

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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LIX.



LONDON:
(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1927

695TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7TH, 1927,

AT 4.30 P.M.

AVARY H. FORBES, ESQ., M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

As the Hon. Secretary was unable to be present, through illness, the Minutes of the previous Meeting were read by Dr. THIRTLE, and signed, and the following elections were announced:—As a Member: Dr. J. A. Fleming, F.R.S.; as an Associate: Patrick K. Irwin, Esq.; and as Library Associate: the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago.

The Rev. G. A. Frank Knight, D.D., was unable to be present to read his paper on "The Identification of the Pharaohs of the Pentateuch," and the CHAIRMAN kindly read it for him.

*THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE PHARAOHS OF THE
PENTATEUCH.*

By THE REV. G. A. FRANK KNIGHT, M.A., D.D., F.R.S.E.

CURIOSITY has always been strong in regard to the identification of those monarchs of Egypt who figure so prominently in connection with the early annals of the Hebrew race. The fact that merely their dynastic name—"Pharaoh" (= "The Great House")—is given in Scripture, opens the door to wide diversity of opinion, and conjectures as to the persons concealed under this vague title have been many. Yet the consensus of modern discovery has gradually been converging towards certain definite conclusions.

(i) *The Pharaoh of Abraham's time.*

The earliest Pharaoh mentioned in the Bible is the sovereign with whom Abraham came in contact (Gen. xii, 10 ff.). It is

now generally agreed that Abraham's descent into Egypt took place during the Hyksos regime. The Hyksos, who belonged to the great Semitic race, overflowed from Arabia in successive swarms, invaded Egypt while the Nile Valley was in the hands of the feeble monarchs of the XIVth Dynasty, and in countless hordes poured in and subjugated the whole land. Yet no sooner had they conquered the country than they were themselves overcome by the civilization which they temporarily displaced. For these nomads settled down in the land they had subdued, availed themselves of the resources of the arts and culture they had despised, adopted the language, learning, and religion of the subjugated population, and to a large extent became thorough Egyptians. They constitute what are known to history as the XVth and XVIth Dynasties.*

It was sometime during the XVth Dynasty that Abraham entered the Delta. The view once held, that he came down to Egypt during the XIIth Dynasty, when the powerful Amenemhats were on the throne, has now been entirely discarded. Equally impossible from a chronological point of view is the argument that Abraham came into Egypt during the XIXth, or towards the close of the XXth Dynasty. But various clues led us to relegate his entrance to about 2080 B.C., when the Hyksos had settled themselves in the land. The chief clue is his association with Amraphel, king of Shinar (Gen. xiv, 1), whom modern scholars, with practical unanimity, now identify with the famous Hammurabi of Babylon, the sixth king of the Ist Dynasty.† Hammurabi's era has been assigned by Kugler to 2123–2080 B.C., by Langdon to 2067–2024 B.C., and by others to dates slightly different. As the Biblical chronology gives 2090 B.C.‡ as the

* One of the latest discussions on the voluminous Hyksos question—whether the Hyksos were of Semitic or of non-Semitic affinities—will be found in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, i, pp. 310 ff. Various scholars have claimed them as Scythians, Mitanni, Hittites, Pelasgians, etc. It is now, however, generally agreed that they were of Semitic stock. (See Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*, p. 5; Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 41; Piltner, *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, xxxv (1913), p. 171.)

† This is now virtually conceded by most experts, though some still hold out. Peet says (*Egypt and the Old Testament*, p. 49): "There is a fairly general agreement that in Amraphel of Shinar we may recognize Khammurabi of the Ist Dynasty of Babylon." Similarly, Hall, in *Journ. of Egypt. Arch.*, ix (1923), p. 253.

‡ 965 B.C. (the date of the founding of Solomon's Temple) + 480 (1 Kings, vi, 1) + 430 (Exod. xii, 40) + 215 (Gen. xii, 4; xxv, 26; xlvii, 9) = 2090 B.C.

period when Abraham left Chaldæa, the date corresponds with the reign of Hammurabi.

It is impossible, however, with our present data, to identify the particular Hyksos king who welcomed Abraham on his arrival in Egypt. The annals of the Hyksos period are exceedingly dim, obscure, and fragmentary. We do not know where to draw the line between the XVth and XVIth Dynasties, nor can we with definiteness assign the various Pharaohs whose names we know to their proper chronological niche. Many names of Hyksos sovereigns have come down to us merely on solitary scarabs, their personalities otherwise being quite unknown. Manetho mentions the names of six of the XVth Dynasty, yet some of these almost certainly must be credited to the XVIth Dynasty. There are even two kings of Babylonian origin—Khenzer and Khandy—who seem to have sat on the throne of Egypt.* But whoever was the particular Pharaoh with whom Abraham had dealings, he was a Hyksos monarch who had, with his Court, become thoroughly Egyptianized. Abraham, as a great Semitic chief of kindred race, would be warmly welcomed by the Royal House of Egypt.

(ii) *The Pharaoh of Joseph's time.*

The XVIth Dynasty produced some great men. The mighty Khian looms up in the obscure annals of the time, and tokens of his widespread fame and influence are found as far apart as Knossos in Crete, Gezer in Palestine, Zenjirli and Bagdad in the Mesopotamian valley.† One of his successors, Aa-user-Ra Apepi II, must have exercised authority as far south as Gebelen in Upper Egypt, showing that by this time the Hyksos monarchs had so thoroughly consolidated their power that their rule extended far to the south of Thebes.‡

In all likelihood it was while one of these later Hyksos was on the throne that Joseph was sold into Egypt. A tradition, widely held in the Middle Ages,§ gave his name as Apapus, or

* Pieper, *Könige zwischen dem mittleren u. neuen Reich*, p. 32; Petrie, *Egypt and Israel*, p. 12.

† See R. Weill in *Journ. Asiatique*, X, Ser. ii, xvi, pp. 247, 507; xvii, p. 5.

‡ Daressy in *Rec. de Trav.*, xiv, p. 26.

§ George the Syncellos *Chronography* (ed. Dindorf, p. 201). Dionysius of Tell Marche (ed. Tullberg, 1850, p. 2).

