

Theology on the *Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Palestine Exploration Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_peq_01.php

fact that the Greek and Latin do not agree. The "Onomasticon" cannot be received as authority for identification, because its suggestions in many cases are irreconcilable with the Bible. In many cases, however, Jerome appears to accept Jewish traditions, which are sometimes correct. The work is interesting, as indicating the Roman garrisons; the mixed population—Jewish, Christian, and Pagan; the convict miners; the survival of temples in remote places; the native superstitions; and the early date of churches like those of Bethel and at Jacob's Well; with other points which have been noted. The greatest value lies, however, in its witness to the survival of the Hebrew nomenclature of the country in the fourth century, even more perfectly preserved than now.

SOUTHAMPTON.

THE DATE OF THE EXODUS.

I.—By Captain A. E. HAYNES, R.E.

WITH the great progress that we have made in the knowledge of the history and condition of the peoples of the Old Testament, it is necessary occasionally to pick up and group our results and see whither they have led us. This operation, though very necessary, is not altogether an easy one for the casual student: for as the range of facts widens it is more difficult to take anything but a partial view of them; and in many cases, it is feared, our assumed facts are but fictions. However, the process is fascinating enough; and, though one must endeavour to control within reasonable limits the tendency to outrun our facts in the deductions we make, yet some boldness may perhaps be forgiven and even welcomed, as summoning a greater and wider interest, and thus leading to the correction of its errors by increased research.

Amongst the most useful advances in our knowledge of ancient history are the chronologies of the dynasties and kings of Egypt which Professor Petrie has put into the final chapter of his "History of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the XVI Dynasty." The following table gives the dates of the first nineteen dynasties; and in studying it and using it, we must remember—what Professor Petrie stoutly insists on—that he does not vouch for it any absolute accuracy, but that for the earlier parts of the scale only he claims an approximation within a century of the actual date. This, however, matters little, while his scientific comparison of the accumulated data gives warrant for a confidence in the tables that has not hitherto been obtainable in the very varying chronologies of older works:—

Duration of Dynasties in Years.				Dynastic Periods in Years.
				B.C.
Dynasty	I.	263	4777-4514
"	II.	302	4514-4212
"	III.	214	4212-3998
"	IV.	277	3998-3721
"	V.	218	3721-3503
"	VI.	180	3503-3322
"	VII.	70	3322-3252
"	VIII.	146	3252-3106
"	IX.	100	3106-3006
"	X.	185	3006-2821
"	XI.	43	2821-2778
"	XII.	213	2778-2565
"	XIII.	453	2565-2112
"	XIV.	184	2112-1928
"	XV.	260 (Hyksos Dynasty)	1998-1738
"	XVI.	190	1928-1738
"	XVII.	151	1738-1587
"	XVIII.	260	1587-1327
"	XIX.		1327

The salient points of Egyptian ancient history as covered by the above dynasties are tolerably clear to us. The ruling class of native Egyptians appear to have come from the far south—from Punt—and to be kin with the Phœnicians of Syria (*vide* Petrie's "History of Egypt," pp. 12-14); and in the periodical revivals of the native power the motive force always comes from the south, even as it would now were the protection of Europe withdrawn from the Egyptian Government. From the first to the sixth Dynasties we see the native rulers moving from Thinis on the Upper Nile, where the seat of government is first fixed, to Memphis where this period reaches its highest development during the IV Dynasty. It was then that the Pyramids were built, and art took the grandest form it has ever achieved and essayed a rivalry with nature itself. A gradual declension followed, and during the VII-X Dynasties the seat of government moves southwards to Herakleopolis, and we see through the mists of an imperfect record signs of foreigners ruling in Lower Egypt. The sway of the chief Khyan—about 3100 B.C., a contemporary of the IX Dynasty, whose statue (the lower half of it) was found at Bubastis—extended to Bagdad, and probably controlled the countries between Euphrates and the Nile. In the IX Dynasty we see a revival of the native rulers extending their dominion and pushing the seat of government northwards, to culminate in the blaze of energetic splendour which marks the XII Dynasty centred at Beni-Hassan. This period is again followed by a retreat up the Nile before the invading power of the Hyksos; and for 500 years the native kings of Egypt exist mainly by sufferance and as viceroys of their conquerors. The close of the XVII Dynasty brings a revival, and again we

see the power of the Egyptian kings at its zenith during the XVIII Dynasty; when the arms of the Pharaohs penetrated far into Asia, and for a time the dwellers on the Nile had no rivals in the known world.

