Septuagintal reading of the verse that quantifies the length of Israel's sojourn before the exodus. Ray (1986, 234) considered that all of these deviations from the LXX suggest why its reading should not be taken as preferable or original here.

While it can be granted that the "215 years" in Josephus's (*Ant.* 2.15.2, §318) text does provide an ancient source that mentions this number, his historical reference is quite different from a biblical reference to an Egyptian sojourn of 215 years. This complete lack of textual support greatly hinders the variants recorded in the LXX, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and their derivatives. Plus, Josephus is not a reliable source for anyone soliciting support for the short-sojourn view. After all, he expressly stated in *Antiquities* (2.9.1, §204) that the Israelites experienced 400 years of affliction in Egypt. Due to such conflating reports in Josephus's writings, his testimony on Exodus 12:40 should be considered late, contradictory, and inferior to the evidence from biblical manuscripts.

The only way to avoid the conclusion that Josephus's evidence regarding the 400 years is contradictory is to suggest that he viewed the 430-year sojourn in Egypt and Canaan as comprised of 400 years of affliction (Gen 15:13) in Egypt plus 30 years of residence in Canaan by Jacob and his sons, without counting Abraham's or Isaac's sojourn in Canaan in the equation. This could be viewed as the understanding of the standard reading of the LXX since it does not mention the fathers of the sons of Israel, unlike the Samaritan Pentateuch. Perhaps these scribes considered the 400 years of the Egyptian sojourn in Genesis 15:13 to be complemented with 30 years of residence in Canaan by the sons of Israel, meaning that some important event occurred in 1906 BC, exactly 30 years before Jacob's trek to Egypt.

Though this scenario is conceivable, several flaws must be accentuated. First, there is no guarantee that the ultimate source behind the standard reading of the LXX had Genesis 15:13 in view when creating this variant, and that Josephus considered the 400 years of that passage as an exact render-

ing of the time the Israelites were in Egypt. Second, there was no outstanding event in Israelite history that occurred in Shechem 30 years before Jacob's eventual migration to Egypt.

In fact, probably the only recorded event of this era is Jacob's move to Bethel from Shechem (Gen 35:1), after having moved from Paddan-aram (northern Mesopotamia) to Shechem (Canaan) about eight years earlier (Gen 33:18) (Steinmann 2011, 75–76). Therefore, if a scribe of approximately 250 BC or somewhat earlier invented this scenario, perhaps to resolve the "400 versus 430 years" conflict, he would have done so blindly, without alluding to any known event that Moses used as the former chronological peg for the 430 years of Exodus 12:40.

As for Rohl's connection of the short sojourn with his "new chronology" scheme, while he is correct that Dynasty 12 is the time of Joseph's lifetime, his inaccurate date of approximately 1662 BC for the inception of the sojourn is the result of radically reconstructing Egyptian chronology. This redating represents not merely a 25-year variance, the standard maximum deviation among Egyptologists for the differentiating of dates according to the three chronological positions (i.e., high, middle, and low chronology), but a difference of almost two centuries. While Rohl (2015, 79) dated Amenemhat III's reign as about 1680–1633 BC, the correct dates are about 1859–1813 BC (Petrovich 2016b, 234), a difference of a startling 180 years.

Such enormous deviation strains any Egyptologist's ability to reconcile Rohl's scheme with the chronology of ancient Egypt, and with equal force it should strain the biblical scholar's ability to reconcile his synchronization of ancient Egyptian history with biblical history. He stands apart from the entire field of Egyptology on this matter even though he has gained a popular following. Rather than carefully articulating his revisionist scheme in a scholarly fashion for professional Egyptologists to legitimize or dispute through peer review, Rohl instead packaged it in a non-scholarly format and delivered it directly to the general public.

Tragically, the Christian public, untrained in Egyptology and naturally prone to sympathize with anyone willing to resist conventional thought, is largely unable to discern the myriad of flaws in Rohl's method of synchronizing Egyptian and Israelite history. Moreover, incontrovertible evidence has placed Joseph's two eldest sons in Egypt in 1842 BC, Year 20 of Amenemhat III (Petrovich 2016b, 15–29; forthcoming), further damaging Rohl's construct.

The Case against the Sojourn's Including Only Egypt

The first type of evidence to be evaluated regarding the case for Canaan to be absent from Exodus 12:40's sojourn is external evidence. Since—with the inclusion of Canaan in Exodus 12:40—the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch form a double tradition that not infrequently preserves the original wording of the Hebrew Bible, the reading of the MT and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Exodus 12:40 may not be as reliable as the longer variant of the LXX or Samaritan Pentateuch.

Regarding internal evidence, one argument against the shorter reading is that the words “and in the land of Canaan” seemingly dropped out of the ancestors of the MT and the Dead Sea Scrolls at some stage during the process of textual transmission (Rohl 2015, 78). Another argument against the shorter reading is that it conflicts with the view of some scholars about the 430 years in Galatians 3:17, which allegedly measures from the initial giving of the promise to Abraham to the reception of the law at Mount Sinai (Murphy 1866, 134; Hoffmeier 2007, 226; Rohl 2015, 79). Numerous commentators on Galatians have connected the beginning of the 430 years to the promise that was given to Abram and confirmed in Genesis 15 (Bruce 1982, 173; Boice 1976, 463).

The crucial issue in these verses is when to begin the 430 years that ended with the giving of the Mosaic law at Mount Sinai in 1446 BC. If the 430 years began with the promise given to Abraham, then this only allows an Egyptian sojourn of 215 years. Yet if the 430 years began with God's confirmation of the covenant to Jacob in Genesis 46:1–4 (Gromacki [1985] 2002, 100), the sojourn in Egypt would have encompassed 430 years.

Resolution of the Textual Variant: Geographical Extent of the Sojourn

The evidence for the variant in Exodus 12:40 now can be evaluated. Regarding external evidence, the antiquity of the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch renders their texts important for determining the originality of any variation in the Hebrew Bible. While these texts could preserve correctly the inclusion of Canaan as one geographical locale for the sojourn, the MT's reading possesses substantial authority, and only with great caution should it be overruled. Due to the strength of the double tradition of the MT and the Dead Sea Scrolls, external evidence favors the reading without Canaan.

Regarding internal evidence, the MT's reading is amply supported by numerous arguments: (1) No accidental error

of omission seems plausible for its rise. (2) The MT offers the shortest reading, and one canon of transcriptional probability is to prefer the shorter reading, since intentional changes are more likely to have been additions rather than omissions (Greenlee 1995, 72). (3) The context of Exodus 12:40 is woven into a narrative that focuses directly on the Israelite sojourn in Egypt, not the previous patriarchal sojourn in Canaan. (4) The rise of the other readings can be explained easily by the MT's reading, but its rise cannot be explained whatsoever by the originality of any other reading. These four arguments act as four strands that form a strong cord, making the MT's reading the overwhelming choice based on internal evidence.

Regarding ancient history's voice on whether the Israelite sojourn in Egypt lasted 215 or 430 years, the evidence is completely imbalanced. The only legitimate candidate for the exodus pharaoh in Egypt's Dynasty 13, 18, or 19—the only dynasties representing choices offered by scholars, at present—is Amenhotep II, who alone fits *all* of the measurable requirements of the exodus pharaoh's biography (Petrovich 2006, 81–110).

