

ARTICLE III.

THE EXODUS IN THE LIGHT OF ARCHÆOLOGY.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. WHATHAM,  
LOUISVILLE, KY.

IN the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* for July, 1916, Mr. Harold M. Wiener published an article entitled "The Date of the Exodus," and in October, 1917, one on "The Date of the Exodus and the Chronology of Judges."

Now Mr. Wiener claims to have shown in his first article that the Israelites were defeated by the Egyptian Pharaoh, Merneptah, in the fifth year of his reign, being overthrown outside of Egypt somewhere between its eastern border and the southern border of Canaan. In his second article Mr. Wiener claims to have shown that the Exodus of Israel from Egypt took place in the second year of Merneptah's reign. In other words, Mr. Wiener claims to have shown that the defeat of Israel which is mentioned on the celebrated Merneptah stele took place after the Exodus, and while the Israelites were yet in the wilderness.

In opposition to Mr. Wiener's assertions stands a previous statement by the well-known scholars Professors Harris and Chapman, that "a recently-deciphered Egyptian inscription . . . shows that the Bene-Israel were already in Palestine at the time of the Exodus, so that the migration must have been partial and not national" ("Exodus and Journey to Canaan," *HDB*, vol. i. p. 802).

The discoverer of this Egyptian stele, Professor Petrie,

views the defeat of "Israel," to which reference is made on this stele, as an overthrow which took place in Palestine while the historic Israel had not yet fled from Egypt (Cont. Rev., May, 1896); and with this conclusion most modern Biblical scholars agree; such, for instance, as Professor Barton (*The Historical Value of the Patriarchal Narratives*, p. 190; cf. Petrie, *HE*, vol. iii. p. 114; Paton, *ICC*, p. 39; *BW*, July, 1915, p. 86b).

Notwithstanding this consensus of opinion amongst the majority of modern scholars on the point in question, there are, nevertheless, some eminent scholars who still view the Exodus as having taken place in the early reign of Merneptah (B.C. 1225-1215), and in a location outside of Palestine. Be this as it may, Paton thinks that the Exodus may have taken place in the reign of Merneptah's successor, Seti. II. (B.C. 1209-1205), about B.C. 1207 (*ICC*, p. 34), a view further entertained by Breasted (*HAE*, p. 328). Petrie thinks that the Exodus of the Biblical Israelites took place in B.C. 1213, that is, during the reign of Merneptah, and that the entrance of these people into Palestine took place in B.C. 1173, that is, in the reign of Rameses III. (B.C. 1198-1167); although, as we have said, this writer views the Israel of the Merneptah stele as a people distinct from the Israel of the Exodus, and already settled in Palestine before the Biblical "conquest" took place.

In this article it is our object to prove that the Israel of the Merneptah stele are not the Israel of the "Exodus"; that the former were already settled in Palestine while the latter were yet in bondage in Egypt; and that the so-called Exodus of Israel from Egypt took place in the reign of Seti II., and not in that of Merneptah.

Maspero, in attempting to locate the Israel mentioned in the Merneptah inscription, thinks that "the order in which the other peoples are mentioned indicates that they [Israel] inhabited Southern Syria," that is to say, the extreme southern end of Palestine, for he locates them at Kadesh-barnea. He thinks, however, that "the disaster of which they are said to be the victims," that is, in the said inscription, "is the persecution of the Pharaoh who knew not Joseph," and in this explanation he sees "the Egyptian version of the Exodus current at the court of Merneptah" (*New Light on Ancient Egypt*, p. 96). Eminent as Maspero is as an Oriental archæologist, we are, nevertheless, compelled to dismiss his conclusion as inadequate, self-contradictory, and founded on a mistake. In passing such a sweeping criticism of a view of so famous a scholar as Maspero, we certainly would have preferred to preface it with the words "in our opinion," but the evidence is so clear that we are prevented from adopting this literary courtesy. For instance, if the disaster mentioned in this Egyptian inscription as having been inflicted upon the Israelites is "the persecution of the Pharaoh who knew not Joseph" (*Ex. i. 9–ii. 22*), then there is no necessity to view the Israel here mentioned as having any connection whatever with the names of people located in definite centers in Palestine or southern Syria, for this Israel was destroyed in Egypt by the order of the Pharaoh of the oppression, who charged that all their sons should be cast into the river (*Ex. i. 22*). In that case it is no wonder that this inscription adds, "There is none of them left," which we personally believe is the actual significance of the clause usually rendered, *her, its or their* seed "is not." Maspero translates it, "There is no particle of them left." Maspero, therefore, sees the waste or destruction of Israel mentioned on Merneptah's stele as