Throughout the ages Lower Egypt appears to us as the very hotch-potch of races, and we have evidence of the settlement of Arabian and Arab-Semitic peoples in the Delta side by side with the Phœnicians and Egyptians. This mixture of race seems to have led to the oft recurring influx of aliens, and to the ease with which they established themselves there to the temporary exclusion or subjection of the inhabitants proper.

The coincidence of the period of Hyksos dominion in Egypt, with the approximate date of the migration of Joseph and his kindred into Egypt as given by our biblical chronology, and the fitness of the times for an influx of Semitic people into the Delta, have resulted in a general agreement amongst students that these events were contemporary.¹ But while it is universally accepted that the migration of the Hebrews to Egypt, and their sojourn there, took place during the rule of the Hyksos and their immediate successors of the XVIII Dynasty—under which successors the Oppression took place—there is much uncertainty and disagreement about the date of the Exodus. This is but natural when one considers the much greater certainty with which a period of some hundreds of years can be identified in the history of two neighbouring kingdoms, the records of which have been preserved, than the determination of any actual synchronism of a date, the events of which have apparently missed all record by one of those nations. While deprecating any idea that one can point to the exact year in Egyptian chronology for the date of the Exodus, it is possible to show that the evidence daily accruing points with peculiar and increasing persistency to one period of Egyptian chronology as the period in question, in preference to the other (the times of the XIX Dynasty), which has had strong advocates from the times of Manetho² to that of Brugsch. Taking the chronological data of the *Variorum Bible* as our guide, we are able “with much confidence to accept” the explicit statement of 1 Kings xv, 1—that Solomon’s temple was begun in the 480th year after the Exodus. Professor Sayce has shown in “*The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*,” chap. vi, that the chronology of the Book of Kings is some 50 years in excess, and that the (p. 322) date of the beginning of King Solomon’s reign may not be put earlier than 962 B.C. Since King Solomon’s temple was commenced

¹ The record of a seven years’ famine in Egypt during the XVII Dynasty has been found on the tomb of a certain Baba in Upper Egypt, and has been used to support the suitability of the time of the Hyksos for the migration of Israel to Egypt.

² The account given by Manetho is not free from ambiguity, and although it appears to indicate that the Exodus took place in the XIX Dynasty, yet many of his genealogical notes are so imperfect and opposed to the other records which have come down to our time, that it is not safe to put much reliance in this single-instance testimony, although it has controlled the opinions of many Egyptologists for the last 100 years.

in the third year of his reign, from the foregoing data we get the approximate date of the Exodus as 1440 B.C., which, it is the object of this paper to show, agrees with the ruling conditions of that event as far as they are known.

This date throws the Exodus into the XVIII Dynasty, about 150 years subsequent to the expulsion of the Hyksos. Such an interval agrees with the Biblical statement, for we are told that Moses was 80 years old at the time of the Exodus—which gives an interval of 70 years between the expulsion of the Hyksos and Moses' birth. It is scarcely probable that the Oppression of the Israelites commenced immediately after the expulsion of the Hyksos; it would rather have been the policy of the Pharaohs to establish their newly-fledged power by a period of moderation, after which, the Empire being consolidated, and the new order confirmed, rein might be given to their desire of revenge against the "miserable" Asiatics and their compatriots the Hebrews, who had ruled over them for four or five hundred years. That the period referred to in the first chapter of Exodus is not a short one, is clear from the account of the building of the store-cities, and the statement in verse 20 that "the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty." Thus the interval of 150 years between the expulsion of the Hyksos and the Exodus, would appear to be in agreement with the Scriptural narrative.