Aphobis. His name on the monuments is Aa-kenen-Ra Apepi III, of the XVIth Dynasty. Such serious assaults have been made on the historicity of Joseph from many angles that it is noteworthy to observe that Driver has given it, on the other hand, as his conviction that "there was an actual person, Joseph, whose biography, during the time that it lived only in oral tradition, may have been embellished and made more dramatic in details but who underwent *substantially* the experiences recounted of him in Genesis."*

Many points in connection with the story of Joseph are full of interest. It is also remarkable that although again and again attempts have been made to question the accuracy of the Egyptian life as portrayed in the narrative, later investigation and modern discovery have invariably proved the minute fidelity of the account to the details of Nilotic custom.† For example, it has been alleged that the name "Potiphar" does not become common until the XXIIInd Dynasty, and that therefore the late date of the narrative is attested. But Lieblein has shown that names like "Potiphar," "Poti-pherah," "Asenath," "Zaphenath-Paneah," etc., indicate the Hyksos period, and not that of the much later dynasties.‡ He points out that "Potiphar" is a composite hybrid word, compounded from the Egyptian *Pt* and the Semitic *bar*, a name for Baal, and thus probably Potiphar was an Egyptianized Semite.§ Similarly, it has often been asserted that the celebrated Egyptian *Tale of the Two Brothers* is the original of the Biblical story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. But recently Gardiner has shown that Bata, the hero of the story, is a mythological personage, as the elder brother is clearly Anubis, and the incidents in the *Tale* are merely derived from an old mythological tradition.||

Certain clues link the time of Joseph with that of Apepi III. The seven years' famine seems to be referred to in a monument of the period. Beby, an official under Sequenen-Ra of Thebes, one of the kings of the XVIIth Dynasty, which was contemporaneous

* Driver in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, iii, p. 771, whose detailed account of the many Egyptianisms in the Biblical narrative is very copious.

† These may be studied in my book *Nile and Jordan*, pp. 107-19.

‡ Lieblein in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, xx (1898), p. 202.

§ Peet (*Egypt and the Old Testament*, p. 100) says that this is an "illusion which still lingers on in the minds of the uncritical." But was Lieblein "uncritical" ?

|| Gardiner in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, xxvii (1905), p. 185.

with the later portion of the Hyksos XVIth Dynasty, records on his tomb at El Kab in Upper Egypt: "I collected corn, as a friend of the harvest-god, and when a famine arose, *lasting many years*, I distributed corn to the city each year of famine."* Peet has tried to minimize the strength of this evidence on the score that famines were frequent in Egypt, and that we cannot therefore identify Beby's famine with that of Joseph. Yet it must be noted that, as a rule, famines in Egypt did not last longer than one season of low Nile. Here is the striking coincidence of Joseph's "seven-year famine," and Beby's "many years' famine." It is more logical to accept Kittel's verdict:† "We do not hesitate to admit that the coincidence of the time of the famine with the conjectural date of Joseph, together with the extraordinary infrequency of great famines in Egypt, seems to us to be of real weight in favour of the identifications of the two famines, and consequently in support of the history of Joseph generally."

Other indications as to the date of Joseph's Pharaoh are to be discerned in the commission given to Joseph by the king: *See, I have set thee over all the land of Egypt*, which could be strictly true only after the later Hyksos had established their rule as far as the borders of Nubia; in the account given of the transference of the land tenure from the aristocracy to the king (Gen. xlvii, 11), with the exception of the lands owned by the priesthood (Gen. xlvii, 22), a fact testified to by the monuments; and in the geographical references in the narrative. According to the Biblical chronology, the date of the descent into Egypt of Jacob and his family must be 1875 B.C., which is within the Hyksos era. But if this arrival had taken place during the XIIth Dynasty under the Amenemhats, or if it had occurred during the powerful XVIIIth Dynasty which succeeded the Hyksos, Jacob would have had to journey 600 miles up the Nile valley to Thebes before he could have met his son. The Scripture narrative, however, bears the evidence on its face that all the scenes described of the meeting of Joseph with his father, and the settlement of his kinsmen in the land, took place in the Delta, and that there the Pharaoh had his palace. This is in entire harmony with what we know of the Hyksos sovereigns as contrasted with those of the XIIth or the XVIIIth Dynasties.

* Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i, p. 304.

† Kittel, *Hist. of the Hebrews*, i, p. 190.

The Hyksos Pharaohs resided as a rule, not in Upper Egypt, but in Memphis, Bubastis, Avaris, and Tanis.

While, therefore, it would be rash to assert with absolute certainty that the Pharaoh of Joseph's time was Apepi III, there are very strong grounds for the identification, and practically nothing against the theory. Certainly Joseph's Pharaoh was one of the later kings of the XVIth (Hyksos) Dynasty.

(iii) and (iv) *The Pharaohs of the Oppression.*

During the Hyksos regime there were frequent attempts on the part of the native Egyptians to free their land from the hated foreigners. The Theban princes were continually heading revolts, and were as systematically crushed. Nevertheless, they managed to maintain a semblance of power which, according to Manetho, lasted 151 years, during which time 43 Theban "kings" ruled, and constituted the so-called XVIIth Dynasty (1731-1580 B.C.). But the majority of them were subject to the contemporary Hyksos sovereign, and their authority must have been nominal. War at last, however, broke out, and lasted for many years. It was continued by king after king of the Theban line until, after an heroic struggle, Aahmes I finally succeeded in driving out the Hyksos from the soil of Egypt and established the famous XVIIIth Dynasty.

Throughout the whole of Egypt there was now a call for architects, builders, and sculptors. Centuries of neglect of all temples, except those devoted to Semitic deities, had brought the public edifices of the land into a pitiable condition. But now the dilapidated temples of Amen at Thebes, and of Ptah at Memphis, rose again from the ground, while the royal quarries at Tura supplied the whitest limestone for the cutting of delicate inscriptions and exquisite bas-reliefs. A people whom the monuments style the "Fenkhu" were set to quarry the stones for all this building activity, and to act as serfs in the brickfields. These were not so much "Phœnicians" as Asiatic or Canaanite prisoners in general.* They constituted the remaining portion of the non-combatant Hyksos who had not been expelled from Egypt, and among them we must reckon the children of Israel who had been settled by Joseph in Goshen. Of kindred race with the Hyksos, the Israelites had enjoyed prosperity under the

* Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 208.

Dynasty that had now expired. Some of them had even married into the Royal family (1 Chron. iv, 18). But, with the re-establishment of the native Egyptian rule, the lot of the Hebrews had changed indeed. It has become increasingly clear that it was under the XVIIIth and not under the XIXth Dynasty that the Oppression began. Had the Israelites entered Egypt while the powerful anti-Semitic XVIIIth Dynasty was in power, how could their reception have been as cordial and pleasant as we read it was? The remembrance of the indignities they had endured under the Hyksos was too recent and sore for any gracious welcome to be accorded by the Egyptians to a new influx of Semites from Canaan. Equally impossible is it to believe that throughout the whole of the XVIIIth Dynasty—lasting 258 years—no attempt was made by the triumphant Egyptians to tyrannize over the remnant of the “shepherds,” and that only when the XIXth Dynasty arose did the Oppression break out. There is every reason to believe, and contributory evidence from the monuments to prove, that the change for the worse in the lot of the Semitic dwellers in Goshen began as soon as the vast majority of their Hyksos tribesmen had been driven out of Egypt by Aahmes I. On their heads descended the wrath and vengeance of the victorious Egyptians when the new Dynasty was inaugurated. This is the true meaning of the phrase, *There arose a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph* (Exod. i, 8). It refers to the advent of an entirely new Dynasty, whose whole policy was in direct opposition to what had previously obtained under the Hyksos regime which had favoured the Hebrews.

