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.)

1927

694TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 17TH, 1927, AT 4.30 P.M.

LIEUT.-COLONEL F. A. MOLONY, O.B.E., IN THE CHAIR.

Lieut.-Colonel MOLONY, who had kindly consented to preside at the last moment, explained that Mr. A. W. Oke, F.G.S., who was to have taken the Chair, had been unable to attend.

After the reading and signing of the Minutes of the previous Meeting, the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of Frank Cockrem, Esq., as an Associate.

The CHAIRMAN announced that Mr. G. B. Michell, O.B.E., had been detained in Egypt, contrary to his hope, and that he would call on the Hon. Secretary to read the paper.

The HON. SECRETARY then read Mr. Michell's paper on "The Comparative Chronology of Ancient Nations in its Bearing on Holy Scripture."

THE COMPARATIVE CHRONOLOGY OF ANCIENT NATIONS IN ITS BEARING ON HOLY SCRIPTURE.

By G. B. MICHELL, ESQ., O.B.E.

IT would be perfectly possible, in the light of present knowledge—imperfect as it still is—to establish the complete concordance of the chronology of the whole Bible with what is known of that of ancient nations. This I have done in my recent work on *The Historical Truth of the Bible.*

In the small space at my disposal on the present occasion I can do no more than select a representative period. I have

chosen that on which the least has been done hitherto, viz. the second millennium before Christ. This includes the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, the Exodus, and the times of the Judges.

For the history of the ancient nations I have taken the latest and most authoritative work on the subject, namely, *The Cambridge Ancient History* (Cambridge University Press, 4 vols., 1923–6).

For the Biblical chronology of the period now discussed I have established in the above-mentioned work the date of the accession of Solomon in 972 B.C. This agrees, within two years, with that given in the *Cambridge History* (vol. i, p. 160), viz. 970 B.C., near enough, for practical purposes, to make the comparison both possible and reasonable.

I take the Hebrew text as it stands, and proceed as follows: Solomon began to reign in 972 B.C.; his fourth year, in which the Temple was founded, was thus 969 B.C. The Exodus was 480 years before that (1 Kings vi, 1), that is, in 1449 B.C., and the descent of Jacob to Egypt was 430 years before the Exodus (Exod. xii, 41), which gives us 1879 B.C., and the sale of Joseph into Egypt in 1901 B.C., his promotion in 1888 B.C., and his death in 1808 B.C. This will be enough for our present purpose.

At this time two dynasties were reigning in Babylonia, the north being under Samsu-ditana (succ. 1901), of the first, or "Canaanite," dynasty, and the south, or "Sealand," being under Damki-ilishu (succ. 1910). The Elamite domination of Larsa had come to an end nearly 100 years before, in 2015 B.C., and Elam itself was now tributary to Babylon. Assyria was still in a small way. We may surmise that it was at about this time that one Shamshi-Adad introduced the worship of Bel into Assyria. He set up a stela in "the Land of Laban," which has been supposed by some to be Lebanon. Apparently the dominant power in Syria and Palestine was Amurru, as the rule of the Elamites there ("Chedorlaomer" and "Kudur-Mabug") had come to an end with the subjugation of Elam itself by Hammurabi and his son Samsu-iluna.

At a conference of archæologists in Palestine, called together by Professor Garstang in 1922 to draw up a general scheme of classification, it was decided to divide the periods as follows:—

Periods.	Phases.	Approximate dates.
I.—Stone Age	1. Paleolithic	—
	2. Neolithic	—
II.—Bronze Age	1. Ancient Canaanite	2500 to 2000 B.C.
	2. Middle ,, ...	2000 ,, 1600 ,,
	3. Late ,, ...	1600 ,, 1200 ,,
III.—Iron Age	1. Ancient Palestinian (*a*) Philistine; (*b*) Ancient Israelitish	1200 to 600 B.C.
	2. Middle ,, Middle Israel	600 ,, 300 ,,
	3. Late ,, (*a*) New Israel; (*b*) Hellenistic	300 ,, 50 ,,

This places the Palestine of Jacob's time in the "Middle Canaanitish" period of culture in the Bronze Age.