having taken place *in* Egypt. At least, this is the logical conclusion of his words, for the persecuting of the Israelites by the said Pharaoh resulted first in the drowning of all their male children in the river Nile as soon as they were born. However, he asks, touching these wasted Israelites, "Where did these Israilou live? What misdeeds of theirs had drawn on them the chariots and bowmen of Egypt?" One would have thought that there would have been no Israelites left of a sufficiently large number to call for this military pursuit after the throwing of all the male baby Israelites into the Nile, for the escape of Moses from this command is recorded as quite an exceptional instance (Ex. ii. 1-10). The inconsistency, however, does not here lie entirely with Maspero, but equally with the Exodus record; for, after describing the destruction of all the Hebrew boy babies according to Pharaoh's command, for the only force of the story of the preservation of Moses is in this said destruction having been definitely carried out, it represents that at the Exodus there were 603,500 fighting men besides the Levites, an altogether impossible number under any condition, as Sayce concedes ("Exodus," *The Temple Bible Dictionary*; Duncan, *The Exploration of Egypt and the Old Testament*, p. 89; Ex. xxxviii. 26). However, be this as it may, Maspero replies to his own question by telling us that these Israelites were in southern Syria in or near Kadesh-barnea, which brings us to our second point.

Maspero puts the Israel of this stele on the southern border of Palestine, owing to the order in which the other defeated people are named, Askalon, Gezer, Yenoam, Israel, which is the reading of these towns in the order given by Breasted, Petrie, Paton, and Mr. Wiener. From this order Maspero picks out the third name, and attempts to identify it

with a town "that other documents seem to locate in the mountains of Judah," and as Israel comes next, he associates the residence of these people with the neighborhood of this town, the Yanim or Yanum of Josh. xv. 53. Mr. Wiener attempts the same identification, and after saying that the Yenoam of this stele has been identified with Yanuh near Tyre, the Janoah of 2 Kings xv. 29, he adds: "It is not clear how a place so far north as Yanuh would come in the list at this point, if the order is geographical, and it may be conjectured that the name Yenoam here refers to the Yanim or Yanum of Josh. xv. 53" (*loc. cit.*, p. 457). However, in a note at the bottom of the page he tells us, "The order may of course be due to literary or chronological considerations, or to chance, or to the relative importance of the places named."

Now had Mr. Wiener only tested out this last assumption, he would have seen that he had at length actually imagined the truth in this case — a truth of very vital importance, as we shall see.

Breasted reproduces the record which reports that Thothmes III. subdued in North Palestine three towns lying on the southern slopes of the Lebanon Mountains, and he gives their names as Nuges, Yenoam, and Herenkeru (ARE, vol. ii. pp. 187, 223; HE, p. 293). Petrie gives the names of these towns as Yenuamu, Anaugasa, and Harnekaru. Later he reproduces a record which refers to the second town, the first in Breasted's enumeration, as "the territory of Anaugasa" (HE, vol. ii. pp. 110, 117), Breasted referring to it as "the district of Nuges" (HE, p. 313).

Budge tells us that Thothmes III., "having marched into Phœnicia, directed his course towards the district of Anaukasa" (HE, vol. iv. p. 42); and even Maspero describes this

Pharaoh as warring in Phœnicia and subduing the same district (The Struggle of the Nations, p. 266).