Aahmes I was succeeded by his son Amenhotep I (1559–1539 B.C.), and he by his son Thothmes I (1539–1514 B.C.). He was the first of the great Egyptian military conquerors. He blazed a track through Syria as far as the Euphrates, and swept off to Egypt an enormous loot of gold. His son and successor Thothmes II (1514–1500 B.C.) was completely overshadowed by the personality of his strong-minded half-sister, Hatshepset, who was the real ruler of Egypt. She was one of the most remarkable sovereigns the world has ever seen, for her splendid organizing power, her commercial enterprise, her building exploits, her famous expeditions, have made her name illustrious. But the main fact which renders the personality of this queen of engrossing interest is that there are urgent reasons for identifying her with *the daughter of Pharaoh* who preserved the life of the infant Moses. According to the Biblical chronology Moses was

born 1525 B.C.,* precisely the time when Hatshepset was a princess, the favourite *daughter of the Pharaoh*, Thothmes I. The policy of repression initiated by Aahmes I, the founder of the new Dynasty, had been continued by Amenhotep I, but it would seem that it was Thothmes I who was the author of the inhuman command, *every son that is born ye shall cast into the river* (Exod. i, 22). And possibly Hatshepset would have followed the same cruel policy had not her womanly instincts been roused at the sight of the infant's pathetic situation. It should be noted that the Bible does not describe her as "Queen." She did not begin to reign till 1514 B.C., and, as we have seen, Moses was born in 1525 B.C. Had she been spoken of as "Queen," the discrepancy would have been manifest. But she is referred to merely as the *daughter of Pharaoh*. Nevertheless, as the favourite daughter, and latterly the co-regent of her father Thothmes I, this remarkable princess, even at an early age, wielded very considerable authority, and it was therefore appropriate that she should be able to defy the Royal order, and in the face of the law carry out her own scheme of saving Moses alive.†

While these facts fit in admirably with the events of the XVIIIth Dynasty, it is hard to reconcile them with the state of matters under the XIXth Dynasty, as is so often attempted. The main argument used in support of the theory that the Oppression took place under Rameses II of the XIXth Dynasty is the statement that the *Hebrews built for Pharaoh store cities, Pithom and Raamses* (Exod. i, 11). The reasoning is fallacious and inconclusive. Apart from the fact that the true reading (as Lagarde has pointed out)‡ is probably "Pithom of Raamses," an explanatory addition made later to identify the site (as in Gen. xlvii, 11), there is this to be remembered, that modern excavation has revealed that Pithom was a site which had been occupied since at least the VIth Dynasty. Any "building" must merely have been re-building on a foundation already hoary with age. Peet, indeed, has clearly stated that the verse proves nothing, for the names mentioned are those of a date long subsequent to the actual

* Obtained from these dates: To 965 B.C. (founding of Temple) add 480 (1 Kings vi, 1) = 1445 B.C. as date of the Exodus; but Moses was then eighty (Exod. vii, 7), so that his birth-year was $1445 + 80 = 1525$.

† It is significant also that Josephus gives this princess the name of Thermuthis, which may well be a corruption for Tahutimes, or Thothmes, the family name of the XVIIIth Dynasty.

‡ On this see Jack, *The Date of the Exodus* (1925), p. 23.

time of the original building.* Similarly Hall says: "The name Rameses, as that of a store-city, may have been conferred by a scribe writing long after the Mosaic period."† No stress, then, can be laid on these titles, seeing that there is so much evidence to prove that Rameses II could not have been the Pharaoh of the Oppression.

The death of Hatshepset was followed by the long and strenuous reign of Thothmes III (1515-1461 B.C.). He avenged himself on his predecessor by chiselling out her name from all inscriptions which he could erase. Then he embarked on that vast systematic plundering of Palestine and Syria which has earned for him the fame of being one of the world's greatest military conquerors. Though Thothmes I was the one who gave the order for the extermination of the male Hebrews,‡ it was Thothmes III who was *par excellence* the "Pharaoh of the Oppression." In this connection a very interesting point emerges.

At the close of the thirty-first year of his reign, Thothmes III, on returning from one of his Palestinian campaigns, found an embassy of Nubians coming to him with lavish tribute-gifts. Early in his reign he had subdued Nubia, as many memorials recently explored testify. But in the thirty-first year the Ethiopians had again broken loose and had been re-conquered. The question is—by whom? If Thothmes III began to reign in 1515 B.C., his thirty-first year would coincide with 1485 B.C. But we have already seen that the Bible chronology gives 1525 B.C. as the date of Moses' birth. Consequently Moses would be forty years of age at precisely this same date, 1485 B.C. Now, as we are told that Moses was brought up as the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter, and as that princess was in all likelihood Hatshepset, the art of war was certainly one of the accomplishments he would be taught. Stephen declared that *Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and in deeds* (Acts vii, 22), clearly referring to events in his career prior to his flight to Midian. What were these exploits? If we turn to Josephus§ we find reference to an invasion of Lower Egypt by the Ethiopians. The country was in terror when Moses came to

* Peet, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

† H. R. Hall, *Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 403.

‡ The Pharaoh of Exod. i, 8-ii, 10, is Thothmes I; the Pharaoh of Exod. ii, 11-ii, 23, is Thothmes III. This distinction is often overlooked.

§ *Antiq.*, ii. 10, 1.

the rescue. As head of the Egyptian troops he marched southwards until he reached Saba or Meroe, the capital of Nubia, and began the siege. Tharbis, the daughter of the Nubian king, offered to deliver up the city if Moses would promise to marry her. The bargain was accepted. Meroe was captured, and Moses wedded the Ethiopian princess.