In Egypt the XIIIth Dynasty was reigning—we cannot say exactly under which king until the dates of these are fixed. The fact that it was under the native XIIIth Dynasty that Joseph was promoted, and his father and brothers kindly received in Egypt, is of the greatest importance to understand the whole of the subsequent history of Israel.

The invasion of Egypt by the Hyksos cannot be placed by any means earlier than 1800 B.C., as the *Cambridge History* decides. Consequently it could not have been by them that Joseph was raised to the highest position in Egypt under the king, nor Israel settled in the land of Goshen. On the contrary, as Joseph died in 1808 B.C., the king that arose that knew not Joseph could be no other than the Hyksos conqueror. Now it had been foretold to Abram (Gen. xv, 13) that his seed should be a stranger in a land that was not theirs, and should serve them; and *they should afflict them* 400 *years*; "and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward shall they come out with great substance." Thus the affliction of Israel was not merely during the reign of the last Pharaoh before the Exodus, but for four entire centuries. Joseph died in 1808 B.C., and the entrance to Canaan under Joshua was in 1409 B.C.—*exactly* 400 *years*. Thus there is no possibility of

doubting that it was the Aramæan Hyksos that were the oppressors of Israel, who were themselves of Aramæan origin.

In this circumstance we have the explanation of the extraordinary fact that, throughout their history, the Israelites were strongly pro-Egyptian and bitterly anti-Semitic.

In all the relations of the Hamites and the Semites, Semitic Israel alone showed through all its history an undying antipathy to their Semitic kindred, which was bitterly reciprocated, while Hamitic Egypt exercised on them a fascination which held them fast till well into Roman times.

According to the "Reconstructionist" theory there was nothing in the religious opinions of early Israel to divide them from their Semitic brethren, nor in their social life and traditions. I use the term "Reconstructionist" in preference to "Higher Critic" or "Modernist," as an inoffensive title, and because I deny to them the right to be properly called "Critics," or exclusively "Modernist."

We must look for another cause, and a sufficient one, for this persistent antipathy, and since we find no traces of such between the other Semitic races, we must find it in something in Israel itself, in spite of the protests of the prophets. The explanation is furnished by the true chronology alone. It was the oppression of the Israelites by the *Hyksos* in Egypt that infused into the character of Israel an ineradicable instinct of repulsion against everything Semitic. It has been very widely taught that the Hyksos kings were friendly to the Israelites. But this is based upon a false chronology. An examination of the facts will show that the contrary was the case.

When Joseph was sold into Egypt in 1901 B.C., the XIIth Dynasty had come to an end, and, while the XIIIth Dynasty was reigning at Memphis and the north, they were not acknowledged at Thebes, which set up a king of its own, no doubt a junior male member of the old Royal family. Several Theban monarchs reigned, Senusert IV and several Mentuheteps. Egypt was once again divided. This division presented a new and very serious danger which threatened the whole of Lower Egypt, produced by the very means taken by Amenemhat III, of the XIIth Dynasty, to avert such a disaster, namely, the great famine which took place in the time of Joseph.

To regulate the water-supply of Lower and Middle Egypt, Amenemhat III constructed immense hydraulic works in the Fayoum, a low-lying district west of the Nile, south of Memphis.

But the very efficiency of these works brought a still greater menace of famine. If the regulating sluices between Siut and Hawara were to fall into the hands of an enemy it meant that this water-supply would be cut off altogether; only by this means could a famine now occur in Egypt of any seriousness. The Fayoum reservoir would keep supplies going in the case of a low Nile. Now, the conditions during the time of the XIIIth Dynasty were precisely those in which this danger might be realised. The rival princes at Thebes could, at any time, open an inlet at Derut into what is now the Bahr Yusuf, and so run off into the Fayoum an enormous bulk of water, thus starving the whole of Middle and Lower Egypt. If the outlet from the Fayoum into the Nile were also to fall into hostile hands the starvation would be complete. Further, in time of war, the cultivators of the soil would be called off to military service, and the irrigation canals would be untended and soon blocked. Joseph was doubtless well alive to this contingency, and the advice to collect supplies before it should occur was the wisest course possible, in the political weakness of his sovereign.

