

On the Question of the Exodus.

BY PROFESSOR J. V. PRÁŠEK, PH.D., PRAGUE.

V.

THE Jahwistic tradition makes quite a clear distinction between Joseph's and Jacob's going down to Egypt. From this we have to infer that in the first instance the tribe of Joseph alone was carried from Palestine to Egypt, and was not followed till some years afterwards by the tribe of Jacob. But these two tribes did not represent the totality of the clans and tribes reckoned to Israel, for we are in a position to prove that considerable portions of the Aramæan stock that formerly came to Syria under the leadership of Abraham remained in Palestine. Whether these also, like those that removed to Egypt, went under the name of *Israel* must be left an open question, owing to the want of contemporary information. That the tribes of Joseph and Jacob in Egypt were viewed as one whole, a single tribe of Israel, we learn from the stele of Merenptah. The tribal fragments that remained behind in Palestine may be grouped under the names Judah, Asher, and Simeon. Regarding the tribe of Judah the Jahwist also relates that it was settled in the far south of Palestine. The well-known story of Judah's relations with Tamar gives us a welcome glance into the then condition of things in S. Palestine. It was not till after Joseph was sold into Egypt that Judah, according to the testimony of the Jahwist (Gn 38^{1ff.}), left his brethren and attached himself to an Adullamite named Hirah, after which he formed a connection with a Canaanite woman, Shua, by whom he had three sons, of whom two, Er and Onan, died when they had reached manhood. Such events demand for their occurrence a considerable period of time, at least some years more than the average length of a generation. They also reveal the circumstance that the tribe represented by the personality of Judah was on a good footing with the Canaanites, and on the opposite with the tribes of Jacob and Israel. We may now compare all this with the well-known isolation of the tribe of Judah, which did not till the time of David enter into closer union with the general body of the people, but which, so early as the time of his grandson, gave

rise, owing to the tyrannical schemes of the latter, to the founding of a purely Israelitish kingdom, in which the hegemony was assumed by the tribe of Ephraim, descended from Joseph. It is reasonable to infer from this that the Israelites *par excellence* regarded the elements from which afterwards the tribe of Judah grew up as foreign, and were on that account opposed to the rule of the Davidic house. Recently it has been sought to discover traces of this tribe of Judah even in the Amarna tablets. Father Scheil read a defectively written name found in tablet xxxix. of Winckler's collection as ^{sabi} *Ia-u-du*. The reading *IA*, judging from Winckler's copy at all events, was well founded, and it is not to be wondered that reputable investigators have assumed the existence of a Judahite garrison in the service of Egypt in N. Syrian Tunip during the Amarna period. E. Meyer (*Ægyptiaca*: Festschrift für Georg Ebers zum 1 März, 1897, p. 74) first took exception to the above reading of the passage, and was disposed to assume that it was based upon a false decipherment. The doubts he expressed have led me to seek for information as to the real state of the case, both from Winckler, who meanwhile in his edition of the Amarna texts in Schrader's *K.I.B.* has replaced the reading *Ia-u-du* by *Su-u-du*, and from Knudtzon. Winckler has frankly confessed that the former reading is a mistake, certainly pardonable enough in view of the present condition of the tablets, and Knudtzon, who had just subjected all the Amarna tablets in the British Museum and in Berlin to that thorough process of collation peculiar to himself, was good enough to inform me by letter that, while the reading, *-u-du* is established, the first sign cannot possibly be taken for *ia*. In his opinion it may be read *zu* or *su*, it being well known that *zu* is found in instances where one would have expected *su*. Scheil's view, then, must be abandoned.

On the other hand, it is now positively established that an Israelitish tribe, named Asher, was known in Palestine during the sojourn of the

Israelites in Goshen. In Papyr. Anast. i. 23, among the Syrian foes of the Pharaohs Seti I. and Ramses II. is mentioned a land or tribe *i'-s-i-raw*, between Kadeš and Megiddo, that is, apparently, in the district stretching between them as far as Lebanon. The unquestionable identity of the name with the biblical אֲשֵׁר, and the certainly known position in W. Palestine, supply the proof that what is in view here is the afterwards half-Israelite tribe of Asher, which was interpenetrated with Canaanite elements, and it is interesting to learn from the Egyptian source that this tribe or land—according to Guthe's (*Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 4 f.) recent very attractive explanation—had its own prince, named *Ka-da-ira-di-y* (W. Max Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, 236). We see from this that a considerable portion of the Israelites remained in N. Palestine.