Now, putting aside the later legendary accretions to this story, may there not remain some substratum of fact? We have (1) the statement of Stephen as to Moses' exploits while still attached to Pharaoh's Court; (2) the fact that later *Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married* (Num. xii, 1); and (3) the remarkable way in which the respective dates tally, the year 1485 B.C., as shown, by two entirely independent lines of calculation, being alike that of the thirty-first year of Thothmes III's reign, wherein a successful expedition against Nubia (but not by the Pharaoh himself) is recorded, and also that wherein Moses attained his fortieth year. Surely it would be a most natural thing when *Moses was then grown up, and forty years old*, and was flushed with the renown of a great victory, that he made the rash and premature attempt to figure as the deliverer of his enslaved compatriots. Thothmes III resented this proposed reversal of his settled policy of repression, and Moses had to flee to Midian, where he remained in seclusion for other forty years till Thothmes III was dead.

A large number of inscriptions in the Nile valley represent the slavery into which Thothmes III reduced his captives. They are an exact reproduction in stone and wall-painting of what we read in Exodus of the cruelty of the taskmasters. The labourers who thus toil have Semitic countenances, and doubtless represent the hapless Hebrews and their fellow-captives from Canaan. But at last *it came to pass in the course of these many days, that the king of Egypt died* (Exod. ii, 23). The expression is remarkable, and draws our attention to the fact that the greatest of Egyptian conquerors was the greatest oppressor of the Israelites, and also the longest lived of Egypt's kings. He had been co-regent with Hatshepset for twenty-one years, and sole monarch for fifty-three years; in all he had sat on the throne for seventy-four years. He was the embodiment of absolute power, tyrannical might, and brute force. He was the most despotic sovereign Egypt ever had, and to him belongs most appropriately the title of the "Pharaoh of the Oppression!"

(v) *The Pharaoh of the Exodus.*

The Pharaoh of the Exodus was Amenhotep II, who succeeded his father on the throne, and reigned from 1461-1436 B.C. His innate cruelty was revealed in the inhuman way in which he treated his Palestinian captives, as he returned from Canaan after an expedition in the beginning of his reign. He continued his father's ruthlessly oppressive measures, and ever more bitter grew the lot of the enslaved Hebrews. It was not, however, till the fifteenth or sixteenth year of his rule that Moses and Aaron appeared at his Court. This was when Moses was eighty years of age (Exod. vii, 7), in 1445 B.C., according to the Biblical chronology, which is wonderfully supported by other facts.

It has often been pointed out that each of the Ten Plagues was directed against some particular form of Egyptian superstition and idolatrous worship. It is not possible within the limits of this paper to elaborate this point. But two striking facts may be mentioned. The Fifth Plague—that of the murrain of beasts—smote Amenhotep II in a very special and tender spot. No monarch showed such a fanatical attachment to sacred oxen and cow deities as he. In 1906 Naville discovered at Deir-el-Bahari the famous statue of a gigantic Hathor cow, with Amenhotep II kneeling naked under the cow's belly, imbibing the divine milk, and thereby becoming adopted as her son.* Tremendous, therefore, must have been the blow inflicted on the king when these sacred cows, typified in the statue adored by Amenhotep II himself, fell victims to the ravages of the Fifth Plague.

The other fact has reference to the Tenth Plague—the slaying of the firstborn. The mention of the death of *the firstborn of Pharaoh that sat on the throne* (Exod. xii, 29) leads us to enquire if Egyptian records afford any confirmation of this extraordinary and tremendous tragedy. The evidence is not altogether wanting. Thothmes IV, the son and successor of Amenhotep II, records on an immense granite slab that one day, hunting gazelle in the desert, he was tired, and lay down to sleep under the shadow of the Sphinx. The god spoke to him in his sleep, promised him the kingdom, and ordered him to clear away the sand from his (the god's) feet. It is evident from Thothmes IV's narrative that he had no expectation of being king. He was the son of

* See Maspero, *New Light on Ancient Egypt*, p. 272 f.

Amenhotep II, but not by a woman of royal rank. His elder brother, the offspring of a union with a royal princess, was the legal and destined heir to the throne. Why did that legitimate crown prince not succeed? Simply because, as *the firstborn of Pharaoh that sat on the throne* he perished in the Tenth Plague. It is a most interesting side-link, identifying Amenhotep II as the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

As the mummy of Amenhotep II was discovered in 1898 in the Tombs of the Kings at Thebes, it is clear that he was not drowned along with his troops in the Red Sea. But the Bible is careful to avoid stating that Pharaoh himself met that fate. Moses sang of "*Pharaoh's chariots*," "*his host*," "*his chosen captains*," as being sunk in the Red Sea, but never of Pharaoh himself (Exod. xv, 4).

There is still another link in the chain of evidence connecting Amenhotep II with the Exodus, in that Manetho* associates the expulsion of the "lepers" (by which phrase we must understand the Hebrews) with a King Amenhotep who had at his Court an adviser bearing the same name. This can be none other than the celebrated Amenhotep, son of Hap, one of the most distinguished ornaments of the middle of the XVIIIth Dynasty. He must have been in his prime during the reign of Amenhotep II, for he was an old man in the time of Amenhotep III. It is noteworthy also that Chaeremon† associates a certain King Amenhotep with the Exodus, and Theophilus of Antioch‡ (A.D. 180) echoed the ancient tradition that Thothmes III was the great oppressor of the Hebrews.

The date of the Exodus—1445 B.C.—is checked in Scripture by four different methods of calculation: (1) It is said to have taken place when Moses was eighty years of age (Exod. vii, 7); and as we have seen that Moses was born in 1525 B.C., it follows that eighty years later we are brought to 1445 B.C. (2) It is said to have occurred 430 years after the Descent into Egypt (Exod. xii, 40, 41). As this Descent of Jacob and his family took place in 1875 B.C., we find that by subtracting 430 years from that date, we are again brought to 1445 B.C. (3) St. Paul stated (Gal. iii, 17) that the Law was given to Israel 430 years after the covenanted Promise at the time of the Descent (Gen. xlvi, 3), so again we

* Josephus, *c. Apion*, i, 26.

† *Ib.*, i, 32.

‡ Theophilus, *ad Autolyicum*, iii, 20.

are brought to 1445 B.C. (4) It is said to have taken place 480 years before the founding of Solomon's Temple (1 Kings vi, 1).* It is not a little remarkable that all these lines of calculation meet in the same year, and that the date should fall in the lifetime of Amenhotep II.

Amenhotep II was succeeded by his son Thothmes IV (1436-1427 B.C.). He ravaged Palestine and forced the Syrian chieftains to resume their annual tribute. All this time, however, the Hebrews were safe from molestation, lost to view during their forty years wandering in Sinai. Under the next reign, that of Amenhotep III (1427-1392 B.C.), Egypt attained the summit of worldly glory. The XVIIIth Dynasty reached its climax of culture and civilization while this magnificent monarch occupied the throne. But one thing connected with his reign goes to strengthen the belief that the Exodus had already taken place. A remarkably fine scarab† records a hunting expedition undertaken by Amenhotep III in the land of Goshen, where the king found the country swarming with roaming wild cattle, 141 of which he slew. This hunt took place on the very spot where the Hebrews had been most thickly planted. How could there have been these roving herds of savage wild cattle in the midst of a dense population of men, women and children occupied in the arts of civil life? This episode is but another proof, therefore, that the Exodus took place earlier than Amenhotep III, and that, since the Exodus, Goshen, cleared of its former inhabitants, had been left deserted, a wilderness given over to wild beasts.