Now why Breasted should have chosen to transliterate the Egyptian hieroglyphics signifying Anaukasa into Nuges when they actually read Anaukasa,<sup>1</sup> we are at a loss to say; yet the fact that he did so does not make the town in question anything but what it is given in the said hieroglyphics, and that is, Anaukasa, a district with a town of the same name lying close to two other towns, Herenkeru and Innuamam, the Yenoam according to the hieroglyphics on the Merneptah stele.

But Thothmes III. (1479–1447 B.C.) was not the only Pharaoh who had to subdue the town of Innuamam in a North Palestine campaign, for Seti I. (1313–1292 B.C.) is recorded in Egyptian annals as, after crossing Carmel and entering Phœnicia, subduing inland from Tyre the town of Innuamam (Breasted, ARE, vol. iii. p. 47; Petrie, HE, vol. iii. p. 12). No wonder that the majority of the most eminent

<sup>1</sup>The name Anaukasa is given by Budge in describing the campaign of Thothmes III. into Phœnicia, and he immediately follows this name with the hieroglyphics which evidently appear in the record of the said campaign. (Books on Egypt and Chaldea, vol. xii.; HE, vol. iv. p. 41). These hieroglyphics when transliterated give clearly and definitely A-n-a-u-k-a-sa, no such name as Nuges appearing in the Index of Budge's History of Egypt, which is included in this series of books on Egypt and Chaldea.

In describing this said campaign of Thothmes, Petrie three times mentions the name Anaugasa, evidently as the transliteration of the hieroglyphics which appear in the records as designating this particular town and district of the same name. In one reference he mentions together the three towns, Yenuamu, Anaugasa, and Harnekaru (Hist. of Egypt, vol. ii. p. 110), given by Breasted as Yenoam, Nuges, and Herenkeru, all three towns forming a tripolis situated on the southern slopes of the Lebanon range of mountains (Ancient Records of Egypt, vol. ii. pp. 187, 223). On page 187 he immediately follows the name Nuges with brackets inclosing certain letters as follows: Yn-yw-g-s'—letters

scholars, such as Breasted (ARE, HE), Petrie (HE), Budge (HE), Paton (BW), Hommel (AHT), and Cook ("Jews," *Encyc. Brit.*), view the Innuamam mentioned on the Merneptah stele as a town in northern Palestine subdued by Egyptian forces during the reign of this monarch (1225-1215 B.C.), for it had similarly been subdued by his predecessors, Thothmes III. and Seti I. Thus Mr. Wiener's attempt, including that of Maspero, to locate the Israelites of Merneptah's stele on the southern border of Palestine, owing to their assumption that the Innuamam of this stele was located in Judah, is seen to be not only without warrant, but contrary to the logical conclusion, if these Israelites are to be located in Palestine near the town of Innuamam, as mentioned on this stele.

But are we to locate the Israelites near to this town of Innuamam? Locate them in Palestine possibly, but not necessarily as far north as Innuamam, for there is nothing in the Merneptah stele which indicates that the overthrow of

which he transliterates by the Hebrew equivalents which he represents as spelling Ynyugsa (cf. vol. i. p. xv). Petrie makes no mention of Nuges, but in the recorded list of names representing the towns conquered by Ramessu II. during his campaign in Syria he gives An)augasa and A)nnugas, two names evidently signifying one and the same town, to which he refers as Anaugasa, one of the three store cities of Megiddo, near Tyre. In a previous volume, as shown above, he names these store cities as Yenaamu, Anaugasa, and Harnakeru (*loc. cit.*, vol. iii. pp. 49, 50).