When we come to the detailed history of the XVIII Dynasty, we are met with an absence of all clear reference to any such occurrences as are given in the Bible concerning the events which accompanied the Exodus. The following table gives the dates of the kings of the XVIII Dynasty as calculated by Professor Petrie. Though there is some obscurity as to the latter four kings, the date of the remainder may be taken as probably correct, to a margin of error of five or ten years.¹

					B.C.	B.C.
Aahmes I..	1587-1562	1557
Amenhotep I	1562-1541	1532
Tahutmes I	1541-1516	1511
Tahutmes II	1516-1503	1490
Hatshepsut	1503-1481	1478
Tahutmes III	1481-1440	1456
Amenhotep II	1449-1423	1424
Tahutmes IV	1423-1414	1406
Amenhotep III	1414-1383	1397
Amenhotep IV (Khu-en-atn)	1383-1365	1360
Rasmenkhka	1365-1353	1348
Tutankhamen	1353-1344	1339

¹ The corrections necessitated in Professor Petrie's chronology by astronomical considerations are given side by side in the text, with his dates of the various kings. *Vide* "Some Considerations regarding Professor Petrie's Egyptian Chronology," D. R. Fotheringham, in "Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology," March, 1896, pp. 99-102.

					B.C.	B.C.
Ay	1344-1332	1327
Horemheb	1332-1328	1315
Ramessu I	1310
Sety	1308
Ramessu II	1257
Merenptah	1190

The date of 1440 B.C. falls during the reign of Amenhotep II, successor of the brilliant Tahutmes III, the Alexander the Great of Egyptian history. If Amenhotep was the Pharaoh of the Exodus, then Tahutmes III and his immediate predecessors were the Pharaohs of the Oppression. There are recorded fifteen expeditions into Asia during the reign of Tahutmes III; and the triumphs which appear to have attended each, doubtless resulted in the transportation to Egypt of vast numbers of captives, amongst whom would be many of Semitic race. These captives (as we learn in Brugsch's "Egypt under the Pharaohs," p. 172) were employed in public works, and principally in the great imperial edifices, such as the Temple of Amen: they were forced to labour under the superintendence of overseers (Rois) who had to carry out the orders and directions of the king's chief architect. After the death of Tahutmes III a spirit of independence seems to have risen up in Asia, and Amenhotep¹ II conducted an expedition into the country. This expedition was carried on as a war of vengeance in the fullest sense of the term, and the Pharaoh appears to have acted with cowardice and barbarity. The power of the king and government appears during this reign to have suffered considerable diminution, and the monuments that remain are neither many nor important; and it is during such a period that we might expect that the departure of the Israelites would be effected.

Taking the birth of Moses 80 years before the Exodus, as in 1520 B.C., we see that this would have occurred in the reign of Tahutmes I. We know that during the later part of this reign the king's daughter Hatshepsut had a share in the government; and she seems to have gathered the reins of power into her hands completely during the reign of the next monarch, her brother and husband. Whether or no this, the Amazon Queen, were the princess who saved the child Moses from the waters of the Nile, and brought him up in the king's palace, it is, of course, impossible to say; but it seems probable, and her name, Thermutis—as Josephus has it—may be identified with Tahutimes (Tahuti's² child), the family name of King Aahmes, his Queen Aah-hotep, and their descendants of the XVIII Dynasty. The circum-

¹ Amenhotep is the name of the Pharaoh under whom—according to the historian Manetho—the Exodus took place; but there are several Pharaohs of that name in the Egyptian Dynastic lists.

² Tahuti was the God of Science, Art, and Astronomy, who dwelt in the moon.

stantial account given by Josephus of the campaign against the Ethiopians, in which Moses led the Egyptian armies, might suitably be connected with the joint reigns of Hatshepsut and Tahutmes II, or of Hatshepsut and Tahutmes III. The account of Moses marrying the Ethiopian Princess receives some support from the reference to his Ethiopian wife in Numbers xii; and the verse 22, Acts vii, seems also to testify to his prowess and attainments in the departments of science presided over by the god Tahuti.