Everyone knows how, under his successor, Amenhotep IV, a religious revolution took place. The "heretic" king broke away from the religion of his fathers, and set up a new faith. In the Royal Library at Tel-el-Amarna, the city which he built, the cuneiform tablets which have been dug up describe the anguish and terror of the Palestinian peoples at the invasion of Canaan by a race styled the Khabiri. The controversy which has raged so long over the identity of these people may now be said to be settled. Practically all authorities are agreed that they represent the Hebrews, in the broad sense of the word,

* These dates and year measurements are scouted at by Burney's *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, p. 90, and those who hold to the Merenptah theory. But see Luckenbill in *American Journal of Theology*, xxii (1918), p. 39. The same date (1445 B.C.) has been arrived at by Jack, *The Date of the Exodus* (1925), by other lines of evidence which are clearly marshalled.

† Willoughby Fraser in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, xii (1899), p. 155.

including not only the Israelites, but other members of the same wide Semitic group.*

The date fits with absolute precision. As the Exodus took place in 1445 B.C., the interval of forty years in the Wilderness brings us to 1405 B.C. as the year in which the Hebrews crossed the Jordan and invaded Canaan. It took seven years to achieve the conquest. This is proved from the data of Caleb's life. Caleb was forty when he went out as a spy from Kadesh-Barnea (Joshua xiv, 7): the spies were despatched two years after the Exodus, *i.e.* in 1443 B.C. But forty-five years later Caleb captured Hebron (Joshua xvi, 10), so that the date of the seizure of Hebron was 1398 B.C. (*i.e.* 1443 B.C. — 45 = 1398 B.C.). This is precisely the period of the Amarna Letters, which tell of the confusion in Canaan in the end of the reign of Amenhotep III and in the beginning of the reign of Amenhotep IV. The two records dovetail into each other.† The Book of Joshua describes the onward rush of the Hebrews, as city after city fell into their hands. The Amarna Letters tell of the terror in all the land as the Khabiri sweep all before them. The correspondence is so close that it is not surprising that the majority of modern scholars recognize the identity of the two peoples.

Still more. Excavation in Palestine has revealed traces of the invasion. Bliss‡ found at Lachish a vast mass of ashes in which were embedded scarabs of the Khabiri period, showing that the city was burned at this era, as the Scriptures state (Joshua x, 32). At Beth Shemesh, Mackenzie§ found numerous XVIIIth-Dynasty Egyptian relics, and on the top of them a deposit of ashes and burned debris from ruined houses. The conflagration was the work of the victorious Hebrews. It is the same at Taanach, Gezer and elsewhere. In every case exploration shows XVIIIth-Dynasty tokens of civilization superimposed by a layer of ashes. At Jericho we find, indeed, an overwhelming proof that the Exodus did not take place under the XIXth Dynasty.|| The deposits of pottery reveal a clear line of demarca-

* The latest and fullest discussion of the identity of the Khabiri is by Jack, *The Date of the Exodus*, pp. 119-98. He urges the identity with such copious logic that it is difficult to rebut such a mass of evidence.

† For full details of this, see my *Nile and Jordan*, pp. 216-22.

‡ Bliss, *A Mound of Many Cities*, pp. 55, 184.

§ Mackenzie, *Excavations at Ain Shems*, and *P.E.F.Q.S.*, 1912, p. 171.

|| Sellin in *Mittheil. d. Deutsch. Orient. Ges.*, Nos. 39, 41, and Sellin u. Watzinger, *Jericho, Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen*, 1913.

tion between the civic life of the town in the days of Canaanite rule, and the restoration under Ahab in the 9th century B.C. There is an immense hiatus between the fall of Jericho under Joshua and the refounding of the city under Hiel (1 Kings xvi, 34). By the time of Merenptah* (the oft-styled "Pharaoh of the Exodus") Jericho had been in ruins for 147 years, as the archaeological evidence clearly shows. If, then, it be maintained that the Exodus happened under Merenptah, the story of the fall of Jericho's walls will have to be abandoned, as by that time there were no longer any walls to fall! But all is consistent if we equate the Exodus with the reign of Amenhotep II.

Still further evidence reaches us as to the identity of the Pharaoh of the Exodus from the early years of the XIXth Dynasty. Seti I records that among the peoples whom he ravaged in Palestine was the tribe of Asher, north of Mount Carmel.† Such chastisement is referred to in Judges ii, 13, 14. How could Seti have mentioned Asher if the Israelites were still in Egypt, until the reign of Seti's grandson, Merenptah?

It has been asserted by some that the fact that Rameses II, Seti's son, ravaged Palestine, and left monuments of his presence at Beisan and other spots, proves that the Israelites were not yet settled in the land. But the reasoning is fallacious. Not only does the Book of Judges witness to constant invasions of *spoilers that spoiled them*, and of their being *sold into the hands of their enemies*, so that they could not any longer stand before their enemies, but it is expressly stated that Beisan was not in the possession of the Israelites till it was captured by David (1 Sam. xxxi, 10).

The crowning proof of all is the famous stele of Merenptah, Rameses II's son, in which he glories that "the Hittites are pacified: Canaan is seized upon with calamity of every kind: Ascalon is carried away: Gezer is captured: Israel is wasted: he hath no seed: Palestine is become as a widow before Egypt." That this refers to Israel settled in Canaan has been much debated. There are four possible alternatives:—

(1) It is claimed by some that the Hebrews were oppressed by Rameses II, and that at his death, when his son Merenptah succeeded, Moses led them forth. But how could Merenptah say that he had ravaged and desolated Israel in Canaan, when this conquest of Canaan took place in the *third* year of Merenptah's reign? Where is there room for the wandering for forty years

* Otherwise Menephtah, as on p. 114 *seq.*

† W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 236.

in Sinai? If Merenptah be the "Pharaoh of the Exodus," then we must abandon the whole story of the wilderness journeyings.