From the evidence now produced it would seem that the name Anaugasa, or Anaukasa, much more accurately represents the hieroglyphics signifying this town, and of course specially so if the hieroglyphics given by Budge as indicating this town actually appear in Egyptian records narrating its capture by the Egyptians. We think, therefore, that our criticism of Breasted in recording this said town as Nuges instead of Anaugasa or Anaukasa is fully justified, especially as no other Egyptologist gives Nuges in place of Anaugasa or Anaukasa, all of them giving either of these last two names for the town in question.

these Israelites is to be placed in the neighborhood of this last-named town. The Palestinian victories recorded on this stele indicate a complete subjugation of southern Syria by Egyptian native forces. The description of this subjugation opens with the statement that the land of Canaan, for this is the name by which the Egyptians knew what centuries later came to be known by the name Palestine (Breasted, HE, p. 410; Palestine, HDBs), had been quelled from Askalon, near the gates of Egypt, to Innuamam, on the southern slopes of the Lebanon Mountains as far north as Tyre.

Canaan, we are told, is plundered with every evil, that is, the entire region has been pillaged, put to the sword, and its chiefs carried off as prisoners. The principal fortified towns upon which the people put so much dependence, Askalon, Gezer, and Innuamam, have been demolished, and thus southern Syria, or Canaan, that is, the portion of Syria covered by the location of the towns named, has now become, in Egyptian eyes, a land without a husband.

Within the foregoing description the Israelites are mentioned as so completely exterminated that there is none of them left, and the two points to settle are: (1) How come Israelites to be associated with this Canaanite campaign? and (2) Where were they when met and, according to the record, practically annihilated by the Egyptians? We desire to answer these two questions absolutely in accordance with the evidence in the case, not making more nor less of it than is adequately warranted—a somewhat difficult task.

Mr. Wiener contends that “nothing in the inscription warrants the statement that Merneptah defeated Israel,” and he thereupon concludes that this particular defeat in the said inscription was the work of “vassals of the Pharaoh,” that



is, the Egyptian king who succeeded "the Pharaoh of the oppression" (*loc cit.*, pp. 460, 465).

But, in the first place, how does Mr. Wiener so positively assume that Merneptah did *not* in Canaan itself personally defeat the Israel mentioned on his stele? and, in the second place, how does he so positively assume that this defeat was "a defeat in the south of Palestine of an invading non-territorial Israel . . . by vassals of the Pharaoh"? Purely and solely by a system of guesswork, for otherwise he has not a particle of real historical evidence for his two assumptions. Of course he appears to produce real historical evidence, but this is only because he is a clever lawyer who can beg the question with an adroitness that is calculated to deceive both himself and his readers.

Now Merneptah may *not* have personally undertaken the campaign into Syria recorded on his stele, for at this time he was an old man of seventy years of age, but then he *may* have done so, for there is nothing in his hymn of victory to signify that he did not personally undertake this campaign, and the invariable custom was that the Egyptian monarch should personally conduct all military campaigns. There is, of course, the story of the vision in which Ptah appeared to Merneptah, and instructed him to remain at home and give the command of his troops to his officers. This story is adopted by both Maspero (NLAE, p. 93), and Budge (HE, vol. v. p. 100), unfortunately adopted, since Breasted tells us that in the speech addressed by the god to the king there is not "any warning to Merneptah to withhold himself from the battle and to remain at home, as indicated in the translation of Chabas" (ARE, vol. iii. p. 245). Why such eminent scholars as Maspero and Budge should have overlooked the fact that here Chabas had made a mistake is surprising, but

they did overlook or ignore it, with the result that what they say on the basis of the supposed direction given to Merneptah to stay at home and send his officers in his place is of no value.

As for Mr. Wiener's assumption that Amorite vassals defeated the Israelites mentioned on the stele, this is absolutely nullified by the fact that it is impossible to assume that other Amorite vassals subdued Askalon, Gezer, and all the rest of the Canaanite towns until we come to Innuamam, on the southern slopes of the Lebanon Mountains, for the indication is that the mention of three of the most important towns in Canaan as being in a state of revolt against Egypt shows that all Canaan, more or less, is in so great disorder that nothing less than a native Egyptian army could possibly bring peace out of so extensive a military insurrection. Askalon, Gezer, and the towns following until we get to Innuamam, could only have been subdued by an Egyptian home army, and the joy over their defeat manifested in the inscription we are considering must have also included the notice of the desolating of the Israelites by the same military forces.

