

## On the Question of the Exodus.

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

### IV.

In the minds of those who have most recently sought to investigate the subject of Israel's sojourn in Egypt and its date, a twofold conviction is gaining ground: that this sojourn must be regarded as an historical fact, and that the Israelites took possession of their pasture grounds in the eastern Delta not, as has been hitherto almost uniformly held, during the continuance of the Hyksos period, but while the eighteenth dynasty was making its conquests in Syria. With reference to the first of these points, the latest discussions by B. Stade are of great importance. This brilliant scholar, in his *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel* maintained, with arguments that are not to be depreciated, the view that not only the sojourn of the patriarchs in the West Jordan land, but also the sojourn of the people of Israel in Egypt are exposed to suspicion (i. 127),—in view of the cautious and well-weighted forms of expression used by Stade, the word 'suspicion' has a far-reaching import. He regarded the Jahweh religion as borrowed from the Arabo-Sinaitic tribe of the Kenites, which had partially amalgamated with the Israelites, and found the first point of history in the settlement of the Israelites in the East Jordan land, from which they got possession of the fertile plains on the right bank of the river, not by force of arms, but simply by a gradual process of overflowing, in the well-known fashion of the Aramæans and their Arab successors. We must certainly note that Stade put forward his theory in a strictly scientific manner, disdaining to draw far-reaching conclusions from the silence of the hieroglyphic records regarding Israel's sojourn in Goshen and its earliest relations to Egypt.

In course of time Stade has reached what we believe to be a more correct view. In a full and suggestive inaugural address (*Die Entstehung des Volkes Israel*, dritter Abdruck, Giessen, 1899) he accepts the historicity of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt and of the personality of Moses, and supplies, as I think, a new and sure basis for historical investigation by his method of procedure, which consists in starting from the Jahwistic tradition as the foundation of historical exposition in

all questions relating to the earliest period of Israel's existence,—a method which I already advocated in 1895 in an article appended to the *Akten der böhmischen Kaiser Franz Joseph Akademie*.

The era of the Tahutmidæ is also on other grounds of great importance for the history of Israel, for it is here that we meet with the first monumental mention of Israel or its component parts. I refer to the data contained in the Karnak list of Tahutmes III., in the Amarna tablets, and finally in the extremely important stele of Merenptah.

First deserving of citation are the two names of the great Tahutmes list, the name No. 78 *y-sšp-i-rʿ*, and No. 107 *y-k-b-i-rʿ* (cf. Maspero, 'Sur les noms géographiques de la liste de Thoutmos III. qu'on peut rapporter à la Judée,' in *Instit. Victoria*, 1888, pp. 8, 16). These rare names, and especially their connexion with Palestinian place-names known from other sources, had attention first called to them in 1885 (*Revue égypt.* iv. 95 ff.) by Groff, who identified them with the Bible names Joseph and Jakob. He was followed by Ed. Meyer (*ZAW*, 1886, 16 ff.), Maspero (*loc. cit.*), W. Max Müller (*Asien u. Europa nach altägypt. Denkmälern*, 162 ff.), and A. H. Sayce (*The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, 337). It is evident how a point like this would be greedily laid hold of by investigators, and treated by each according to his individual standpoint; but at the same time it is to be noted that the above conclusion has been gaining adherents on all sides. Its interests have been greatly advanced of late by W. Max Müller, who (in the *Oriental. Literaturzeitung*, 1900, 396 ff.) examines afresh the reading of both names, finds the reading *y-k-b-i-rʿ* correct, claims *I-a-a-si-pi-i-li* as the cuneiform basis of the name *y-sšp-i-rʿ*, and proves by a detailed investigation that the comparison with the name *Joseph* can be to a certain extent made out. We must remember that it was W. Max Müller who first discovered the rules of transcription of cuneiform and Semitic names in general into hieroglyphic, so that his judgment on such a question is authoritative.