(2) The second alternative is that the Hebrews had not yet gone down from Canaan into Egypt, or begun their years of bondage there, and therefore it was possible for Merenptah to describe them as dwelling in Palestine still. This is Eerdman's theory: * but it is chronologically impossible. Not to speak of the absurdity of putting the descent into Egypt of Jacob and his family as late as the years subsequent to Merenptah's ravaging of them in Canaan, it means that we must find room for all the sojourn in Egypt, the wilderness wandering, the conquest of Canaan, and the period of the Judges, within a space of about sixty years! † The theory breaks down utterly.

(3) The third alternative finds most favour among scholars. It is that only part of Israel descended into Egypt with Jacob; that part remained behind in Canaan; and that it was this remnant "Israel" whom Merenptah attacked, while their compatriots were still in the Sinai desert, having emerged from Egypt on the death of Rameses II. Yet no two critics agree as to details. Burney ‡ regards the tribes of Asher, Gad, Dan, and Naphtali as four inferior tribes who entered Canaan as the "Khabiri," centuries before the mass of the "Israelites" under Joshua. They were idolaters, and worshipped Jehovah under the form of a calf. But Moses revealed to the other "Joseph" tribes, the "Goshen" tribes, the true name and nature of Jehovah. Hence, when the "Goshen" tribes conquered Palestine they found their brethren already there living as semi-pagans, and they had to contend with them as well as with the Canaanites! Equally remote from the Bible narrative are the theories of Petrie, § Spiegelberg, || Maspero, ¶ and Prásek, ** who all in varying phases maintain that some tribes never entered Egypt at all. Yet what of the statements that Dan was in the wilderness? (Exod. xxxi, 6; xxxv, 34: xxxviii, 23; Lev. xxiv, 10; Num. i, 12, 38: ii, 25, etc.) What of the many references to the *twelve* tribes in the Sinai desert? (Exod. xxiv, 4, and many others.)

* Eerdman's *Alttestamentliche Studien*, ii (1908), 67.

† *i.e.* from Rameses XII (1115-1088 B.C.) to Saul in 1050 B.C.

‡ Burney's *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, pp. 36, 84.

§ Petrie, *Egypt and Israel*, p. 35.

|| Spiegelberg in *Orient. Litt. Zeit.*, xi, 403.

¶ Maspero, *Struggle of the Nations*, p. 444.

** *Expos. Times*, xi (1900), p. 507.

How is it that when the Hebrews reached Canaan they met with none but enemies, who were all by Divine command to be exterminated? This could not have been the case had the dwellers there been of the same family, for then these compatriots of theirs ought to have received the incomers as friends and allies, yet the record is that the people of Canaan were so vile that the land vomiteth out her inhabitants (Lev. xviii, 25, 27).

(4) As these three alternatives, therefore, present extraordinary difficulties, and involve violations of the Biblical narrative and a drastic recasting of Scripture chronology, most modern Egyptologists have been compelled to discard the untenable theory that the Exodus took place under the XIXth Dynasty. Scholars such as Fries, Breasted, Max Müller, Böhl, Obbink, Hommel, Lieblein, Hall, Luckenbill, Daressy, Peet, and many others have been forced to acknowledge that the evidence is strong for the XVIIIth Dynasty, and an increasing number give the Pharaoh of the Exodus as Amenhotep II.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to thank Dr. Knight for his very interesting paper, in which he seems to me to have proved his points clearly. The subject is essentially one for Egyptologists and experts, and few of us can aspire to that rôle. What interests me most about Egypt is the wonderful way its history has borne out the predictions of Ezekiel. When Egypt was at the height of her greatness and power, and while the prophet could not (as we can) look back to history for numerous precedents of the fall of great and powerful kingdoms, he foretold that Egypt would not only fall, but be *a base nation*. "The land of Egypt shall be desolate and waste . . . they shall be there a base kingdom. It shall be the basest of the kingdoms" (Ezek. xxix, 9, 14, 15). When Ezekiel wrote, nothing was to be seen of Egypt but her greatness. Her antiquity, her dynasties, her kings, her monuments, her cities, her conquests, her wealth, her trade, her commerce and her manufactures—all proclaimed her greatness. Yet what followed? In 525 B.C. (about sixty years after Ezekiel's time) Egypt was conquered by Cambyses the Persian. In 331 B.C. she was subdued by Alexander the Great, and for 300 years was ruled by his nominees, the Ptolemies.

In 30 B.C. Egypt was annexed by the Romans, and after the fall of Rome (in A.D. 476) she had to yield obedience to the Eastern Empire. How far she suffered from the scimitars of Genseric and the Vandals, or the sword of Belisarius, it is not easy to say. But in A.D. 641, she had to yield to the Saracens for 600 years. In A.D. 1250 the Mamelukes—Turkish and Circassian *slaves*—usurped the government. In 1517 the Turks conquered Egypt; but the Mamelukes still ruled the country until their destruction by Mehemet Ali in 1805. Mehemet Ali—an upstart, but endowed with considerable genius—rebelled against the Sultan, and defeated the Turks in a great battle. He aspired to be an “Egyptian Mussolini,” and to revive the ancient greatness of his country. France believed in him, but he came to grief and died insane in 1849. Later on, Arabi Pasha tried the same rôle, but he failed likewise.

After the Great War, Egypt was freed from Turkey, and in 1922 was declared an independent kingdom, while her defence is in the hands of a British garrison. Whether there are any materials amongst the Egyptians for self-government is very doubtful; but could anything prove more clearly the truth of Ezekiel’s prophecy than the history of the country?

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: I am glad to notice that, unlike the lecturer of January 17th, Dr. Knight shows (on p. 100) that Jacob and his family went into Egypt at the time when the Hyksos, or, as they are sometimes called—and, I think, with a measure of truth—the Shepherd Kings were ruling. This seems to explain why Joseph warned his father to be sure and tell Pharaoh that “their trade had been about cattle” (Gen. xlv, 34). Because, as “every shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians,” they would then get all the help and protection they needed from this so-called shepherd king, who also appears to have belonged to a race similar to the Hebrews.

I cannot, however, think that the legend referred to on p. 105 has anything whatever to do with the complaint of Miriam and Aaron against Moses “because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married; for he had married an Ethiopian woman” (Num. xii, 1), for the following reasons: First, if he had married an Ethiopian woman when in Egypt, what became of her when he fled to Midian? Did he take her with him? Is it likely that Jethro would have given his daughter Zipporah in marriage to a man who had a wife already? or,

secondly, did he leave her behind in Egypt, and withhold from Jethro the fact that he was a married man? No, the natural assumption is that Zipporah was dead at the time of the complaint, and that the marriage of Moses to the Ethiopian woman was a more recent occurrence.