As for the possibility of a simultaneous famine in Palestine, which was not under the same conditions, "It is equally likely that just as Canaan in a 'short year' was normally supplied with corn from Egypt, now that Egypt was hoarding her supplies, the inhabitants of Palestine and neighbouring territories experienced the sore results of the stoppage of the corn-trade." (Knight, *Nile and Jordan*, p. 113.)

It must be remembered that Jacob and his family, though they were not nomads, and only incidentally were shepherds, were *cattle breeders* and dealers. (Gen. xii, 16; xiii, 2, 7; xlvi, 32, 34.) Besides, and more than, pasture, the cattle, etc., would need fattening foods, which, in a hilly country like Palestine, would have to be imported.

The theory that the Hyksos kings were reigning at the time is based on the impossible hypothesis that the Exodus took place under Rameses II or Merneptah. There is *nothing* in favour of this hypothesis, and everything against it.

(1) The sites of the store-cities, Pithom and Raamses, have nothing to do with the situation of the land of Goshen nor with the Exodus; they might have been anywhere in the realm of the Pharaoh. Nor is it likely, for their purpose, that they would both be in one district.

(2) If the sites that have been claimed for them were built by Rameses II, they were certainly only *rebuilt* by him, for their earlier foundations have been found.

(3) "Rameses," where Joseph settled his brethren, and whence the Exodus started, cannot be the same as the store-city "Raamses" which was *built* by the Israelites.

(4) The decisive argument is that, from the time of Thothmes IV onwards, names compounded with "Ra" were pronounced "Riya," as is shown in the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence. This is an infallible landmark.

Every argument and every conclusion based upon the supposition that Joseph was promoted, and Jacob kindly received, by a Hyksos king must, therefore, be false. On the contrary, the native, the XIIIth Dynasty, was reigning.

It follows, therefore, that the new king that arose up over Egypt, which knew not Joseph (Exod. i, 8), was the *Hyksos*. And this is in entire accord with the facts.

These Hyksos were Aramæans, and consequently of close kin to the Israelites, and it has been generally supposed that they would be friendly to the Israelites for that reason. But the contrary was the case. Israel remained loyal to the Egyptians, and suffered for their loyalty with the Egyptians. There was more than one good reason for this, though it brought them between the hammer and the anvil.

(1) The Israelites had a big stake in the success of the native kings. Joseph was granted a very high position by one of them. This position was then hereditary in Egypt. Even if it were not so in his particular case, he was married to the daughter of the priest of On, and, in accordance with Egyptian law, her sons would inherit from her father. Even under a change of native dynasty this would be the case; only under a foreign domination could they lose their rights. Therefore, the king that knew not Joseph could be no other than a *foreigner*.

(2) It may be asked, Could they not retain their rights by siding with the foreigner, who was of their own race? The answer is, Not in this case; their situation as cattle-breeders in the land of Goshen precluded it.

(3) The theory that this district was in the Wadi Tumilat, in the Eastern Delta, is utterly untenable. There is *no* valid evidence for such a theory, and that district is totally unfitted for cattle- and sheep-breeding on a large scale; it is entirely dependent on *irrigation*, and it would be the first to suffer from a famine, and the greatest sufferer from the lack of water. The family of Jacob went down to Egypt in a time of *famine*, with five years more to come. It would be madness to settle them in such a district.

(4) There was only *one* district in Egypt where there could be no lack of water under any circumstances, and that was the *Fayoum* and the Nile Valley between Cairo and Thebes. It certainly was the best of the whole land of Egypt. (Gen. xlvii, 6.)

(5) The seat of government of the XIIIth Dynasty was at Ithttaui, a fortress-palace near the modern village of Lišht, south of Memphis. Here the government had control of the Fayoum, and it was here that Joseph planted his relatives. (Gen. xlv, 10.) Here they would, in their own interests, keep the closest watch on the sluices and hydraulic works regulating the water-supply. Thus they would hold the key of the whole prosperity of Egypt.