Hebrew inscriptions in Egypt and Sinai (see esp. Sinai 377, 376, 375a, and 361) date to approximately 1840–1446 BC and name three biblical figures: Asenath, Ahisamach, and Moses (Petrovich 2016b, chaps. 1–2). *ʿApiru* (= Hebrew) slaves are documented as vintners in Egypt during the reign of Thutmose III (= the exodus pharaoh's father and predecessor), while “Israelites” appear in a conquest list on an Egyptian inscription (Berlin Pedestal 21687; see van der Veen et al. 2010, 15) that has been dated to the reign of Amenhotep II by one paleographer (Görg 2012, 60), which almost certainly relates to this king's final Asiatic campaign in November of Year 9 (= 1446 BC). A myriad of other examples can be cited, but this representative list should suffice.

Resolution of the Textual Variant: Reconstructing the Rise of the Spurious Readings

With the textual variant solved, the rise of the spurious variants can be reconstructed. Because the reading in the LXX was shown to represent the first generation of intentional scribal errors of addition in Exodus 12:40, the explanation of its rise can be offered first. The scribe who first altered the text behind the standard LXX reading obviously would see “in Egypt” as the singular location of the foreign sojourn and would feel compelled to retain this location as the initial

one, out of respect and deference, yet he awkwardly would add “and in the land of Canaan” afterward.

Perhaps he was convinced that 430 years simply was too lengthy for the Israelites’ stay in Egypt, possibly because he assumed there to be too few generations between Jacob and Moses to account for the alleged “four generations” that defined the time from God’s prophetic message to Abram about the Egyptian sojourn (Gen 15:16) to the time when Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt. Or, he may have assumed from Genesis 15:13 that the entire Egyptian sojourn consisted of 400 years, while considering that thirty years in Canaan prior to this would eliminate the apparent discrepancy of 430 years in one text versus 400 years in another text.

In the case of the former scenario, the scribe who first altered Exodus 12:40 may have felt compelled to avoid having to stretch a mere four generations of people to fit into the enormously long period of 430 years between Jacob’s sons and Moses. He could resolve this dilemma by reducing the actual sojourn in Egypt to only 215 years, given that this is the proper time frame between Abram’s call to leave Haran and Jacob’s descent into Egypt (Merrill 2008, 93; Steinmann 2011, 71, 74).

As for the MT’s reading, the scribe of the Dead Sea Scrolls who penned 4Q14Exod most likely saw “in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan” in contemporary LXX manuscripts and—although he resisted the temptation to add Canaan to the list of places that comprise the 430-year sojourn—concluded that his Hebrew exemplar omitted the words “the land of” by mistake. Therefore, he committed an intentional error of addition. In other words, he added the words intentionally but expected that he was correcting an earlier mistake of accidental omission. Intentional errors are less numerous than unintentional errors, primarily deriving from attempts by scribes to restore the text, no doubt implementing changes in good faith under the impression that an error had crept in during an earlier phase of transmission (Greenlee 1995, 58; Black 1980, 17).

Resolution of the Textual Variant: David Rohl’s Failed Attempt

David Rohl (2015, 78) ventured a simplistic argument for solving the textual variant in Exodus 12:40. First, he correctly noted that the MT, which he called the Hebrew Torah, and the Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q14Exod) lack any reference to time in the land of Canaan as part of the chronological equation. Second, he suggested that the LXX, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and Josephus (*Ant.* 2.15.2, §318) “are unanimous in

stating that the 430 years began with Abraham’s arrival in Canaan and his visit to Egypt.” Third, he concluded that the words “and in the land of Canaan” somehow dropped out of the text in the MT and Dead Sea Scrolls. Fourth, he declared that the LXX presumably was translated from an original Hebrew text of the Torah during the third century BC. Fifth, he appealed to the 430 years in Galatians 3:17 as supporting a short Israelite-sojourn in Egypt.

Rohl’s alleged resolution of the textual variant is plagued with errors. First, he failed to inform his readers that the order of the lands of Canaan and Egypt are reversed in the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch, and that only the Samaritan Pentateuch adds “the fathers” to “the sons of Israel” as those who participated in the sojourn, which details are crucial for solving the textual variant. The testimonies of these two textual witnesses thus are far from unanimous. Second, the transmissional history of the Hebrew Bible suggests that there were no original Hebrew texts of the Torah during the third century BC.

Even if this point is not at the heart of what Rohl was proposing, one may note that Rohl offered no proof that the exemplar of the LXX’s text was inherently purer than the exemplar of the MT or 4Q14Exod. Third, he offered no carefully reasoned and thorough resolution of the textual variant to prove that the reading in the MT and Dead Sea Scrolls is the result of the phrase’s having dropped out, whether the wording in the LXX or the Samaritan Pentateuch is deemed original. Hopefully, the present study has accentuated the seriousness of his failure to solve the variant carefully and objectively.

Fourth, contrary to Rohl’s conviction, as well as that of Anderson and Giles, the 430 years in Galatians 3:17 instead measures from the final promise God gave to Jacob before the latter from Canaan, which occurred in the same year that he entered Egypt (1876 BC), to the year of the giving of the law at Mount Sinai (1446 BC), which occurred in the same year as the exodus from Egypt. More will be said below about Paul’s use of “430 years” in Galatians 3:17.

Predictive Passage for the Sojourn’s Length: Genesis 15:13

In Genesis 15:13 God appeared to Abram and instructed him to know for sure that his descendants will be strangers in a land not belonging to them. The location of this land is not identified anywhere in Genesis 15 (Hamilton 1990, 435). God evidently withheld this information from Abram and

only subsequent history would bear out that Egypt is where they would reside as foreigners. Obviously the amount of revelation that Abram received was quite limited.

The text then says that the Israelites will serve a foreign nation and that these people will afflict the Israelites. The final statement is that all of these events would transpire over a period of 400 years. This predictive passage in Genesis 15 prophesies the Egyptian sojourn, service, bondage, and exodus, but it includes a time frame (“400 years”) that never was intended to provide Abram with an exact count of how long his progeny would reside in a land that is not their own (Wenham 1987, 332). Thus, the operative term for the predicative passage in Genesis 15 is *limited information*, which implies that exactness and clarity were not the speaker’s goals.

Abram was *not* a firsthand witness to these events, while Moses *was* a firsthand witness to them. The reason why Genesis 15:13 cannot be considered the crux passage for determining the length of the Israelite sojourn in Egypt is that its historical context is prior to and removed from (1) the moment that the foreign sojourn began (by about 210 years), and (2) the moment that the Israelites departed from Egypt (by about 640 years). The chronological basis for this claim is that Abram entered Canaan in approximately 2091 BC (Gen 12:4), and his son, Ishmael, was born in about 2080 BC (Gen 16:3). The reason for confidence in these dates will be discussed below, in the “Final Thoughts.”

One writer could not understand how the time spans in Genesis 15:13 and Exodus 12:40 are related (von Rad 1961, 182). It should be obvious, however, that both the 400 years of Genesis 15:13 and the 430 years of Exodus 12:40–41 have the same interval in view: the former is cast as a round figure looking into the future, while the latter purports to be the elapsed time span for that period.⁷ Durham (1987, 172) has suggested that the variance between the “400” in Genesis 15:13 and the “430” in Exodus 12:40 may be that the latter number is exaggerated, similar to the allegedly inflated number of 600,000 Israelite men of Exodus 12:37, possibly having been inflated for the same reason. However, a far less speculative explanation exists.