On p. 106, Dr. Knight calls attention to a very interesting confirmation of the fact that each of the ten plagues was directed against some specific object of worship in Egypt, by his reference to the statue of Amenhotep II kneeling naked under the cow's belly imbibing its "divine" milk! I myself, when in Egypt last spring, saw at Sakkara, a tomb cut in the rock containing six enormous sarcophagi placed in position with extraordinary mathematical precision, each cut out of a solid block of granite, all highly polished, in which had been placed the dead bodies of the sacred cows!

Dr. H. C. MORTON regretted very much that Dr. Frank Knight was not present in person. His monumental work, *Nile and Jordan*, had been constantly in his hands since its issue, and he was much looking forward to seeing Dr. Knight himself. With the general drift of the lecture he entirely concurred, but some dates given by Dr. Knight he believed to be erroneous. For example, the Exodus is put at 1445 B.C. But this calculation is based on 1 Kings vi, 1, which says that from the Exodus to the fourth year of Solomon was 480 years. The Bible, in reality, gives 594 years, and the prophet historian in 1 Kings omits all years which were not years of God's government. This makes a difference of 114 years. Or again, the sojourning of the Children of Israel (Exod. xii) is calculated from the entry of Joseph into Egypt. Surely, however, the sojourning should be estimated from the departure of Abram from Ur, and that again makes a great difference in the chronology. But the chronology of Egyptian dynasties is utterly uncertain, and 1612 B.C., the Bible Exodus date, may quite well be the date of Amenophis II.

Dr. Knight seems securely to establish Amenophis II as the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Manetho's words, to the effect that in the fifth year of Menephtah, a tribe of foreigners in Egypt was exterminated, do not seem capable of application to the Exodus of Israel. Moreover, when one asks what is the further ground upon which the Menephtah identification rests, it is the theory that one great drive from the East accounts for the establishment of the Kassite Dynasty

in Babylon, a Babylonian movement into Syria and Arabia, and the Arabian, or Hyksos, movement into Egypt. Thus, it is urged, as Abraham was contemporary with Hammurabi, who was of the 1st Babylonian Dynasty, he could not have been contemporary with the Hyksos, who were contemporary with the 2nd or Kassite Babylonian Dynasty. But of this mighty drive eastward—Central Asia to Babylon, Babylon to Arabia, and Arabia to Egypt, at one and the same period—there is need of very much more proof.

What seems to lend very great probability to the Amenophis II identification is that everything regarding the "heretic king" Khuenaten (Akhnaton) fits in so remarkably with an Exodus dated just about forty years earlier. The religious monotheistic revolution carried out by Khuenaten, and also his extraordinary refusal to take any steps whatever to oppose the occupation of Palestine by the Khabiri (the Hebrews) are explained if the Exodus was an event of the immediate past. He, and Egypt as a whole, would have vivid memories of the Ten Plagues and of the Red Sea—blow after smashing blow against Egypt and her gods—and would be slow to try conclusions once again. Moreover, Khuenaten would recognize in the Israelites his only monotheistic allies in all the world, from whom, in all probability, he himself learned that God is One and God is Love, and refused to fight against them.

When everything fits in so strikingly, there is need of much more than a seemingly irrelevant sentence of Manetho to hamper the argument of Dr. Knight.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS, after saying that, although it needed an engineer to make a good road, a waggoner knew a good road when it was made—as a justification for attempting to decide between men more learned than himself in the subject—expressed his belief that Dr. Morton was wrong and the lecturer right in the date he alleged for the Exodus, which agreed within a year with that given by Professor Peet in his *Egypt and the Old Testament* (1922), working on the so-called Higher Critical premises. He quoted Professor Peet's statement in his book (p. 64) that "tradition" (his name for the Old Testament) was often incorrect in detail, that its chronology was generally poor, that it telescoped and duplicated, and that its geography was rarely consistent; and pointed out that the Professor went on to admit that "in most cases in which

archæology has permitted a test, the central facts of tradition have been found to contain some kernel of truth." Seeing that, on all but these central facts, the Higher Critical theories could not be tested, the admission proved that the Old Testament narratives stood their ground.

He did not agree with Mr. Collett's suggestion that Moses married an Ethiopian woman during the wilderness journey after Zipporah's death, for he thought Aaron and Miriam's criticism of their brother would have been just, if Mr. Collett was right; whereas it was condemned as unjust because the marriage took place when Moses was excommunicated by his brethren, and could not, therefore, marry an Israelite. He expressed his desire that those who read papers like the present would not content themselves with merely stating their agreement with Scripture, but would proceed to criticize the so-called Higher Critics, for he did not consider it sufficient to denounce their theories: they should be proved in detail to be unsound.

Sir CHARLES MARSTON said that the conclusions of the so-called Higher Criticism of the Bible assumed that humanity possessed a fairly complete knowledge of Nature's Laws, of Ancient History, and of Ancient Languages. As this premise was obviously unsound, it followed that modern conclusions were at best tentative in their character. He complained that many were more eager to establish Theories than to ascertain the Truth. He thought that human ignorance was still too great to pronounce definitely against matters connected with Holy Scripture. Tradition was still a far sounder authority than theory. If we compared the "assured" results of Higher Criticism with those of a generation ago, the obvious absurdity of some of the latter should make us very cautious regarding those of more recent date. Unsound foundations had caused many a construction to collapse, and the higher one built on a false foundation the greater the danger.

Sir Charles said that he had always felt that the date of the Exodus favoured by Dr. Knight was most in keeping with tradition. The only evidence that he could find that conflicted with it was a quotation on the back of a papyrus in the British Museum. It referred to certain despatches which were sent by the Egyptian Government to Palestine in the third year of King Menepthah.

One of these was sent to the King of Tyre, and the bearer of it was Baal**, the son of Zippor, who started from Gaza, at that time in Egyptian hands (Papyrus Anastasi III, in *Select Papyri* from the British Museum—see Sayce's *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 275). The Baal** there referred to might not be Balak, the son of Zippor, who was referred to in Num. xxii, but if it was, it seemed to conflict with Dr. Knight's theories.

The relationship of King Amenhotep IV with the kingdom of Mitanni was curious, for he understood that Mitanni was Aram Naharaim, whence came Rebekah, Leah, Rachel, and indeed, Abraham. This might account for Amenhotep's monotheism, and his indifference to the Khabiri's invasion.