We have not, however, answered either of the questions asked at the commencement of this present examination. Nevertheless, we have advanced evidence to prove that the defeated Israelites of Merneptah's stele are much more likely than otherwise to have been despoiled by Egyptian home forces. But were they despoiled during Merneptah's Syrian campaign, and at what place did this subjugation take place? Let us now carefully examine the statement touching the defeat of Israel as it occurs on the Merneptah stele. We are there told that the Israelites are destroyed, and that there are none of them left, and this telling appears to be directly associated with the complete despoiling of Canaan.

The Israelites referred to on this stele are a numerous people, and also they are foreigners or aliens. The first fact is seen by the accompanying pictures of a man and a woman following the sign for foreigner which immediately follows the hieroglyphics for Israel on the stele where their overthrow is recorded (Budge, HE, vol. v. pp. 104 f.). The said sign, however, does not indicate that the people to whom it refers have no rights in the district in which they are met. Abraham was a stranger in Canaan, where he was definitely settled with a numerous following. He was, however, still a foreigner in the land, and to definitely hold for all time a portion of the district in which he resided, he had to purchase it from those who were considered to own the land itself (Gen. xiv. 13; xxiii. 3 f.). In like manner the Israelites mentioned in the record of Merneptah's Egyptian campaign in Syria are more than likely to have been encountered by the Egyptian forces when these were actually in Canaan quelling its rebellion against its Egyptian overlord. We may be certain of this, namely, that this Israelitish destruction has no connection with the oppression inflicted upon their kinsmen by Rameses II. as it is mentioned in Ex. i. 16 and 22, for this had happened so many years earlier than the incident we are considering that it could not have formed a part of a glorification of Merneptah's prowess recorded on his stele. It must also be noted that the destruction of these Israelites is not mentioned as though they were slaves of recent escape from Egyptian bondage, but in keeping with a very natural circumstance, namely, that they were either a very large independent tribe, or a combination of small tribes, which had settled in Canaan in the same manner as did the *foreigner* Abraham, their forefather, with his numerous followers, and being so settled they gave their aid to Canaan's native inhab-

itants in their efforts to get rid of their Egyptian suzerainty. All this, of course, is an assumption, but we hold that it is an allowable assumption from the manner in which the defeat of a tribe or tribes of Israelites is mentioned on the Merneptah stele as associated with an Egyptian campaign in Canaan. This suggestion, however, calls for a careful examination of all the circumstances connected with "Israel" on the said stele.

Now Mr. Wiener would see in these Israelites of the Merneptah stele the Israelites of an exodus from Egypt which had taken place three years before their defeat mentioned on this stele. He would also, as we have seen, view the defeat they suffered as inflicted by Egyptian vassals, and not by Egyptian native forces. Against this last assumption we have given evidence which seems to us adequate for its rejection. Against the first assumption we shall endeavor to bring as valid evidence. The eminent scholar, Mr. S. A. Cook, sees in the fact that Bedouin tribes were being admitted into Egypt to feed their herds on Egyptian soil in the reign of Merneptah reason for assuming that the Exodus must have taken place in the reign of Merneptah's successor. The Rev. James Baikie, referring to the foregoing fact, adds that it appears in the report of an Egyptian official dated in the eighth year of Merneptah — a report showing "the bringing in of a tribe of Semites to the lakes of Pithom, in the land of Succoth, to feed themselves and their herds." From this he also, with Cook and many others, puts the Exodus in the reign of Merneptah's successor or after Merneptah's Syrian campaign, which took place not later than the fifth year of Merneptah's reign (*The Story of the Pharaohs*, p. 239). This important evidence is strangely omitted by Mr. Wiener in his original article on "The Date of the Exodus."

Taking the date of the building of the Temple as 967 B.C., Paton makes a further calculation which brings the date of the Exodus as 1207 B.C., and places it in the reign of Seti II., Merneptah's successor (ICC, p. 34), the reign in which Breasted, Paton, Cook, and many other eminent scholars place the Exodus.