One response in defense of a long sojourn in Exodus 12:40 is that while fitting four generations into 430 years of time (per Gen 15:16) is challenging, four actually can be delineated between the entry into Egypt by Jacob’s family and the exodus under Moses. Levi was about 44 years old when he entered Egypt with his father (Jacob), and Moses was in the fourth generation down from Levi: (1) Levi, who lived 137 years; (2) Kohath, who lived 133 years; (3) Amram, who

lived 137 years; (4) Moses, who left Egypt at about 80 years of age (Merrill 2008, 94). Yet since this totals 487 years, there is difficulty fitting it with a 430-year sojourn. However, taking *dor* as a human “generation” in Genesis 15:16 is not the only translational option.

The exact length of the sojourn should not be sought in Genesis 15:13 because the “400” in this verse was intended to be a rough number, just as was the use of the term “fourth *dor*” in Genesis 15:16 (Wenham 1987, 332). Kitchen (2003, 355–56) perceptively referred to the predicted 400 years of the Egyptian sojourn as a number that was cast as a round figure and looked into the future, and he argued that the Hebrew word *dor*, which usually is rendered four “generations” in English translations, actually means “spans,” given that the West Semitic cognate *daru* was used to denote the seven spans of time that elapsed between the fall of the Akkadian Empire and the accession of Shamshi-Adad I of Assyria (ca. 1800 BC), whose scribes would have measured these spans as totaling between 530 and 730 years.

Sarna (1986, 7–8), Waltke (2001, 244), and Ray (1986, 236) each noted that Hebrew *dor* and its Semitic cognates more accurately mean “a cycle of time, a lifetime/lifespan,” so four *dor* is not at all incompatible with 400 years. This *dor* could be viewed as a span of time (Deut 32:7; Ps 145:13; Isa 58:12) rather than biological generations, as both etymology and context suggest (Ray 1986, 236). Genesis 15:16 thus could be rendered, “Then in the fourth span *of time* they will return, because the wickedness of the Amorite *is* not complete until then.”

In this sense, the fourth span of time would relate directly to the round number of 400 years from three verses earlier, since the context defines the interval as being equal to 400 divided by four, or 100 years for each rough span of time. If Kitchen, Sarna, Waltke, and Ray are correct, the juxtaposition of the 400 years with the four spans of Genesis 15:16 suggests that the *dor* here is to be understood as a century, leaving no need to find four conventional generations of time between Jacob and Moses, which scholars so often attempt to do (Merrill 2008, 92–94). This proves damaging to the short-sojourn view, because its appeal is significantly dependent on its friendlier adaptability to the “fourth generation” in this verse.

Hamilton (1990, 435), Currid (2000, 262), and Williams (1990, 133) represent those who have assumed that the 400 years of Genesis 15:13 (and Acts 7:6) signals the Hebrews’ affliction at the hands of the Egyptians. Hamilton stated that the Israelites would be abused and victimized as aliens for four centuries, while Carpenter (2016, 475) declared that

Genesis 15:13 asserts that the seed of Abraham would be enslaved in Egypt for 400 years.

However, one of the most important nuances in the translation of Genesis 15:13 above is that the content of the 400 years includes not merely the affliction the Israelites would experience as slaves in Egypt but also their residence there as strangers in a foreign land and their servitude to the Egyptians. A reiterative passage exists in Acts 7:6, where Stephen cited Genesis 15:13 while reviewing the history of what God accomplished in the past on behalf of Israel. Luke's text reads, "But God spoke thusly, 'His descendants will be strangers in a foreign land, and they, themselves, will be slaves and mistreated: *all occurring over a period of 400 years.*'"

In other words, the 400-year period would consist of three events with no predictive indication of their individual durations: (1) the Israelites' living as strangers in a foreign land, (2) the Israelites' serving these foreigners, and (3) the afflictions that the Israelites would experience at the foreigners' hands. Kitchen (2003, 355) interpreted Genesis 15:13 in the same way, placing a comma after the word "oppressed" and adding "some 400 years" after it, then referring to this period as the time measured from Jacob's arrival in Egypt until the exodus. Various scholars have noted that the number in Acts 7:6 was taken from Genesis 15:13 and that this same "400" should be interpreted as a round number (Bruce 1988, 135; Harrison 1975, 113).

When synchronizing biblical and Egyptian chronology and matching this with Egypt's history, it becomes clear that the Israelite oppression did not last 400 or 430 years, but rather a mere 114 years. This short period of actual Israelite affliction in Egypt matches well with the opinion of the ancient Jewish sage Yose ben Halafta (*S. Olam* 3), who stated that the oppression lasted between 86 and 116 years (Guggenheimer [1998] 2005, 40). An oppression measuring 114 years can be known only from a careful study of ancient Egyptian history and a proper synchronization of Egyptian and Israelite history, including a proper identification of the Egyptian king who arose over Egypt but did not know of Joseph (Exod 1:8).

These matters go beyond the scope of the present work, but they are treated in detail elsewhere (Petrovich 2016b, chaps. 1–2; forthcoming). For now, it should be noted that the Bible describes how the Israelites acquired property, became fruitful, and increased greatly in number (Gen 47:27) before they ever began to experience affliction in Egypt, which required the lapse of a great deal of time. Carpenter (2016, 475) correctly noted that Israel enjoyed a significant

time of prosperity and freedom before they became a great multitude whose fruitfulness caught the eye of the Egyptian king (Exod 1:10).

First Consequent Passage for the Sojourn's Length: Galatians 3:15–18

The next major passage to consult regarding the length of the Israelites' Egyptian sojourn is Galatians 3:15–18, which is referred to here as the first consequent passage because the use of "430 years" in Galatians 3:17 is intended to be a consequence of the 430 years mentioned in Exodus 12:40 that define the period from Jacob's entry into Egypt until the exodus. If Exodus was composed in approximately 1425–1406 BC and Galatians was written in about AD 49 (Benware 1993, 49; Guthrie 1990, 473), Paul must have written Galatians about 1,460 years after Moses wrote Exodus.

Views on the Event That Initiated the 430 Years in Galatians 3:17

Curiously, Vine (1997, 93) suggested that Paul was not concerned with the precise length of the interval that comprises the 430 years, and Betz (1979, 158) stated that the chronology itself is of no particular interest to Paul. These remarks instead may reflect the lack of interest of some commentators in the complexities of biblical chronology or in identifying the exact events behind this precisely enumerated interval rather than Paul's alleged lack of interest. Had Paul not been concerned with an exact duration of time, he would not have gone out on a limb by stating that the interval equals precisely 430 years. Hamilton (1990, 435) even observed that in Galatians 3:17 Paul *quoted* Exodus 12:40–41's two references to the 430 years of sojourning.