Another proof that the whole of the Israelites did not migrate to Egypt is supplied by the Amarna tablet Berlin cxxxi. (No. 220 Winckler). One Šamu-Addu, *amil* of Šamḥuna, writes to the king and assures him of his devotion. The editor of the tablet, in explaining the name Šamḥuna, already thought of the Heb. שִׁמְעוֹן (Simeon), and Trampe, in his frequently cited treatise, carried the connection further. It is to be observed that, apart from the complete identity of the two names, there is the circumstance that according to Gn 34^{ff.} three Israelitish families, Simeon, Levi, and Dinah, pastured their herds in the district of Shechem, that the family of Dinah was, to use the expression of the Jahwist, 'forced,' *i.e.* destroyed, by the Canaanites of Shechem, and that the families of Simeon and Levi thereafter lived in blood feud with the Schechemites. In historical times the *disjecta membra* of the Simeonites are found in the extreme south of the country, in the midst of a nomadic population, from which it is to be inferred that they had been driven from their original settlements in Ephraim, and, decimated by continued attacks, found new pasture grounds only outside Canaan proper.

The result of our examination of the Jahwistic tradition is therefore to the following effect. At the time of the bloom of the eighteenth dynasty, presumably during the glorious reign of Tahutmes III., a portion of the Israelites, especially the tribes of Joseph and Jacob, were carried to Egypt as prisoners of war, but scattered remnants continued in Canaan, where afterwards they supplied

the main stock of the tribes of Judah and Asher, and partly also of Simeon. Whether, even during the period of separation which continued for at least two centuries, there were relations between the two portions, is indeed nowhere stated, but, in view of the tenacity of the consciousness of tribal affinity and blood relationship with which we meet, at the same period, on the part of the Minæans and Phœnicians, who were likewise Semites, it is reasonable to assume the presence of friendly relations between the two constituent parts of the Israelitish people. In favour of this view is the circumstance that, according to the biblical narrative, Jacob and Joseph were both buried in Palestine.

It has been stated above that the tribes of Jacob and Joseph were settled in Egypt as prisoners of war. This conclusion of mine is founded upon the great Karnak inscription of Tahutmes III., which was composed after the conquest of Megiddo 1494 B.C., and contains the list of Palestinian tribes and cities which Tahutmes after his victory carried away to Egypt and subjected to the service of the god Amen. In this list there figure, as is well known, amongst others the tribes of Joseph and Jacob. This contradicts, of course, the Jahwist's story of Joseph's piety and of the fortunes that befell him, as well as of his having brought about the transference of Jacob and his sons to Egypt. But we have to bear in mind that the Jahwistic narrative is a folk legend, whose whole centre of interest lies in its heroes whom it glorifies by the aid of poetical embellishment, but which has no claim whatever to historical fidelity. Its principal hero is Joseph, who for the sake of his piety is advanced from slavery to the highest position next to the Pharaoh, and renders great services to Egypt upon the occasion of a famine which lasted for seven years. This famine really occurred, as we now know, thanks to the rock inscription discovered by Edwin Wilbour on the Nile island Sehel (H. Brugsch, *Die biblischen sieben Jahre der Hungersnoth nach dem Wortlaut einer ägyptischen Felseninschrift*, Leipzig, 1891). The inscription declares, indeed, that the famine visited Egypt during the reign of king *D-s-rs'*, Manetho's *Τοσέπρασις*, but this is after all a purely subordinate point, the only essential matter being to find hieroglyphic witness to the main stem of the Joseph legend, and in that way to gain assurance of its Egyptian origin. But even the other motive

of the Joseph story is demonstrably Egyptian. I refer to the well-known incident of Potiphar's wife, which is faithfully reproduced in the Papyrus d'Orbiney, of course with a change of names for the parties concerned. In the story as handed down by the Jahwist, the foreground is occupied by Potiphar the commander of Pharaoh's body-guard, his coquettish wife, and the Israelitish house-slave Joseph; in the fable of the Papyrus d'Orbiney, on the other hand, the *dramatis personæ* are two brothers, Anup and Buta, and the wife of the elder. It is of importance that it is admitted by weighty authorities in Egyptology, that the above fable was first committed to writing at the time of Ramses II. or Seti II., *i.e.* at the time which we must look upon as that of the Oppression and the Exodus.