We learn, then, that at the time of Tahutmes III. (who, according to Lehmann's latest calculations, ruled Egypt B.C. 1551-1461) there make their appearance in Palestine, and, judging from the geographical sequence, in the neighbourhood of Hebron and in the hill-country of Ephraim (cf. Sayce, *l.c.* 337 ff.), two names of places or tribes, *Jaḳob-el* and *Joseph-el*, which exhibit an exclusively Israelitish character, but afterwards disappear entirely,—a circumstance which surely provides material for reflexion when we consider the tenacity with which Palestinian place-names have, as a rule, survived down to the present day, even when their form is changed in accordance with the conditions that have arisen. The name *Joseph-el* recurs, indeed, but not as the name of a place or as a tribal name attached to a district, but as that of the most powerful and for a long time leading tribe of the Israelites, the Bēnē-Joseph; that is to say, the original *Joseph-el* has developed into a great tribe—a circumstance which justifies us in drawing analogous backward inferences in regard also to the name *Jaḳob-el*. The tribe of Jaḳob appears, indeed, in later times no more under this name; but a number of smaller tribes have retained the consciousness that they had a common tribal father, Jaḳob, and presumably bore in common that same name, from which it may be inferred that about the year B.C. 1500 two Israelitish tribes were already settled in the West Jordan land, Joseph upon Mt. Ephraim, and Jaḳob in the district of Hebron.

Next we must consult the famous Amarna tablets, in so far as these also furnish evidence as to the earliest history of Israel, especially as to the circumstances attendant on the immigration and the exodus. Only it is a matter of deep regret that up till now we have not at our disposal any systematic geography of the Amarna tablets, but must content ourselves with the otherwise careful and clear arrangement of names in Trampe's *Syrien vor dem Eindringen der Israeliten (nach den Thontafeln von Tell el-Amarna)*, published as an Appendix to the Jahresbericht of the Lessing Gymnasium at Berlin, Easter, 1898.

We have already pointed out (see the Feb. number, p. 206 f.) that the land which was afterwards called Canaan or Palestine was not distinguished in the Amarna period from the rest of Syria. Trampe's attempt to explain *mIarimuta* of the tablets as the south-western Jordan land, is

met by serious objections, since *mIarimuta* is rather to be sought, with C. Niebuhr (*Mittheil. d. vorderas. Gesellschaft*, 1896, p. 208 f.), in the neighbourhood of the Nile delta, especially if one keeps in view the Heb. and Assy. names for the Nile, *yē'ôr* and *mIari*. We regard Palestine, then, in the light of the Amarna period, as a part of the *mMartu* or *mAmurri*, the land of the Amorites, which was, of course, even then thickly dotted over with cities (*maḳazāni*). All the cities which are afterwards named in the Bible as belonging to the Canaanites, such as Jerusalem-Urusalim, Keilah, Lachish, Gezer, Aijalon, Megiddo, Akko, Ḥazor, Jabesh, etc., appear in the tablets; but numerous place-names of the Tahutmes list are passed over, possibly because through proximity to large fortified cities they had lost their importance; but possibly also, because so far as tribes are in question, their inhabitants had moved from the district.

One point, however, is remarkable, and merits careful consideration. There are seven tablets preserved which emanate from Abd-ḥiba, king of (Uru)salim. Abd-ḥiba says of himself that he was installed neither by his father nor his mother, but by the strong arm 'of the king,' a formula which is employed by no other of the petty princes of Palestine of the time, and which reminds us strikingly of the more clearly defined position of Melchizedek in Gn 14. We must hold that the priest-king form of rule at (Uru)salem or (Uru)salim had continued down to the Amarna period, and that Abd-ḥiba, if not precisely the last, was at least one of the last successors of Melchizedek.