The textual variant in Exodus 12:40 led to a major disagreement about the geographical extent of the sojourn, with important ramifications for its duration in Egypt. The reference to 430 years in Galatians 3:17 also is mired in dispute, as some interpret the beginning of the 430 years as the time that Abram received the promise from God,⁸ while others begin it with the reaffirmation of the Abrahamic covenant to Jacob in the same year that he entered Egypt.⁹

According to one scholar who holds the former view (Garrett 2014, 435), which probably was popularized by Bishop Ussher and his faulty chronological system (Young 2018), Paul's 430 years date from the time of Abraham to the giving of the law at Sinai, which "obviously requires" an

Egyptian sojourn of far less than 430 years. For Rohl (2015, 79), the reference to the 430 years in Galatians 3:17 points to a short sojourn, with Paul allegedly having measured the time from God's promises to Abraham to the writing of the law at Sinai. Yet Paul's reference to the period between a certain giving of the promise and the receiving of the Mosaic covenant may not point to the first time the promise was given to Abram (Gen 12:1–3), because it was (re)affirmed several times: to Abraham (13:14–17; 15:1–21 [or vv. 18–21]; 17:1–22; 22:15–18), to Isaac (26:24), and to Jacob (46:1–4) (Merrill 2008, 94).

Since the final reaffirmation of the Abrahamic covenant dates to the eve of Jacob's entrance into Egypt, Merrill noted that Paul may not have been speaking of Abraham in Galatians 3:17, but of the last expression of the Abrahamic promise by God, which was issued to Jacob exactly 430 years before the exodus and the giving of the law at Sinai. MacArthur (1987, 85) advocated that the repetition of the Abrahamic covenant to Jacob occurred exactly 430 years prior to the giving of the Mosaic covenant at Sinai, while Gromacki ([1985] 2002, 100) agreed that this probably refers to the reaffirmation of the Abrahamic covenant to Jacob when he relocated his family to Egypt.

Proper Event for Initiating the 430 Years in Galatians 3:17

The event that initiated the 430 years referenced by Paul in Galatians 3:17 is indeed the final reaffirmation of the Abrahamic covenant given to Jacob as he was preparing to leave Canaan and enter Egypt (Gen 46:1–4). Jacob left his home, took all of his possessions with him, and arrived at the site of Beersheba in the Negev. He offered sacrifices to the God of his father, Isaac, then went to sleep. That night, Jacob had an encounter with God, who spoke to him and called him by name.

Then God announced himself as the God of his father and reassured Jacob that he did not need to fear relocation to Egypt. Furthermore, God promised that he would make Jacob a great nation there, that he would go down with him, that he would return Jacob to Canaan, and that Joseph would close his eyes. Therefore, Jacob received the same reaffirmation of the Abrahamic covenant that his father and his grandfather had received. The context of Galatians 3:17 makes it known that Paul was speaking of this very event that Jacob had experienced.

The Promise Offered to Abraham and His Descendant

Paul assured his readers that no one nullifies a covenant related to mankind when it has been confirmed. He then illustrated this principle by drawing on the promises (plural) that God spoke to Abraham and to his seed (singular). Clearly a formal contract is in view, given that a "related-to-mankind" *διαθήκην* ("covenant") is announced in Galatians 3:15 (Witherington 1998, 241). In Israel's culture, a testament between people that was ratified legally could not be nullified (Hendriksen 1968, 134).¹⁰ The reference here, of course, is to the covenant that God first made with Abram in Genesis 12:1–3 (Waltke 2001, 45), the Abrahamic covenant. In the original encounter with Abram, the Hebrew word for covenant was not used. The word "covenant" (ברית in the Hebrew Bible, and *διαθήκην* in the LXX), however, does appear in Genesis 15:18, where it states that "on that day He-who-is established a covenant with Abram."

The confirmation of the Abrahamic covenant came through the ratifying ritual in Genesis 15:17 whereby God legally bound himself to fulfill his pledge. Abram's having slept through this event denotes the lack of need for him to perform any action to uphold his side of the covenant. Standard covenant-making in the ancient Near Eastern world, however, required both parties to obligate themselves to fulfill their part of the agreement (Petrovich 2016a, 164–84). The type of covenant described here, however, is not modeled after a vassal treaty but after a parity treaty (Bruce 1982, 17). Therefore, this was not a normal dual-obligation covenant, as God alone obligated himself to keep a bargain, which enacted a legal contract. Abram was merely a recipient, a beneficiary; he participated, but he was under no obligation (George 1994, 245).

The Meaning of the Confirmation of the Covenant

Proponents of the short-sojourn view may suggest that *κεκυρωμένην* ("having been confirmed," from *κυρώω*, but "has been ratified" in the NASB and "has been established" in the NIV) in Galatians 3:15 entails an action that necessarily *puts into effect* a decree or pledge. For them, this confirmation of the Abrahamic covenant could apply only to Abraham in this verse, not to Isaac or Jacob, because it was initiated only with Abram. To address this argument, the range of meaning for *κυρώω* must be examined. According to BDAG (579), there are two basic meanings of the verb: (1) to give

sanction to something, confirm, ratify, validate, or make legally binding; and (2) to come to a decision in a cognitive process, conclude, or decide in favor of.

Under the second definition, BDAG notes that in the middle voice—and seemingly in the active, as well—Plato’s writings reveal that “affirm, make valid” is also a legitimate rendering, and that in 2 Corinthians 2:8, “*reaffirm* deserves consideration.” In that verse, Paul says to the Corinthians (using the active voice, not the middle), “I urge you, therefore, to reaffirm *your* love for him [i.e., the one having offended you].” The implication is that the Corinthians loved the offender previously, but after forgiving his wrongdoing, they must reaffirm their love for him. This reaffirmation of love would enable the offender to know that the forgiveness is genuine and that the offense is a thing of the past.

So from *κυρώ*’s range of meaning in BDAG, it seems that while the first definition may imply an action that puts the decree or pledge into effect, the second definition most certainly does not require the initial implementation of an action. In reference to the second definition, BDAG also cites Herodotus, Josephus, Antigonus, and Thucydides as extrabiblical writings that implement this meaning of “reaffirmation.”

According to J. I. Packer (*NIDNTT*, 1986, 664), the word *κυρώ* in classical Greek and the LXX expresses the thought of ratifying and making firm, as *κυρώ* is common from Herodotus and Aeschylus forward. In the canonical LXX, *κυρώ* appears twice, both times in the passive voice and used to confirm possession (Gen 23:20; Lev 25:30). In the papyri, it appears several times as the legal word to confirm appointments and transactions between various parties.

Regarding the NT, the *NIDNTT* notes that in 2 Corinthians 2:8 Paul uses *κυρώ* in his plea to the Corinthians to “confirm” or perhaps “reaffirm, reestablish” their love for the errant brother, which is similar to BDAG’s second definition. Once again, there is no mention of an action that puts an agreement into effect, whether predicated on a physical action or the giving of an oral pledge. Therefore, no evidence can be marshalled to support the claim that Paul necessarily intended the *initial* establishment of a decree or pledge regarding the type of covenant mentioned in Galatians 3:15.

The Unchangeableness of a Pair:
The Covenant and Its Confirmation

The order of events in Galatians 3 is this: first a covenant, then a subsequent confirmation (vv. 15, 17). This includes

the initial past action of a covenant, followed by a completed confirmation or reaffirmation. For this reason, the passage can be compared to what is seen in Hebrews 6 (Vine 1997, 90). Hebrews 6:14 presents an aspect of the Abrahamic covenant, namely the statement from Genesis 22:17 that God “surely will bless [Abraham] and surely will multiply [him].” Abraham patiently waited beforehand (Heb 6:15), and only then did he obtain the promise (= Gal 3:15, 17).