But in this way we are put in a position to trace the true aim of the Joseph legend. It arose at the time of the Oppression, called in the aid of elements from Egyptian legends, and was meant to serve as a complaint against the harsh oppressor, who, unmindful of the benefits once conferred upon the land by Joseph, set his tribal relations to degrading and enfeebling forced labour. The real thread of the original Jahwistic narrative is broken after the story of the burial of Jacob, and we have thenceforward to examine the condition of the Israelites in Egypt by the aid of very meagre and heterogeneous data.

All the accounts agree on this, that the captive Israelitish tribes were settled in the eastern part of the land, between the Pelusiac mouth of the Nile and the frontier wall at Sur. It was the rich pasture land of Goshen where, according to Gn 46⁶⁶, the Israelites had the charge of the royal herds committed to them. The people were called, as a whole, Israelites, their elders bore the designation זקני ישראל, and even the Egyptians used this same designation for the foreign prisoners of war, as the stele of Merenptah clearly shows. But the Israelites soon began to practise handicrafts and agriculture as well as the pastoral occupation, and it was simply a consequence of the new methods of livelihood if they multiplied to a degree quite out of all proportion to the earlier period of their existence (Ex 1⁷). It must also be assumed that in course of time many other prisoners of war attached themselves to the Israelites, for we know that at that time the eastern frontier of Egypt simply swarmed with

foreigners, in the mouth of the Egyptians *Šasu* (cf. Papyr. Anast. vi., and Ebers' remarks in *Aegypt. Ztschr.*, 1885, p. 50). These foreigners received permission to pasture their flocks in the eastern environs of Heliopolis, a point which is confirmed by Merenptah's Karnak inscription (ll. 7, 8). For our present contention it is of great importance that the later Egyptian nomes, Athribites and Bubastites, are still unmentioned at the time of Seti I.; one may see in this a confirmation of the view that the districts in question had not, prior to Ramses II., been brought within the sphere of Egyptian administration.

The Jahwistic tradition is able to inform us that the Israelites extended themselves from Goshen towards the north-west in particular; according to Ex 2⁵ they had their settlements on the bank of a river in the immediate neighbourhood of a royal residence, while according to 11² they lived in the midst of the Egyptians. The river referred to can only be the Pelusiac arm of the Nile, an interpretation which is still present to the minds of Isaiah and Jeremiah (Is 23³, Jer 2¹⁸), when they employ the term שִׁחֹר.

This extension of the Israelites may have involved important consequences. In the first place it is to be noted that the tribe of Jacob was completely absorbed in the larger community, and that the Josephites assumed the hegemony. They gave themselves out as Jacob's descendants or heirs, and the whole people, along with the foreign elements, was called by the name *Israel*, as we now learn from the stele of Merenptah. The Egyptians, whose views are best represented in the great Papyrus Harris and in Manetho (*ap. Jos. c. Apion. i. 26*), of course gave to the hated 'unclean' foreigners other names, mostly with a contemptuous connotation, and slumped all foreigners together, which explains the very remarkable circumstance that in Egyptian sources down to the discovery of the Merenptah stele, all trace of the Israelites appeared to be lost.

The transition to agriculture and handicrafts had brought considerable advantages to the Israelites. It may also be assumed that, as long as the eighteenth dynasty ruled Syria, the condition of the Israelite prisoners of war was a less hard one. Under such circumstances, and especially owing to their native monotheism, the Israelites were able to maintain their peculiar tribal character. The foreign elements which had attached themselves to them

in Egypt were absorbed, without leaving a trace, in the Israelitish people.