Now Abd-ḥiba constantly complains to his suzerain, the king of Egypt, that foreign conquerors or plunderers, named Ḥabiri, are making serious incursions into his territory, and are threatening his existence. But the same Ḥabiri make their appearance at the same time in other parts of Syria, according to the same authority. The *amilu* of Gebal-Byblos is in the way of calling them *amilu GAS*, *šbî GAS*, a designation which occurs also in the letters of other *amilu*. The ideogram *GAS* has the phonetic value *ḥabbati*, 'plunderers,' 'disturbers,' so that what is in view is not a name but a collective designation. The Ḥabiri or *ḥabbati* come in a body from the East, from the Syrian desert, look with covetous eyes upon the fertile meadows of the West Jordan land

and Central Syria, and press in with such force that the ordinary means of resistance at the disposal of the Syrian princes must appear quite inadequate.

In looking at the description of their method of attack, one cannot but be struck with the resemblance between the Ḥabiri and the later incursions of Ammonites, Amalekites, and other desert tribes which continued down to the time of David. In both instances it is hungry nomads who seek to secure for themselves better conditions of existence at the expense of the settled population. But the name *Ḥabiri* has a resemblance to the designation '*Ibrim*, 'Hebrews,' which was applied by the aborigines of Canaan to the invading Israelites under Joshua. The identification of *Ḥabiri* with '*Ibrim* is philologically permissible, for the Canaanite '(y) corresponds exactly to the Assy.-Bab. *ḥ*, and accordingly many reputable scholars have assumed the identity of the Ḥabiri with the Hebrews. This view, however, requires on the one side explanation, and on the other restriction both as to date and locality. The Israelites never gave to themselves the designation '*Ibrim*, consequently it must have come from the mouth of another people, and indeed, as we have remarked in speaking of the history of Abraham, from the mouth of the Amorites or Canaanites. These already called Abraham '*Ibrā*, 'the Hebrew,' as having come from the land 'beyond the River'—whether this means the Euphrates or the Jordan is of no consequence for the present question. The same Canaanites called the 'plunderers' in the time of Amenhotep III. and IV. 'Hebrews,' reproduced in cuneiform as *Ḥabiri*; nay, in their mouth the same designation would be applied also to the new arrivals from Egypt who, about the time of the transition from the nineteenth to the twentieth Egyptian dynasty, crossed the Jordan at Jericho and began the conquest of Ephraim. The Canaanites made no distinction between different genera of these Hebrews, but this is a circumstance that deserves to be noted. In Egypt the descendants of Abraham are called Israel; that is to say, the Egyptians were acquainted with the native name of the Israelites, whereas in Canaan they are called '*Ibrim*. The motive for the employment of the latter name by the Canaanites must therefore have been independent of Israel's sojourn in Egypt, and must be sought in the circumstances attendant

on the march of Israel through the wilderness till they reached the Jordan ford. It lies, in my opinion, simply in the similarity between the direction from which the Israelites attacked Canaan and that from which like attacks had been made by the whilom *Ḥabiri*, 'plunderers.'

Moreover, considerations of a purely historical kind lead one to see that the Israelites are by no means to be identified with the Ḥabiri of the Amarna tablets. There remains, that is to say, the question *when* the Israelites went down to Egypt. For the answering of this question the statements of the Jahwist are of value, since, in his account of the causes which brought about the migration to Egypt, as well as in speaking of the Exodus, he repeatedly brings Egypt and Canaan into a close political connexion. The famine increased in *Egypt and Canaan*; Joseph drew in for corn all the money in *Egypt and Canaan* (Gn 47<sup>13-14</sup>); when the money in *Egypt and Canaan* was exhausted, the Egyptians handed over their herds to Joseph (v.<sup>15</sup>); merchantmen from Midian move freely between Egypt and Canaan, although at other times the passage of the eastern frontier of Egypt was hampered by all kinds of police regulations; high Egyptian dignitaries accompany Joseph to Canaan; the inhabitants of Canaan are familiar with the Egyptian funeral customs; nay, inhabitants of Egypt and Canaan are expressly described as Egyptians and subjects of the king of Egypt (Gn 47<sup>15-17</sup>). The inference is self-evident: at the time of Israel's entrance into Egypt, Canaan was, according to the testimony of the Jahwist, an Egyptian province.