The records of Karnak show that in one of the expeditions of Tahutmes III, he penetrated into the hill country of Palestine, and found the tribes of Jacob-el and Joseph-el domiciled there. These, with the other inhabitants, were subjected to the Egyptian arms, and the country was secured by garrisoning the principal towns with Egyptian troops under Egyptian or other loyal governors. That such tribes—for apparently these must be connected with the Abrahamic peoples—were domiciled in the land of Canaan before the Exodus, is at first sight difficult of explanation; but in the light of modern criticism it is not impossible to find a solution. In the "Nineteenth Century," April, 1894, Professor Cheyne stated—and the statement has the support of Kittel and Kuenen—that Isaac, Jacob, Israel, and Joseph are tribal names, the legends concerning which embody, to some extent, tribal reminiscences. If this is correct, and the names Jacob and Joseph, &c., apply not merely to individuals, but to tribes which may be scattered in various parts—as, for instance, are the Zulus of South Africa, and the Terebin Bedouin of Egypt and Syria—the difficulty created by their presence in two places at the same time is at once dispelled. The Scriptural history of the times of Joseph shows us that Israel was then cleaved into two distinct and antagonistic parties—Joseph, and the sons of Jacob—the two divisions that Tahutmes III found in Palestine. Again, it is not improbable that the migration into Egypt was but a partial one, and, as in the case of Abraham's departure from Haran, to which he afterwards had to send his son to choose a wife *of his own kin*, representatives of the race were left behind in Canaan. Indeed, the Scriptural narrative would lead us to believe that such were the case; for we know that the burial ground at Hebron continued to be used by the Egyptian Colony of Israel; and the Bible records that Jacob (and, according to Josephus, all his sons except Joseph) was buried there; which evidently implies that throughout this period Hebron continued in the hands of the descendants of Abraham, *i.e.*, of representatives of Joseph and of the sons of Jacob. Hence, whether or no we accept Professor Cheyne's statement, *the probability that there were settled in Canaan representatives of the tribes of Joseph and Jacob while Israel was in Egypt is well established.* In this connection, the records of Manetho and Cheremon, as transcribed by Josephus, are interesting. They show that the Egyptian Jews at the Exodus received assistance from their brethren in Canaan. Manetho says the army that came to their relief and occupied Pelusium (Sin or Avaris) consisted of 200,000 men, and Cheremon puts it at 380,000.

Though the numbers, in light of ancient records of the strength of armies in those days, appear hopelessly exaggerated, yet the record of this contingent to assist in securing the retreat of the Israelites from Egypt is remarkable, and possibly finds confirmation in the Bible, in the record of the assistance rendered to Moses by the Abrahamic people of Midian, and the Kenites, &c.

For further testimony in support of the date that chronology gives us for the Exodus, we must now look at the clay tablets of Tell Amarna, in which is to be found much information concerning the condition of the East about the time of the Exodus. These tablets or letters, to the number of 320, have, as is well known to the readers of the *Quarterly Statement*, been translated and published in a collected edition by Major Conder. They belong to the reigns of Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV (Khu-en-atn) (1414-1365 B.C. or 1397-1348 B.C.), i.e., from about 50 to 100 years after the Exodus. They describe the country of Syria as prey to internecine war. In the north the Amorites and Hittites were making war on Egypt's allies, the Phoenicians. In southern Palestine, in the reign of Amenhotep IV (Khu-en-atn), the garrisons which had been established in the hill-country of Judea in the reign of Tahutmes III—i.e., before the Exodus—were being withdrawn, and the strongholds left to defend themselves as best they could : and at the very moment the district was being invaded by a people, styled in the tablets Abiri (identified by Colonel Conder with the Hebrews), who appear to have been received by the inhabitants with welcome, and who possessed themselves of Jerusalem and the neighbouring strongholds, even invading the low country of Philistia where Egypt's chariots secured the supremacy of that power. At this time the Empire of the East was divided between the ruling powers of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, and Mitanni, which were amicably disposed towards each other, and seem to have paid but little attention to the quarrels and petty strife of their subject peoples. It was much as it is in Africa at the present day ; and though the whole continent is divided between the Great Powers, we take such little part in the government and maintenance of order, as hardly to take cognizance of the internal tribal warfare always going on.