Thus matters stood when, with the accession of the nineteenth dynasty, new conditions came to hold sway in Egypt. The Egyptian world-empire was seriously endangered, Syria was for the most part lost, and the success of the H̄abiri may well have awakened the feeling of nationality among the Israelites living in Egypt. Thus we may explain the circumstance made known to us by the Jahwist that the hitherto comparatively friendly attitude of the Pharaohs passed into an absolutely hostile one. After the loss of Syria, Seti I. directed his attention to the gold mines of Redesieh, near Sinai, and employed convicts and prisoners of war in the hard forced labour connected with them. At the same time the Pharaoh just named caused ruined temples to be rebuilt, especially in Heliopolis and Memphis, a work for which no doubt the service of foreigners was called into requisition.

With still greater severity did Ramses II. (1347-1280 B.C.), the son and successor of Seti, act towards the Israelites. 'Now there arose a new king over Egypt,' so runs the narrative of the Jahwist, mixed, indeed, with Elohist elements, Ex 1^{8ff.}, 'which knew not Joseph. And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel are more and mightier than we: come, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass that, when there falleth out any war, they also join themselves unto our enemies, and fight against us, and get them up out of the land. Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh store-cities, Pithom and Ra(a)mses. But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and the more they spread abroad. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel.'

This narrative bears a true historical impress, and is fully in accord with what is known from hieroglyphic sources to have been the condition of things in Egypt at the time. All that is wanting is the name of the kingly oppressor, but the means of inferring it is provided by the two place names which, by a happy fate, have been preserved to us. Pithom and Ramses were royal store-cities, whose site must be looked for in the districts occupied by the Israelites. But the name Ramses is unquestionably connected with the advent of the nineteenth dynasty, for it was not common prior to that.

The short reign of Ramses I. is excluded, because the oppression of the foreigners in the Delta did not begin till the reign of Seti I., and it is natural, after the first measures of Seti I., to attribute to his successor a conscious augmentation of the severity of these. But this successor was Ramses II., who reigned full sixty-seven years, confined himself at the outset to defensive wars by which S. Syria was preserved to the empire, but, further, spent the revenues of his kingdom on countless buildings throughout the whole land, and even in the Syrian and Nubian provinces. Now we gather from Egyptian sources the fact which is important for our purpose, that it was Ramses II. who began to build in the eastern Delta, and to organize the latter after the Egyptian fashion. The later names, Bubastites and Athribites, in the eastern Delta, did not yet exist in the time of Seti I., but monuments with cartouches of Ramses II. have been discovered where once were the nomadic settlements of Athribis. From the excavations of Naville and Flinders Petrie we learn that Ramses II. built also in Bubastis, Kantara, Tell el-Maskhûta, Tell el-Jehudah, Saft el-Henneh, Faḳûs, and Tell Rotab. But he had a special fondness for building in various parts of his empire 'Ramses cities' (*Pa Ramessu*), of which he even selected one, situated in the eastern Delta, for his favourite residence. According to a contemporary description (cf. Brugsch, *Gesch. Ägyptens*, 547 f.) this 'Ramses city' was upon a flowing navigable stream, in a district rich in lakes and pastures, and was adorned with splendid temples and palaces. All these characteristics are presented by the ruins examined by Naville at Tell el-Maskhûta, nay, the most interesting circumstance is that down to the present day huge buildings without doors or windows remain, in which one may recognize the granaries, that is, no doubt, the storehouses of the Bible (Naville, *The Store-City at Pithom and the Route of the Exodus*, 9). The inscriptions discovered at the spot testify that the city had Ramses II. for its founder. In the immediate neighbourhood of this 'Ramses city' lay, however, another city, called *Pa Tum*, known to Herodotus (ii. 158) under the form *Πάτρονμος*, and to the *Itinerar. Anton.* as *(Pa)-Thum*, which reappears in the *Pithom* of the Jahwist. The great nearness of the one to the other may be held to justify the conclusion that the two cities were regarded as one, like Babylon and Borsippa or Tyre and Uṣu.