Now we are in a position to look at the chronological main question, *when* this immigration took place. In the year of the battle at Megiddo (B.C. 1492), Israelitish tribes, Jaḳob and Joseph, are still mentioned in Canaan; that is to say, the immigration must have been *after* this year. Later records, those of Tahutmes III., his son Amenhotep II., and of the Amarna tablets, are no longer acquainted with these tribes, and the serious damage wrought by the Ḥabiri in the time of Amenhotep III. and IV., shows that the moment was very favourable for new immigrants, that, in short, certain changes in the conditions of the various populations were taking place, which facilitated the settlement of new arrivals in the West Jordan land. This settlement became an

accomplished fact. At the time of Joshua we find in S. Canaan peoples who were unknown at the time of the Tahutmidæ, the preponderance of the Amorites is broken, the priestly State of (Uru)salim has disappeared, and in its place rears itself the defiant fortress of Jebus, a foreign tribe quite isolated in Canaan, while in the district of Hebron the Arabo-Aramæan peoples of Jerahmeel and Amalek are settled. These changes must be viewed as due to the incursions of the Ḥabiri, for the letters of Abd-ḥiba describe the severe straits to which (Uru)salim has been reduced by these; but the condition of things at the time of Joshua's invasion shows very clearly that (Uru)salim is in foreign hands, in possession of a warlike tribe, that it has become a tyrant's hold; nay, that it has even lost for the time its original name, which was first restored in David's time along with its elevation to the same sacred character that it had enjoyed as the ancient sanctuary of El Elyon.

For the date of Israel's migration to Egypt we must accordingly fix upon the period between the accession of Tahutmes III. and the invasion of the Ḥabiri, *i.e.* during the reign of Amenhotep III. Now we know that especially during the Syrian wars of Tahutmes III. numerous prisoners and many of those vanquished were taken to Egypt, where some of them had portions of land assigned them in the eastern Delta for cultivation or for pasture, and others were employed as temple slaves. According to the Jahwist, the tribes of

Israel and Jaḳob lived in blood feud with the Shechemites on account of the seduction of Jacob's daughter, Dinah,—it is significant from our present point of view that the Jahwist, in agreement with the Tahutmes list, makes the tribe of Israel (Gn 34<sup>7</sup>) to have been then settled in the neighbourhood of Shechem. In prosecution of this feud 'the sons of Jaḳob' fell upon Shechem and slaughtered its inhabitants. In consequence of this 'the sons of Jaḳob,' presumably the Israelitish tribe known to the Egyptians under this name, saw themselves compelled to move much farther south, to the district of Hebron. One portion of them, the tribe of Joseph, came hence to Egypt as captives,—so is the story of Joseph that has come down to us to be interpreted,—and were settled to the east of Heliopolis in the still uncultivated districts there, which probably belonged to the Tum temple at Heliopolis. Some portions of the tribe of Jaḳob may have followed voluntarily. From the annals of Tahutmes we learn that many of the inhabitants of Canaan removed to Egypt after the decisive battle at Megiddo; it is therefore very natural to suppose that among these there were found also Israelitish elements. But some portions of Israel remained, as we shall yet see, in Canaan. The invasion of the Ḥabiri and *ṣabî GAS* was consequently subsequent to the departure of Israelitish tribes for Egypt.

(To be concluded.)

## Training according to Bent.

BY THE REV. JAMES M. CAMPBELL, LOMBARD, ILLINOIS.

INTO this proverb the wisdom of ages has been packed. The thought which lies upon its surface appears to be simple and self-evident; yet few of the utterances of Scripture have been more egregiously misunderstood. As generally interpreted, it has inflicted many a needless and cruel wound upon sensitive and godly hearts.

I. Consider what this proverb does not mean.

(1) It does not mean that those who have to

'Train up a child in the way he should go: and even when he is old, he will not depart from it.'—Prov. xxii. 6.

do with the religious training of youth are guilty of the neglect of duty if the end of that training has not been secured. The common conception of these words is that they contain an implied promise on the part of God that if parents do their part in the religious training of children the result aimed at will be infallibly attained; and hence where there is failure the inference drawn is that parents have come short of duty. They have