The "Abiri" are mentioned as desert people—people of the "blood" or tribe of the Abiri, and of the land of the Abiri—showing, as Colonel Conder says, that the term is derived from Abarim, the mountains east of Jordan, whence the Israelites descended into the Promised Land. Amongst the letters are several from King Adonizedek of Jerusalem addressed to the suzerain power of Egypt. They detail how the Abiri are fighting against the walled towns left by the Egyptian armies in the hands of governors loyal to the Pharaohs. The invaders are described as "capturing the fortresses of the king. Not a single governor remains. . . ." Ajalon is destroyed. Lachish, Askelon, and Geser, are all taken ; and finally Jerusalem is abandoned to the invaders.

The parallel, between the account given in the clay-tablets and the operations of Joshua, is so striking that one cannot but conclude with

Colonel Conder that the Abiri are the Hebrews, and that the records of the cuneiform characters are another version from another point of view of the operations of the Israelites after crossing the Jordan.

Professor Sayce connects the Abiri with Hebron,¹ but inclines to the opinion that they were Amorites. The grounds upon which he bases his view are not very clear as far as the identification with the Amorites is concerned; but in the connection with Hebron he finds support in the names of places in that vicinity which were captured by them, such as Hareth and Tabu (*vide* pp. 123 and 150 of Major Conder's "Tell Amarna Tablets"); and if the Abiri really represent the Hebrews we can readily understand that they would naturally be connected with Hebron, although they had but lately come across Jordan, for Hebron was the site of their tribal burying-ground, at Hebron they possessed property, and, as we have already shown, doubtless many of the Israelites were already domiciled there—in fact, the connection of the Abiri of the fourteenth century B.C., with such a place of itself supplies a strong ground for their identification with the Hebrews. Although the description of the operations of Judah and Simeon in the first chapter of Judges closely accords with the notices of the Abiri given in the Tell Amarna Tablets, yet the history of the conquering of the Promised Land given in the books of Joshua bears a character distinct from the irregular operations of the Abiri. There is, however, one feature common to these two accounts. The action of both invasions seems to have aimed principally at obtaining possession of the walled towns. These as we know had been established after the Egyptian conquest, and in the operations of Joshua we see the occupation of the country developing as the towns are taken possession of—in contrast to the later operations of Israel against the Philistines, Hittites, and Amalekites, &c., when regular campaigns and pitched battles took the place of the siege and the assault.

As the proposed identification of Amenhotep II as the Pharaoh of the Exodus, and of Amenhotep IV as the Pharaoh during the time that the children of Israel were establishing themselves in the Holy Land, leaves an interval of 40 years between the reigns of these two Pharaohs, we must examine this period and see what it has to tell us of the time of the Wanderings in the desert. As during the time of Amenhotep II Egypt was undergoing a period of exhaustion, after the splendour and energy of the previous reign, so in the time of Amenhotep IV Egypt was in a state of open rebellion, which doubtless caused the withdrawal of the garrisons from Canaan, and gave the opportunity for Israel to get possession of its inheritance. In this interval of 40 years two kings reigned, Tahutmes IV and Amenhotep III, both of whom were active warriors. In the evidence of their activity we may see the policy of the 40 years' wandering, during which the Israelites had to satisfy them-

¹ Professor Sayce translates the name of this people as Khabiri; but the Kh appears to be a prefix which can be neglected at will, *vide* the identification of Khetam with Eham, of Yahukhaze with Jehoahaz, of Kheziqyahu with Hezekiah, of Khumri with Omri, &c., &c.

selves with the mountains of Idumea and the country beyond Jordan, districts which scarcely ever, as far as we know, felt the weight of the Egyptian arms.