The writer of Hebrews subsequently stated that one swears with an oath as a confirmation (Heb 6:16) of the surety of the original promise. Then in Hebrews 6:17, God reportedly showed the heirs of the original promise (i.e., the covenant) the unchangeableness of his purpose, whereby he interposed with an oath (i.e., the subsequent confirmation), which itself is a verbal promise. The reference to two unchangeable things (Heb 6:18) draws attention to this dual act that reflects the certainty of its coming to pass, since God does not lie (Titus 1:2).

This principle is paralleled in Genesis 41:32 with the two dreams that the king experienced in Joseph’s day, which effectually were the same dream experienced twice (Gen 41:25). This repetition was designed to instruct that God had determined that the matter of seven years of plenty followed by seven years of famine certainly would come about (Gen 41:32), since the immutable one by no means will leave it unaccomplished. By analogy, the repetition in Galatians 3 (i.e., covenant then promise) is to signal that these are events that certainly came to pass.

The Former Chronological Peg:
The Covenant Reaffirmed to Jacob

The law is said to have come 430 years “after” something (Gal 3:17). The author thus defined for his readers the latter chronological peg: the receiving of the Mosaic law, which is separated from the former peg by 430 years. The question is whether the text identifies the precise event that defines the former chronological peg or if one simply is resigned to guesswork. This leads to an important point: there is no reference whatsoever in Galatians 3:15–18 to Abram’s relocation to Canaan, Jacob’s relocation to Egypt, Israel’s sojourn in Egypt, or Israel’s exodus from Egypt.

Before importing an idea into the text as to what might define the former chronological peg for the 430 years, the context should be consulted. What surfaces repeatedly are two words: covenant (two times) and promise(s) (four times). Moreover, of vital importance is Paul’s use of “after” to imply a specific event that preceded the reception of the

law and the 430 years. As for the nearest event before the word “after,” one cannot rely on the statement that begins with the clause “He does not say” (Gal 3:16) because that clause represents a digression from the main argument (see the translation offered above). The statement is parenthetical, as Paul uses the singularity of the seed who would be given the land of promise (i.e., Christ) to illustrate the singularity of the seed who last received the promise of the Abrahamic covenant.

Neither can Abraham’s receiving of the promise be identified as the nearest referent. Instead, the nearest referent in the main argument is the statement that the promises were spoken by God to Abraham’s seed. Of course, *ἐπαγγελίαι* (“promises”) is plural, but *σπέρματι* (“seed”) is expressly singular. This clearly indicates more than one promise, and more than just Abraham as a recipient of the promises connoted here.¹¹ The plural form *σπέρματα* (“seeds”) does occur in the LXX, such as in Leviticus 26:16 (Bruce 1982, 172), so the difference in number is not merely academic.

The context thus leads to several conclusions: (1) The reception of the law is the final chronological peg, which dates to the year of the exodus: 1446 BC. (2) There was a period of 430 years before the event that marks the final chronological peg, denoting an event that occurred in 1876 BC. (3) Context reveals that the former chronological peg is defined by a promise God gave to a particular seed (descendant) of Abram, who was alive in 1876 BC and received the promise in that year. Which patriarch qualifies as meeting both requirements? Biblical chronology reveals that Isaac died in 1886 BC (Gen 35:28). The answer must be Jacob, the last person to receive the confirmation (promise) of the original covenant, which occurred immediately before he led his entire household into Egypt (Gen 46:5–7).¹²

Just as Christ was the one seed who would inherit the land, so also Jacob was the one (and final) seed to whom the Abrahamic promise was confirmed. Jacob had departed—leaving Canaan for Egypt, due to famine—with all that he possessed, and he arrived at Beersheba (Gen 46:1), where he offered sacrifices to God. Then while he dreamt at night, God spoke to him (Gen 46:2), promising him that not only will he go down with Jacob to Egypt, but that he “surely also will bring [him] up again [to the land of promise]” (Gen 46:4). At no time after this, and with no subsequent patriarch, did God offer another promise to possess the land: never again to Jacob, never to Joseph or any of his brothers, and never to Ephraim or Manasseh or their heirs.

This reaffirmation to Jacob was the final promise that confirmed the original covenant that God established with Abram. Again and again, Scripture mentions Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in one breath, almost always in relation to God’s covenant, which unites these individual patriarchs into a rope of three cords (Hendriksen 1968, 139).¹³ Thus, the final promise delivered to Jacob acts as the perfect event for Paul’s former chronological peg. The context of Galatians 3:17 is sufficient for identifying the initial chronological peg, so there is no need to speculate about the referent’s identity merely by introducing events into the narrative that just are not a part of Paul’s argumentation.

The summary statement for Galatians 3:15–17 that Paul offers at the end of the passage, in Galatians 3:18 (Betz 1979, 159), is worthy of emphasis. “For if the inheritance *derives* from law, *then* it no longer *derives* from promise. Yet God graciously gave it to Abraham by means of promise.” Here, Paul offers both ends of the chronological spectrum: not an unstated event and the giving of the law, or even the departure to Egypt and the giving of the law, but the making of the promise and the giving of the law. Abraham is mentioned by name, but not Isaac or Jacob, because the promise was given to Abram initially.

The Former Chronological Peg: Its Connection to the 430 Years

Clearly Paul’s mention of “430 years” is an echo of the exact time the Israelites spent in Egypt. In this sense, he counted on his readers’ knowledge of the length of the Egyptian sojourn as recorded in Exodus 12:40–41. However, the absence of any discussion about that sojourn is a telling one, and intentional. Egypt ultimately does not fit into the equation, as far as the Abrahamic covenant or the promises to these three patriarchs are concerned.

Paul intentionally focused on the greater issue at hand: the endurance of the promise related only to the promised land. Plus, Paul would have known that Jacob’s receiving of the promise from God and the beginning of the Egyptian sojourn occurred in the same year, just as he knew that the exodus and the receiving of the law took place in the same year. Egypt does not appear in any of God’s promises to Abraham or Isaac despite God’s revelation to Abram in Genesis 15:13–16 about his descendants’ eventual descent into—and return from—a foreign land (Egypt). The actual promise to Abram begins in Genesis 15:18, the very promise that the law was unable to nullify (Gal 3:17).

Egypt simply is not on Paul's radar screen in Galatians 3. His refusal to introduce Egypt into the argument when using the "430 years" figure validates the point, even if he does infer that the time from the final reaffirmation of the promise to the reception of the law is interrupted by the Egyptian sojourn that also lasted for 430 years. The 430 years here measures from the time of the final reaffirmation of the promise to Jacob—just as it had been given to Abraham, and to Isaac—to the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. Therefore, Galatians 3:17 fully supports the long-sojourn view, undergirding Exodus 12:40–41 by reinforcing the truth that two crucial events took place in the same year, while two other crucial events took place exactly 430 years later.

Second Consequent Passage for the Sojourn's Length: Acts 13:17–20

The final passage to consult regarding the length of the Israelites' Egyptian sojourn is Acts 13:17–20, which does not explicitly address its length. The construction of this second consequent passage is quite similar to that of Genesis 15:13, both of which name three events and provide the time frame for the three events at the end of their recounting. The three events recorded in Acts 13 are the Egyptian sojourn, the wandering in the desert, and the conquest of seven nations in Canaan. The seven nations destroyed in the land of Canaan are listed in Deuteronomy 7:1: the Hethites (not Hitites, per Wood 2011), the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites (Bruce 1988, 255).