On the motion of Mr. A. W. OKE, LL.M., F.G.S., a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Dr. Knight for his paper and to Mr. Avary Forbes for presiding on the occasion.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Dr. J. A. FLEMING wrote: I very much regret that I cannot be present at the reading of this very interesting paper by Rev. Dr. Frank Knight; but I have perused it carefully and should like to add my thanks with those of others present, to the author for his full and illuminating survey of the subject of the Pharaohs of the Pentateuch. I have long taken a great interest in this topic, and never have been convinced of the correctness of the widely adopted view that Rameses II was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and his 13th son and successor Merenptah was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. For one thing, if the dating of the XIXth Dynasty adopted by Petrie and others is correct, then the Exodus must have taken place as late as about 1220 B.C. This dating leaves far too little time before the foundation of Solomon's Temple, for all the events described in the Books of Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, even if some of these events are arranged in parallel instead of all in series. Moreover, it is contradicted by the statements in the New Testament—of Stephen and of Paul. It would hardly be possible to crowd all this history into 250 years or so, if the Exodus were as late as the dates commonly fixed for the limits of Merenptah's reign.

There is one point on which I should be grateful for the opinion of the learned author of this paper. The Divine Prediction to Abraham was that "thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs and shall serve them and they shall afflict them four hundred years But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." (Gen. xv, 13, 16.)

Now Moses was 80 years old at the Exodus, and was the son of Amram, who was the son of Kohath, who was the son of Levi (Exod. vi, 16-20). This gives four generations. The ages of these patriarchs at birth of sons is not given, but only their ages at death. Levi 137 years, Kohath 133, Amram 137. Even if we assume the births of Kohath, Amram, and Moses took place when their respective fathers were each 100 years old, this will hardly fill in the 400 years of the prediction. The question I should like to ask the author is : Between what dates does this 400 years extend ?

It is deeply gratifying to those who firmly believe in the Inspiration of the Old Testament to have such convincing proofs given of the minute accuracy of scriptural chronology as is indicated by the author's statements in his most interesting paper. (Even twenty years ago scholars such as Dr. Orr, in his book *The Problem of the Old Testament* discarded the Rameses-Merenptah theory, and argued that the Pharaoh of the Oppression was most probably Thothmes III, and Amenhotep II, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Canon Girdlestone, in his *Outlines of Biblical Chronology*, also rejects the Merenptah Exodus, but places it in the reign of Thothmes III, which hardly agrees with the facts. The author of the paper now under discussion has therefore placed us under obligation by his very careful review of the subject and his reconciliation of Biblical and secular chronology.

Mr. G. B. MICHELL, O.B.E., wrote : With Dr. Knight's Biblical chronology I am in close agreement, with a difference of only four years throughout. I also support his contentions in Sections (iii), (iv) and (v), from p. 101 onwards. But I differ from him with regard to the Hyksos.

It is, I think, unfortunate that he adopts the "long" Egyptian chronology, which is quite impossible, in spite of the powerful support of Sir Flinders Petrie and other great Egyptologists.

It depends upon the Sothic cycle. As the "short" dating seemed

to allow only about 250 years for all the Kings of the XIIIth to the XVIIth Dynasties, which was manifestly too little, the only alternative was to push back the reign of Senusert III by a whole Sothic cycle of 1460 years, making him to reign in about 3300 B.C. Yet this is far too long an interval to place between the art of the end of the XIIth Dynasty and that of the beginning of the XVIIth.

Now the discovery by Mr. Gardiner of the change in the Egyptian calendar before the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty solves the whole difficulty. It shows that Mesore, later the twelfth month, was, till the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty, the first month of the year. This shifting of a month adds 120 years to the "short" chronology before the War of Liberation, so giving 370 years instead of 250 years for the interval between the XIIth and XVIIIth Dynasties. This is allowed to be ample. It brings the seventh year of Senusert III to 2002 B.C. Consequently, the XIIth Dynasty arose in 2121 B.C. and the XIIIth in 1909 B.C., and the Hyksos conquest occurred in about 1790 B.C. As the XIVth Dynasty was apparently existing contemporaneously with the Hyksos, and the Thebans reigning, if not ruling, in the South, probably continuously until they arose again as the XVIIth Dynasty in about 1630 B.C., this period is not too short for the events—so far as they are known. The result is that it was the XIIth Dynasty that was ruling in Egypt when Abraham came down to that country. As they governed the whole country, it was not necessary for Abraham to go all the way to Thebes, their capital.

But the XIIIth Dynasty was *Memphite*, their court being at Ithtavi, near Lisht, a little south of Memphis. It was under this dynasty that Joseph was sold into Egypt, and the Hyksos conquered the country some eight years after his death. Thus it was the Hyksos that knew not Joseph, and this throws a new light on the whole subject.

THE LECTURER'S REPLY.

I have to thank the various members who spoke for their very kindly and generous remarks on the points mentioned in my paper. Very briefly I shall touch on one or two of the questions raised.

(1) I see no reason to change my opinion in regard to the time when Moses married the Ethiopian woman. There was **nothing**

in Oriental life, as it then was, to hinder him marrying Zipporah even though he had a Nubian wife living. I therefore agree with Mr. Roberts as against the view held by Mr. Collett.

(2) For the chronological evidence on which I base the date of the Exodus as 1445 B.C., I would refer Dr. Morton to the Appendix on p. 515 of my *Nile and Jordan*, where all the facts recorded in the Bible in this connection are marshalled.

(3) I cannot see that there is any ground for the identification of the Baal, son of Zippor, of Papyrus Anastasi III, with Balak, son of Zippor of Num. xxii. The so-called "Diary of a Frontier Officer" betrays no link of connection with the King of Moab. It is, therefore, no proof at all against the validity of my plea that Merenptah could not have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus, as Sir Charles Marston seeks to argue.

(4) The question raised by Dr. J. A. Fleming is certainly difficult to answer. The period of 400 years mentioned in Gen. xv, 13, as the length of time during which the Israelites would be afflicted in a strange land is certainly a round number for the more exact period of 430 years, which we know was actually the length of the sojourn in Egypt) 1445 + 430 B.C. = 1875 B.C., the date of the Descent into Egypt). But it is strange to read: "In the fourth generation they shall come hither again" (Gen. xv, 16). It is evident that here at least 100 years was reckoned as the length of a generation. Certainly we find it recorded that Caleb was the fourth from Judah (1 Chron. ii, 4, 5, 9, 18): Moses was the fourth from Levi (Exod. vi, 16-20); and doubtless there were many more.

(5) The question of the "long" and the "short" chronology, referred to by Mr. G. B. Michell, I cannot discuss here. I may say, however, that it seems to me impossible to crowd into 370 years—the alleged length of the interval between the XIIth and the XVIIIth Dynasties—all the events which are alluded to in the monuments. Though the period is admittedly most obscure, it is significant that to the XIIIth Dynasty alone there are 60 kings ascribed by Manetho, all ruling from Thebes, their united reigns totalling 453 years. If this be near the truth, how can we compress Dynasties XIII-XVII within 370 years?