Perusal of the early books of the Old Testament suggests an element in the Biblical account of the rise of the Israelites to a position of dominance in the Holy Land very difficult to explain, *i.e.*, the total absence of any reference to the part that Egypt played in the matter subsequent to the overthrow of Pharaoh in the Red Sea. Throughout the XVIII and XIX Dynasties, *i.e.*, from 1587–1180¹ B.C., we know that the armies of Egypt were constantly campaigning in Asia, and Syria was their advanced base of operations for the greater portion of the time. Expeditions were indeed made into the hill-country of Judea to establish the authority of Egypt in this part, and the results of these expeditions of Tahutmes III, 1470¹ B.C., Ramessu II, 1250¹ B.C., and Ramessu III, 1160¹ B.C., are recorded on the monuments of Egypt, triumph being claimed for the Egyptian arms. During the greater part of the XVIII Dynasty the dominance of Egypt in Syria is undoubted. The cities were occupied by Egyptian soldiers and the country regularly administered; but this occupation scarcely ever reached across the Jordan, and left Edom almost untouched. The Egyptian expeditions generally aimed farther afield than Palestine, and the route they followed was up the coast by the plain of Sharon to Kadesh of the Hittites; thus the hill-country of Judea, as long as it was not in the hands of an actively hostile people, was of little account. Although neither people mention the other in their records we find that by each is recorded struggles with the same nations. The enemies of the one nation are the enemies of the other: the Kheta of the one are the Hittites of the other; the Nairi are the people of Aram-Naharaim; the Shasu are the Amalekites and kindred peoples; the Pulista are the Philistines; the Amu are the Amorites. Although it is certain that both peoples had to do with Syria at the same time,²—one as the suzerain power, the other struggling for a foothold—we have no certain record that they came in contact. To whatever cause this circumstance is due it is impossible yet to satisfactorily determine; and although, as far as the Scriptures are concerned, the fact that they were compiled as late as the sixth century B.C., when Egypt had sunk to a period of insignificance amongst the nations, has been urged to account for this seeming omission, such reasoning cannot but be profoundly inconclusive.

A more satisfactory argument may be found to lie in the probability that the Egyptian arms were represented in Asia by contingents to tributary monarchs, except when great expeditions directed against their more formidable foes were required. Thus the struggling Hebrews, suffering periodic enslavements at the hands of the petty peoples that occupied with them the Land of Promise and its confines, were beneath the

¹ This date is only approximate.

² Even in the tenth century B.C. Solomon received as a dower with his Egyptian bride the Syrian city of Gezer within the borders of Philistia.

notice of the Pharaohs, and could safely be left for the local rulers to deal with. The Philistines, who were a kindred people to the Egyptians—as the cast of countenance shows (*vide* Petrie's "History of Egypt," chap. i)—acted as the outposts of Egypt across the Desert of Arabia Petraea; and in fighting them the Israelites were actually fighting Egypt, much as the Mahdi, in his struggles against Egyptian officialdom, has really been fighting the British Empire. As the power of Egypt decreased, the Philistines gradually got the worst of the struggle, so that, from David's time, they ceased to give the Hebrews any trouble. On the development of Israel into a powerful kingdom and on the overthrow of the Philistines, we find the Egyptians prompt to form an alliance with the House of David, as they did with the rival Hittite Power some two centuries or less earlier; and we read that the town of Gezer formed the dower of Pharaoh's daughter when she was given in marriage to Solomon. Gezer was, and always had been, in the heart of the Philistine country; and the fact that it was disposable by Egypt shows that the Philistine power was in some way subject to Egypt.¹ Similarly, in the power of Jabin, king of Hazor, and his chariots and horses, we may see the contingents of Egypt: although success attended the struggles of the Israelites at first against this king, it was followed by a long period of subjection under the forces of Sisera. This latter name has a great affinity to Egyptian nomenclature (possibly the name is SES-RA, servant of Ra, *vide* p. 6, "Tell Amarna"), and it is possible that in his force of 900 chariots of iron may be seen the contingent of the suzerain power.