Some consider the 450 years of Acts 13:17–20 to include the time "until Samuel, [the] prophet," thus rendering the Egyptian sojourn as not included within the temporal measurement (as noted in Ray 1986, 232). This view is based on a textual variant that places the phrase "about 450 years" immediately following the statement, "Then after these things, he gave *them* judges" (Acts 13:20). This variant, which is followed by the KJV, is supported by the Byzantine text-type, at least six non-Byzantine manuscripts, several versions (one Old Latin manuscript, Ethiopic, and an Old Slavonic manuscript), Chrysostom, a Greek manuscript according to Bede, and several lectionaries.

A second variant is the placement of "about 450 years" after "he parceled out their land as an inheritance" (Acts 13:19). This variant is supported by Papyrus 74, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi Rescriptus, numerous other Greek manuscripts, and several versions (most Old

Latin manuscripts, the Vulgate, Bohairic Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, and an Old Slavonic manuscript). Consequently, the external evidence strongly favors the second variant.

Since this textual variation reflects a problem that does not directly record the length of time for the sojourn, it will not be discussed at length here. A full resolution of the variant is available elsewhere (Petrovich 2014, 1–4), but here it can be stated that both external and internal evidence favor the reading of the second variant.

F. F. Bruce (1988, 255) correctly noted that the 450 years seem to cover the sojourning in Egypt plus the 40 years of wandering in the desert and the period between the entry into Canaan and the allotment of tribal territory recorded in Joshua 14:1–5. The conquest of Canaan under Joshua required six years (Petrovich 2008, 495n26), meaning that the three events in Acts 13:17–20 total 476 years, when factoring a sojourn of 430 years. If the sojourn's length was rounded to 400 years, as it was recorded in Genesis 15:13, the total for the three events that Paul named in his sermon in Acts 13 would be 446 years.

Therefore, the long-sojourn view works comfortably here whether using 400 or 430 years for the length of the Egyptian sojourn. Conversely, a sojourn of 215 years totals a mere 261 years, which is 159 or 189 years short of Luke's 450 years and thus is completely incongruous with the number in Genesis 15:13 or in Exodus 12:40–41. In fact, the textual variation in Acts 13:20 may be the direct result of an intentional scribal error to avoid this chronological dilemma, in deference to the short-sojourn view and the reading of the LXX in Exodus 12. Either way, the data in Acts 13:17–20 join Exodus 12:40–42, Genesis 15:13, and Galatians 3:15–18 in exclusively supporting an Egyptian sojourn of exactly 430 years.

Final Thoughts

This study has shown that the precise length of the Israelite sojourn in Egypt undoubtedly was 430 years, just as Rea, Riggs, Ray, Merrill, and others argued in the second half of the 20th century. In the first two decades of the 21st century, Rohl, Hoffmeier, and others attempted to revive the view that the residence in Egypt lasted 215 years, but the present study has proven that they failed. The four passages treated here, when read and interpreted correctly, uniformly attest to the long sojourn.

The external and internal evidence related to the textual variant in Exodus 12:40 argues overwhelmingly in favor of a

430-year stay in Egypt and does not include Abraham's, Isaac's, Jacob's, or any of Jacob's sons' sojourns in Canaan. The context of Genesis 15:13 clarifies that the 400 years there is a round number placed in a predictive passage that is characterized by the offering of limited information about what would transpire in an unnamed foreign land over four 100-year spans of time (Gen 15:16), which forms an obvious pair with the 400 years to signify an approximate length of time, not a genealogical tree of four generations.

The reference in Galatians 3:17 to 430 years is defined by two chronological pegs: the final promise offered to a (singular) seed of Abraham, which was experienced by Jacob in the same year that his household entered Egypt, and the receiving of the Mosaic law at Mount Sinai, which took place in the very year of the exodus. Acts 13:17–20 only supports a sojourn of 430 years, unless the short-sojourn's variance of 159 or 189 years less than 450 is taken as acceptable for the phrase "about 450 years," which would amount to nothing less than special pleading.

The results of this study are so overwhelmingly one-sided that the only explanation for embracing the short-sojourn view is to proof-text, but for historical rather than theological reasons. The final step here is to plot the 430-year sojourn onto a timeline and show how it fits with the evidence from ancient history. The proper year of the exodus is 1446 BC, which is known by adding 479+ years from the beginning of construction on the First Temple in 967 BC (1 Kgs 6:1). The certainty of these dates is based on the efforts of Edwin Thiele ([1983] 1994) and the confirmation of—and refinements on—his work by Rodger Young (2003, 601–2; 2006, 71–83; Young and Steinmann 2012, 223–48). With 1446 BC established as the exact year of the exodus, counting back 430 years from this date establishes 1876 BC as the year in which Jacob departed from Canaan and entered Egypt with his household (Gal 3:17; Exod 12:40–41).

As for how this date coincides with Egyptian history, while Rohl (2015, 79) incorrectly dated the start of the Egypt-

ian sojourn to approximately 1662 BC, he correctly connected it to Dynasty 12. However, by tying this event to the reign of Amenemhat III, he linked it to the son of the king who was ruling when Jacob arrived. The correct synchronism for the entrance into Egypt in 1876 BC is two full years into the reign of Sesostris III (Petrovich 2016b, 234) based on the datable astronomical event recorded on Berlin Museum Papyrus 10012 from Lahun and the preference for the high chronology view (Parker 1976, 184; Ward 1992, 56–59; Huber 2012, 224). All of this will be argued in the present writer's subsequent volume, *Origins of the Hebrew People: New Evidence of Israelites in Egypt from Joseph to the Exodus*.

Some advocates of the short-sojourn theory believe that the reigns of the Asiatic rulers in Egypt known as the Hyksos (Dynasty 15) fit well with a 215-year sojourn. Yet in reality, the details surrounding the Hyksos' rule are quite damaging to their view. According to the Turin Royal Canon, the Hyksos ruled for 108 years from their capital at Avaris (ca. 1668–1560 BC), an abandoned city that is located in the eastern Nile Delta. The short sojourn would date the Hebrews' arrival in Egypt to approximately 1661 BC, based on the proper date for the exodus, about seven years after the Hyksos had arrived.

The presence of Israelites in Egypt already during Dynasty 12 (Petrovich 2016b, chap. 1), long before the Hyksos arrived, renders the short-sojourn view totally implausible after synchronizing Egyptian and Israelite history, both of which are well documented chronologically. Moreover, when *Origins of the Hebrew People* is published, it will demonstrate from material cultural and epigraphical evidence (e.g., Middle Egyptian inscriptions attesting to several biblical figures) how the Israelite residence at biblical Ramesses (Gen 47:11; Exod 1:11) precisely harmonizes with the evidence from proto-consonantal Hebrew inscriptions to place Joseph's two eldest sons in the eastern Nile Delta during Amenemhat III's reign.