Another piece of archæological evidence is the finding of a broken tombstone inscribed to the memory of an official who lived in the reign of Rameses II., and is here recorded as being the keeper of "the foreigners of Syria in Succoth," foreigners identified by Sayce with the Israelites who built the treasure cities of Pithom and Raamses ("Exodus," TBD). Putting, therefore, this evidence with that giving the escape of Syrian slaves across the eastern border of Egypt, slaves who in the reign of Seti II. made good their escape, although pursued by Egyptian troops (Cook, *Encyc. Brit.* [11th ed.], vol. x. p. 78; Paton, *BW*, Aug. 1915), we are justified in seeing in this last incident the historical basis for the Old Testament record of the Israelite Exodus from Egypt.

Let us now attempt to briefly sum up the points which we have so far stated and maintained in this present thesis.

Our article has mainly been written as a reply to Mr. Wiener's contention that the "Israel" mentioned on the Merneptah stele as overthrown in a campaign undertaken by this monarch was the Israel which constituted the "Exodus" defeated by Egyptian vassals in the wilderness to the south of Palestine after the Exodus had occurred. Now we showed that Mr. Wiener fell into the mistake of Maspero in assuming that the order in which Israel is mentioned on the Merneptah stele as amongst the overthrown inhabitants of Canaan or southern Syria, later called Palestine, indicates that when

defeated they were near Kadesh-barnea in southern Canaan. We showed that both writers so concluded, owing to the mistake in assuming that the Innuamam of this stele is the Yanim or Yanum of Josh. xv. 53, which we, however, incontrovertibly proved to be a town situated on the southern slope of the Lebanon Mountains.

We next showed that the defeat of Israel recorded on the Merneptah stele was to be understood as having taken place within the land of Canaan, and not outside of it, because this defeat completes the entire subjugation of Canaan to Egypt. Moreover, we further showed here that Mr. Wiener was guessing without warrant in assuming that this particular Israel was defeated by Egyptian vassals outside of Canaan proper. Mr. Wiener's *guess* would make all revolted Canaan brought again under Egyptian suzerainty by vassals, and not by Egyptian native forces — an absolutely absurd assumption.

We next produced evidence to show that an exodus from Succoth of Syrian, otherwise Israelite tribes, fleeing in large numbers from Egyptian slavery, is entirely out of harmony with the existence of an Egyptian document recording that in the eighth year of Merneptah's reign a tribe of Semites was given permission to feed themselves and their herds near the lakes of Pithom.

Finally, we showed that such an exodus as described above could only have been likely in the reign of Merneptah's successor (Seti II.), and that there exists an Egyptian document showing that in this reign a successful escape of Syrian slaves across the eastern border of Egypt into the wilderness beyond had actually taken place. Putting, therefore, all this archaeological evidence together, we naturally concluded that the so-called Exodus of Israel from Egypt had not yet taken place when Merneptah defeated certain Israelites in his campaign

waged in Canaan — a conclusion as worked out by us which was accepted as irrefutable by the two eminent Semitic scholars Professors Paton and Barton, to whom we had submitted this present effort of ours for review.

There are, of course, other reasons besides archæological ones for confirming the view that the Exodus took place after the Merneptah Syrian campaign. These, however, come more properly under the head of "Biblical Criticism," — an investigation which we shall reserve for another paper. In the meantime we cannot but think we have confirmed the statement of Professors Harris and Chapman that the said Egyptian stele "shows that the Bene-Israel were already in Palestine at the time of the Exodus, so that the migration must have been partial and not national."

In his lectures on "The Religion of Israel to the Exile" (published in 1899), Professor Karl Budde, referring to the discovery of the Merneptah stele, says that "the mention of Israel on the Merneptah-stone is so indefinite, and the abode of the people at that time so uncertain, that the most varied possibilities are open" (p. 7). Professor Driver goes further, saying, that "the mention of Israel on the stele of Merneptah . . . is too vague and indefinite to throw any light on the question of the Exodus" (EB, vol. iii. p. 867a). In a later work (*Exodus*, Cam. Bible, p. xl), however, he thinks it possible that the mention of Israel on the Merneptah stele shows that part of Israel, at least, was settled in Palestine or Canaan at the time of Merneptah's campaign in southern Syria.