On Egyptian monuments we first hear of the Philistines as a separate, nationality in the time of Ramessu III, about 100–150 years before Saul was made King of Israel, and this exemplifies another very curious and remarkable element in the books of the Old Testament. They are written for the people of the age when they were compiled, viz., about the sixth or seventh century B.C., and the local colouring is adapted so to appeal more readily to the people then living. Thus it is certain that if the Pulista existed as a distinct people in Philistia long before the invasion of Egypt in the time of Ramessu III, they would have been frequently mentioned on the monuments, since they occupied the ground on the threshold of Egypt's road into Asia. But in the troublous years that preceded Ramessu III's accession, when Egypt was passing through a period of civil war, the fortress-gate of Asia, whether seized upon by aliens or not, apparently started business on its own account, and from being the outpost of Egypt joined the invaders in endeavouring to spoil the Egyptians. The Pulista were thrown back with the others, but henceforth they appear as a separate people, although then probably as

¹ In Judges i, 19, we have a mention of a power in the plains (probably plains of Philistia), with chariots of iron, against which the Israelites could not stand. The presence of the chariots indicates the arms of the suzerain power, which, in the wars of Egypt of that age, played much the same part that Maxim guns do for us, when fighting against savages.

much part of the Egyptian Empire as Basutoland is part of the British Empire. Thus the references to the Philistines in Genesis are probably mere references to the people who, in the time of the Patriarchs, occupied that country which was occupied by the Philistines in the time of the Judges and Kings. Similarly the tenth chapter of Genesis is written from the horizon of the time of Ezekiel. This proleptical peculiarity is an element of great importance to the study of the Bible. It may thus have been—though this explanation does not satisfactorily explain all the circumstances of the omissions referred to—that the references to Egypt are coloured by the very inferior position occupied by that nation at the time that these books took their present form. Egypt was then the broken reed, the obsequious vassal of the Persian Empire; and it would have been little, to forward the nationalizing instincts of the compilers of the Bible, to have laid any stress upon the fact that a people so prostrate could ever have been the arbiters of the East, and under whose supreme authority the people of Israel maintained a position of subordinate humility. The dismissal of Egypt in the dramatic *denouement* at the Red Sea may thus have more to do with the contemporary purposes of the Jewish reformers than our modern historians would consider justifiable.

II.—By Lieut.-Colonel CONDER, D.C.L., R.E.

The discovery of a new text of Merenptah in Egypt casts new light on the relations of Israel and Egypt, and appears to discountenance Bunsen's theory that the Exodus occurred in the time of this king (Mineptah).

As given by Dr. Petrie ("Contemporary Review," May, 1896) the inscription, after recording the defeat of the Libyan invaders in the fifth year, continues:—

"Vanquished are the Tahennu (N. Africans); the Khita (Hittites) are quieted; ravaged is Pa Kanana (near Tyre) with all violence; taken is Askadni (perhaps for Ascalon); seized is Kazmel; Yenu of the Amu (perhaps Janohah) is made as though it had not existed; the people of Isiraa is spoiled; it hath no seed; Ruten (Syria) has become as widows of the land of Egypt; all lands together are in peace."

The allusion, as Dr. Petrie argues, is probably to Israel and not to Jezreel; and the text shows clearly that the people so ravaged were in Palestine, not in Egypt. Pa Kanana cannot properly be placed, as he suggests, at Deir Kanûn ("the monastery of Canons"), since that name is probably modern. It has long been identified with Kanah near Tyre. Kazmel may be connected with the ruin *Kasimiyeh*, north of Tyre, and the route followed in this raid was the old sea coast route of Thothmes III and Rameses II.

Dr. Petrie, who adheres to the view of Bunsen, and of Brugsch, which places the Exodus so late, seeks to explain this reference by supposing