Endnotes

1. Ray 1986, 231–48; Riggs 1971, 18–35; Rea 1960, 58–66; see also Merrill 2008, 92–96.

2. The standard reading of the LXX is complemented by several rabbinical sources. This includes Mekilta: "in Egypt and in the land of Canaan and in the land of Goshen is 430 years"; Tanhuma: "in Egypt and in the land of Goshen and in the land of Canaan is 430 years"; Soperim majority: "in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan is 430 years"; Soperim manuscripts: "in

the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt is 430 years" (Tov 1999, 3–5; English translations provided by Craig S. Petrovich).

3. The rabbinical sources include the majority reading: "in Egypt and in the remainder of the lands is 430 years"; *Midrash Hagadol*: "in Egypt and in the remainder of the lands is 430 years"; *Jerusalem Megillah*: "in Egypt and in all of the lands is 430 years" (Tov 1999, 3–5; English translations provided by Craig S. Petrovich).

4. The suggestion should not be ventured that the underlying Hebrew text of the LXX reads בְּאֶרֶץ־מִצְרָיִם, as Tov and Polak (CATSS Database 2005, Exod 12:40⁶ and 12:40⁷) correctly noted that only one preposition was used in this construction. Two בְּ prepositions are highly unlikely, because of the 59 times that “in the land of Egypt” is rendered in the Hebrew Bible, not once does the article מִצְרָיִם precede בְּ.

5. The final letter ו (waw) would not have been written at the end of the word before ca. 850 BC except as a pronominal suffix, because *matres lectiones* are unattested in epigraphical Hebrew prior to this date (Gogel 1998, 8–10; 56–59), signifying that the convention was not invented until close to this date (Petrovich 2016b, 199).

6. See Young (2004, 27–29, 38) for why 587 BC is the exact year for the Neo-Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem at the end of the Judahite monarchy.

7. Kitchen 2003, 355; Currid 2000, 262; Ryken 2005, 353; Waltke 2001, 244; Williams 1990, 133; Ray 1986, 233.

8. Ussher 1660, chap. 8; Ellicott 1867, 78; Bruce 1982, 173; Ray 1986, 231; George 1994, 248; Vine 1997, 93; Witherington 1998, 245; Garrett 2014, 435; Rohl 2015, 79.

9. Hendriksen 1968, 138–39; Lightfoot (1865) 1982, 143–44; Ray 1986, 247; Merrill 2008, 92, 95; MacArthur 1987, 85; Gromacki (1985) 2002, 100.

10. The *mattenat bari'* designated a transaction of property from donor to donee, which took place immediately and was not dependent on the donor's death (Betz 1979, 155).

11. This contrasts with the view of Lightfoot ([1865] 1982, 142), who held that the words here were spoken to Abraham and not to one of the later patriarchs. However, Lightfoot failed to explain how the promises can be plural, while Paul specifically notes that these promises were not spoken strictly to Abraham but to Abraham and to his particular (i.e., singular) seed. While some may argue that *seed* is used only as a collective noun, the Bible is replete with examples of how it can refer to just one person: Gen 4:25; 21:13; 1 Sam 1:11; 2 Sam 7:12; Gal 3:16b; 3:19; Acts 3:25; Rom 9:7; Heb 11:18 (Hendriksen 1968, 135).

12. Ellicott (1867, 76) and Vine (1997, 91) opined that “and to his seed” instead refers to Christ, but this interpretation seems to get ahead of itself. Certainly the subsequent reference to the singular seed refers to Christ, but Ellicott failed to understand that there is a pause between the current connection to the receiving of the Abrahamic covenant and the subsequent reference to Christ as a seed who inherited the land of promise. Paul's initial use of the singular *seed* acts as the overlapping space between two circular rings that are interconnected, to use illustrative terms.

13. Gen 28:13; 32:9; 48:16; 50:24; Exod 3:15; 6:3; 32:13; Deut 1:8; 9:5; 29:13; 30:20; 1 Chr 29:18; Matt 22:32; Mark 12:26; Acts 3:13; 7:32.

References

- Anderson, Robert T., and Terry Giles. 2012. *The Samaritan Pentateuch: An Introduction to Its Origin, History, and Significance for Biblical Studies*. Resources for Biblical Studies 72. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. (1885–87) 1994. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 10 vols. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Benware, Paul N. 1993. *Survey of the Old Testament*. Rev. ed. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. 1979. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Black, David A. 1980. “The Address of the Ephesian Epistle.” MDiv thesis, Talbot Theological Seminary.
- Boice, James Montgomery. 1976. *Galatians*. In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gæbelein. Vol. 10, *Romans through Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Bruce, F. F. 1982. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bruce, F. F. 1988. *The Book of the Acts*. Rev. ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bush, George. (1859) 1993. *Commentary on Exodus*. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel.
- Carpenter, Eugene. 2016. *Exodus 1–18*. Evangelical Exegetical Commentary. Bellingham, WA: Lexham.
- Cassuto, U. (1967) 1997. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Reprint, Jerusalem: Magnes.
- CATSS Database. 2005. *The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible*. By Emanuel Tov and Frank H. Polak. Module, BibleWorks 7.
- Currid, John D. 2000. *A Study Commentary on Exodus*. Vol. 1, *Chapters 1–18*. Evangelical Press Study Commentary. Darlington: Evangelical Press.
- Dillmann, August. 1880. *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 12. 2nd ed. Leipzig.

- Dines, Jennifer M. 2004. *The Septuagint*. Edited by Michael A. Knibb. Understanding the Bible and Its World. London: T&T Clark.
- Durham, John I. 1987. *Exodus*. Word Biblical Commentary 3. Nashville: Nelson.
- Ellicott, Charles J. 1867. *A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. Boston.
- Falk, David A. 2018. "The Egyptian Sojourn and the Exodus." In *Behind the Scenes of the Old Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts*, edited by Johnathan S. Greer, John W. Hilber, and John H. Walton, 194–200. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Gardiner, Alan H. 1916. "The Egyptian Origin of the Semitic Alphabet." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 3 (1): 1–16.
- Garrett, Duane A. 2014. *A Commentary on Exodus*. Kregel Exegetical Library. Grand Rapids: Kregel.
- Gentry, Peter J. 2009. "The Text of the Old Testament." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52, no. 1 (March): 19–45.
- George, Timothy. 1994. *Galatians*. New American Commentary 30. Nashville: Broadman & Holman.
- Gispén, Willem H. 1982. *Exodus*. Bible Study Commentary 3. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Gogel, Sandra Landis. 1998. *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*. Resources for Biblical Study 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Görg, Manfred. 2012. "Weitere Beobachtungen und Aspekte zur Genese des Namens 'Israel'" [Further observations and aspects of the genesis of the name "Israel"]. *Biblische Notizen* 154:57–68.
- Greenlee, J. Harold. 1995. *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Gromacki, Robert. (1985) 2002. *Stand Fast in Liberty: An Exposition of Galatians*. Gromacki Expository Series. Reprint, The Woodlands: Kress.
- Guggenheimer, Heinrich W. (1998) 2005. *Seder Olam: The Rabbinic View of Biblical Chronology*. Translated by Heinrich W. Guggenheimer. Reprint, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Guthrie, Donald. 1990. *New Testament Introduction*. 4th ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Hamilton, Victor P. 1990. *The Book of Genesis*. Vol. 1, Chapters 1–17. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Harrison, Everett F. 1975. *Acts: The Expanding Church*. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Hendriksen, William. 1968. *Exposition of Galatians*. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Hess, Richard S. 2018. "The Ancestral Period." In *Behind the Scenes of the Old Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts*, edited by Johnathan S. Greer, John W. Hilber, and John H. Walton, 187–93. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Hoffmeier, James K. 2007. "What Is the Biblical Date for the Exodus? A Response to Bryant Wood." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 50, no. 2 (June): 225–47.
- Huber, Peter J. 2012. "The Astronomical Basis of Egyptian Chronology of the Second Millennium BC." *Journal of Egyptian History* 4, no. 2 (January): 172–227.
- Josephus, Flavius. 1999. *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. Vol. 3, *Judean Antiquities, Books 1–4*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. Leiden: Brill.
- Kitchen, Kenneth A. 2003. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Lightfoot, Joseph B. (1865) 1982. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. Reprint, Lynn, MA: Hendrickson.
- MacArthur, John F. 1987. *Galatians*. MacArthur New Testament Commentary. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Merrill, Eugene H. 2008. *Kingdom of Priests: A History of Old Testament Israel*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Mitchell, Wayne A. [2017?]. "The Israelite Sojourn in Egypt: 430 or 215 Years? A Text Critical Analysis." Unpublished manuscript. <http://www.publicdomainbibles.com/files/exo12.40.pdf>.
- Murphy, James G. 1866. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Edinburgh.
- Nestle, Eberhard. 1901. *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*. Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate.