In the One Volume HDB, Barton supposed "that the Leah tribes were roaming the steppes to the south of Palestine where Merneptah defeated them" (*Israel*, p. 395a). This view, held by him in 1909, he altered in an article written in

1913, and already referred to, for here he wrote that "Israel, or the Leah tribes, were already in Palestine," that is, when Merneptah defeated them prior to the historic Exodus. In his last published work (*Archæology and the Bible*, p. 312), he notes the difference of opinion touching the settlement of the points involved in the appearance of "Israel" on the Merneptah stele, adding, "All scholars would welcome more information on these problems." Mr. Wiener himself in a courteous criticism of my first attempt to answer his contention as to the date of the Exodus, for this is the third effort before succeeding in getting my manuscript accepted for publication, wrote, "In spite of these criticisms I am really pleased with Mr. Whatham's article. I would greatly value his view if he would master my case on the various points raised, and look forward to his making a substantial and important contribution to the critical discussion."

As in duty bound I carefully considered the points raised by Mr. Wiener, but could still see no reason why I should substantially alter my conclusions arrived at in my first effort. Indeed, the view which I held in opposition to Mr. Wiener on archæological grounds seemed confirmed from the standpoint of Biblical criticism, and I therefore wrote the second manuscript, entitled "*The Exodus in the Light of Archæology and Criticism*," mainly because the editor of this Journal, Dr. G. F. Wright, had written me that if I would rewrite my article, after giving due consideration to Mr. Wiener's criticism, he would "publish it at as early a date as possible" (letter of Oct. 20, 1917). It was this rewritten article that I sent to Professors Paton and Barton. Professor Barton wrote unqualifiedly, "It seems to me a clear refutation of Mr. Wiener's positions." Professor Paton, however, wrote, "The first part of the article in which you discuss the



bearing of the facts of archæology upon the problem of the Exodus seems to me entirely clear and irrefutable. . . . The second part of your paper in which you discuss Modern Criticism and the Exodus seems to me less clear and satisfactory." Without rewriting the second part I sent the whole rewritten article to Dr. Wright, only, to my astonishment, to receive the following reply: "On rereading your article with its changes I am confirmed in my opinion that it would be inexpedient to publish it. My objection is largely to the latter part concerning which Dr. Paton expressed his dissatisfaction."

Feeling that a promise had been somewhat violated, a promise under which I had gone to no little labor in rewriting my article, I replied to Dr. Wright, saying that at least he ought to publish the first part of my rewritten manuscript, especially as it had been so highly indorsed by two of the most eminent Semitic scholars in the United States of America.

This immediately brought a rejoinder from Dr. Wright, who stated that he had no objection to publishing the first half of my article, in which I dealt exclusively with the archæological evidence connected with the Exodus, but objected to publishing the second part for a number of considerations.

I thereupon determined to make two distinctive parts of my article, letting each stand by itself, and, therefore, gave a somewhat altered title to my manuscript, rewriting the opening and closing of the first part, and leaving the second part to a fresh investigation along the lines suggested, respectively, by Drs. Paton and Wright. I include this somewhat personal element for two reasons: (1) Because I am not at all prepared to think that Mr. Wiener, as evidently a traditionalist, is any less anxious to give every point its due weight in this discussion than am I, a Higher Critic; and (2) Mr. Wiener

concluded his letter quoted with the statement, "I am myself expecting to have to join the forces shortly and this may interrupt my work." His letter was written July 23, 1917, and God alone knows, at the moment of my writing, where Mr. Wiener is continuing his work — in the region where so much is guesswork, or in that region where we cannot but think that we shall have clear light thrown on what cannot but be with us more or less dark problems. May God be praised either way, for surely Traditionalists and Higher Critics are equally working in His cause.