Naville has actually discovered at Tell el-Maskhûta a great temple of the god Tum built by Ramses II.

The Jahwistic record is thus found to be in strict harmony with the data gathered from Egyptian sources, and it may accordingly be regarded as proved that the Pharaoh of the Oppression was no less an one than Ramses II. himself. During his long reign Moses was born. The latter, who had the advantage of an Egyptian education and who was endowed with rare mental powers, conceived the plan of leading his countrymen to Palestine. His purpose was, however, prematurely betrayed, and he found himself compelled to seek for safety in the desert, whence he did not return to Egypt till after many years. When he came it was as God's messenger, who felt himself bound, and also divinely called, to free the Israelites from the heavy Egyptian yoke.

The oppression of the Israelites still continued, according to the Jahwistic narrative of Ex 3⁷⁻⁸, after the death of the oppressor. Under Merenptah Hotephima, the successor of Ramses II., events, however, occurred which must have greatly encouraged the resolutions of Moses. In Merenptah's fifth year the Delta, and especially its eastern districts, was inundated by the so-called 'sea-peoples,' and from Papyr. Anast. iii., verso, ll. 5-8, we learn that the foreigners pitched their camp by the canal of Heliopolis, close by the boundary betwixt the cultivated and the pasture lands. The Israelites were thus eye-witnesses of the mighty foreign invasion which seriously im-

paired the strength of Egypt, and hence may have arisen their determination to quit Egypt under the protection of the foreigners, and to betake themselves to Syria. This intention has been rightly inferred by Naville as explaining the words of Merenptah found upon a triumphal stele. Upon that occasion their scheme was still frustrated by Merenptah (cf. Naville, *Recueil de travaux*, xx. 32-33), and it is reasonable to assume that the attempt was not repeated during this king's reign, which, besides, was a short one. With this the biblical record agrees. According to it the oppression still continued under the successor of Ramses II. (cf. Ex 3⁷⁻⁸ and 3⁹), and it was not until the time of the successor of this second oppressor, namely, Seti II., that Moses returned to Egypt (cf. Ex 4¹⁹, where the death of the *second* oppressor is mentioned). Seti II., who encountered in the eastern Delta a general uprising of the foreigners, the Israelites included, and who had to yield to one of their leaders, the Syrian Arsu, is accordingly *the Pharaoh of the Exodus*. According to the now ascertained chronology, Seti II. reigned 1273-1271 B.C., and the Exodus is to be placed in his second year, *i.e.* 1271 B.C. As the Syrian coast-land was still under the Egyptian sway in the time of Ramses IV. (cf. Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, iii. 223 c.), the movements of the Israelites from Paran onwards, which were probably carried on in conjunction with the tribes of Judah and Simeon, are capable of a perfectly natural explanation.

(*The End.*)

Point and Illustration.

An Agraphon.

The Secret of the Presence.

THERE is in Northern India a spacious city, built by a Mogul emperor, for his own glory, Futtypore Sikri. It is absolutely deserted now by man. Over a vast gateway in the silent walls is carved an Arabic inscription, which purports to preserve, strange to say, an *ἀγραφον*, an extra-scriptural utterance of our blessed Lord's: 'Jesus, on whom be peace, hath said, This world is but a bridge; pass over; but build not thy dwelling there.'—H. C. G. MOULE.

A Mother.

The Secret of the Presence.

It is often well to turn from the swelling thoughts suggested by the exceptional and the heroic in the records of

the gospel, to the sober questions of the uneventful lifetime, and the common scene, and the transfiguring power of the blessed secret there. And as I do so, a name, a face, a presence, rises on my soul. I see one whose life for long, long years I watched indeed with microscopic nearness. I see a Christian woman, surrendered at all hours to the never-ceasing doing of the nearest and least romantic duty; open on every side to every appeal for aid, for toil, for love; the summer sunshine of the full and busy home; the friend of every needling, every sinning life, in the wide poor parish; experienced, indeed, in the pure joys which come to hearts that forget themselves, but called again and again to agonies of sorrow. And I see this life, in its radiant but unconscious beauty, at once, and equally, and with a living harmony, practical down to the smallest details, and filled