- Packer, James I. 1986. "χυρώω." In *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, edited by Colin Brown, 1:664. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Parker, Richard A. 1976. "The Sothic Dating of the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties." In *Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes: January 12, 1977*, 177–84. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 39. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Petrie, W. M. Flinders. 1906. *Researches in Sinai*. New York: Dutton.
- Petrovich, Douglas. 1998. "ἐν ἐφέσω and the Destination of the Ephesian Letter." ThM thesis, The Master's Seminary.
- Petrovich, Douglas. 2006. "Amenhotep II and the Historicity of the Exodus Pharaoh." *The Master's Seminary Journal* 17, no. 1 (Spring): 81–110.
- Petrovich, Douglas. 2008. "The Dating of Hazor's Destruction in Joshua 11 by Way of Biblical, Archaeological, and Epigraphical Evidence." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 51, no. 3 (September): 489–512.
- Petrovich, Douglas. 2014. "N. T. Textual Criticism Variant Reading Resolution: Acts 13:20." Unpublished manuscript. https://www.academia.edu/5987785/Resolution_of_Acts_13_20_Textual_Variant.
- Petrovich, Douglas Neal. 2016a. "Tayinat's Building XVI: The Religious Dimensions and Significance of a Tripartite Temple at Neo-Assyrian Kunulua." PhD diss., University of Toronto.
- Petrovich, Douglas. 2016b. *The World's Oldest Alphabet: Hebrew as the Language of the Proto-Consonantal Script*. Jerusalem: Carta.
- Petrovich, Douglas. 2017. "O. T. Textual Criticism Variant Reading Resolution: Exodus 12:40." Unpublished manuscript. https://www.academia.edu/34278461/Resolution_of_Exodus_12_40_Textual_Variant.
- Petrovich, Douglas. n.d. "Illuminating Biblical History from the Tower of Babel to Abraham." Unpublished manuscript.
- Petrovich, Douglas. Forthcoming. *Origins of the Hebrew People: New Evidence of Israelites in Egypt from Joseph to the Exodus*. Jerusalem: Carta.
- Propp, William H. C. 1999. *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 2. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rad, Gerhard von. 1961. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Ray, Paul J., Jr. 1986. "The Duration of the Israelite Sojourn in Egypt." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 24, no. 3 (Autumn): 231–48.
- Rea, John. 1960. "The Time of the Oppression and the Exodus." *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 3, no. 3 (Summer): 58–66.
- Redford, Donald B. 1997. "Observations on the Sojourn of the Bene-Israel." In *Exodus: The Egyptian Evidence*, edited by Ernest S. Frerichs and Leonard H. Lesko, 57–66. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Riggs, Jack R. 1971. "The Length of Israel's Sojourn in Egypt." *Grace Theological Journal* 12, no. 1 (Winter): 18–35.
- Rohl, David. 2015. *Exodus: Myth or History?* St. Louis Park, MN: Thinking Man Media.
- Ryken, Philip Graham. 2005. *Exodus: Saved for God's Glory*. Preaching the Word. Wheaton, IL: Crossway.
- Sarna, Nahum M. 1986. *Exploring Exodus: The Heritage of Biblical Israel*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Sexton, Jeremy, and Henry B. Smith Jr. 2016. "Primeval Chronology Restored: Revisiting the Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11." *Bible and Spade*, Spring/Summer, 42–49.
- Steinmann, Andrew E. 2011. *From Abraham to Paul: A Biblical Chronology*. St. Louis: Concordia.
- Stuart, Douglas K. 2006. *Exodus*. New American Commentary 2. Nashville: Broadman & Holman.
- Thiele, Edwin R. (1983) 1994. *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*. Rev. ed. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1999. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 72. Leiden: Brill.
- Ulrich, Eugene, and Frank M. Cross. 1995. *Qumran Cave 4. Vol. 7, Genesis to Numbers*. Discoveries in the Judean Desert 12. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Ussher, James. 1660. *Chronologia Sacra* [Sacred chronology]. Oxford.
- Veen, Peter van der, Christoffer Theis, and Manfred Görg. 2010. "Israel in Canaan (Long) before Pharaoh Merenptah? A Fresh Look at Berlin Statue Pedestal Relief 21687." *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 2, no. 4 (November): 15–25.
- Vine, William E. 1997. *Vine's Expository Commentary on Galatians*. With C. F. Hogg. Nashville: Nelson.
- Waltke, Bruce K. 2001. *Genesis: A Commentary*. With Cathi J. Fredricks. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Ward, William A. 1992. "The Present Status of Egyptian Chronology." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 288:53–66.
- Wenham, Gordon J. 1987. *Genesis 1–15*. Word Biblical Commentary 1. Waco, TX: Word.
- Williams, David J. 1990. *Acts*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament 5. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Witherington, Ben, III. 1998. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Wood, Bryant G. 2011. "Hittites and Hethites: A Proposed Solution to an Etymological Conundrum." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 54, no. 2 (June): 239–50.
- Würthwein, Ernst. 1995. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the "Biblia Hebraica"*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Young, Rodger C. 2003. "When Did Solomon Die?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 46, no. 4 (December): 589–603.
- Young, Rodger C. 2004. "When Did Jerusalem Fall?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 47, no. 1 (March): 21–38.
- Young, Rodger. 2006. "The Talmud's Two Jubilees and Their Relevance to the Date of the Exodus." *Westminster Theological Journal* 68, no. 1 (Spring): 71–83.
- Young, Rodger C. 2018. "Ussher Explained and Corrected." *Bible and Spade*, Spring, 47–58.
- Young, Rodger C., and Andrew E. Steinmann. 2012. "Correlation of Select Classical Sources Related to the Trojan War with Assyrian and Biblical Chronologies." *Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament* 1 (2): 223–48.
- Zuntz, Günther. 1953. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*. Schweich Lectures of the British Academy. London: Oxford University Press.