(6) At the first invasion of the Hyksos, the native kings, whether at Memphis or at Thebes, were in possession of this key, and they long retained it. Until these kings were conquered by the Hyksos they were masters of the Fayoum. Even if the Israelites had been traitors to the kings at Memphis and joined the Hyksos, they would have been at the mercy of the kings at Thebes, and until the fortune of war declared itself on the Hyksos side, they would have been in dire peril of destruction by the Egyptians who surrounded them on all sides. What could they do to help the Hyksos? Nothing but to interfere with the water, which would damage the Hyksos as much as the Egyptians.

(7) On the other hand, as Semites akin to the Hyksos they would always be objects of suspicion to the Egyptians. The only course open to them, therefore, was frankly to side with the latter. This would bring upon them a specially bitter revenge on the part of the Hyksos—just what we are told of their attitude to them in Exod. i, 9, 10.

Also, it must be remembered that it was the *kings* that made them serve with rigour, not the people. The Egyptians are depicted in their monuments as being driven by their taskmasters just as cruelly as the slaves. This would foster a fellow-feeling between the Egyptian people and the Israelites.

The kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty had much to do in restoring the country after the expulsion of the Hyksos. Queen Hatshepsut was a specially great builder. Thothmes III (or more probably his son Amenhetep II, who was co-regent with his father at the time) is not represented as being especially hostile to the Israelites, but as resenting any interference with his work going forward.

Nor did the Israelites propose to quit his jurisdiction, which extended over Palestine and all the intervening country.

We have, therefore, the Israelites as *loyal Egyptian subjects*, long resident in Egypt, having absorbed much Egyptian sentiment and culture, considerably intermarried with the Egyptian people, who did all they could to facilitate their departure (Exod. xii, 33–36), and, at the last moment, even enjoying the favour of the king (Exod. xii, 31, 32). This is of prime importance in considering all the succeeding history of Israel. They were *pro-Egyptians* and *anti-Semites*; this did not cease when they were wandering in the Wilderness of Sinai, nor when they entered Palestine. There were always good Egyptian subjects, and they did not attempt to set up a king of their own till the Egyptian authority over Palestine was gone for ever.

While Amenhetep II and Thothmes IV were carrying on their wars in Palestine, Israel was safe in the backwater of Sinai, out of harm's way, incapable of interfering with those kings' operations and with no desire to do so. On the contrary they were useful in keeping the Semites of the peninsula from giving trouble in the king's rear.

The Law was given on Sinai in June, 1449 B.C., and the Tabernacle set up in March, 1448 B.C., and Israel became definitely, at least in theory, a strongly monotheistic nation.

Thothmes IV died in 1414 B.C. (or, according to Professor Breasted, 1410), and was succeeded by Amenhetep III whose wife was Queen Tiy.

The Israelites made no hostile movement until November, 1410 B.C., when they conquered Heshbon, and afterwards Bashan. This was the first act that might call for attention from the

Egyptian king. Then Israel crossed the Jordan into Palestine under Joshua (April, 1409 B.C.), and thus committed themselves definitely to war in that country.

Why did not Amenhetep interfere? Unless we can find an adequate explanation, the conduct of this king and of his successor Akhenaton, in allowing Palestine to be overrun by the Khabiri, is a mystery which no one yet has succeeded in solving. I offer the simple and satisfactory solution that these kings (or, at least in the case of Amenhetep III, his wife) were in *favour of the invaders*.

It must be borne in mind that, although the earliest letters now existing in the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence date from about 1410 B.C., the series is far from complete, and the reports from Canaan, complaining of the activities of "Sa-Gaz" and "Khabiri," do not begin until about 1385 B.C., and then only refer to the intrigues of the Amorite princes Abd-ashirta and his son Aziru, and of the Hittite king Shubbiluliuma in the north. This was in the thirtieth year of Amenhetep III, and twenty-five years after the conquest of Canaan under Joshua. Consequently, even if the Khabiri can be identified with the "Hebrews," these letters cannot describe their initial conquest. It is useless, therefore, to look for the names of kings given in the Book of Joshua in the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, though the places mentioned were the same.

On the other hand, the intrigues of the Hittites and the Amorites in 1385 B.C. do explain how it was that Cushan-Rishathaim was able to oppress Israel from 1383 B.C. to 1375 B.C. The Egyptians advanced to Phenicia in 1377 B.C., but they soon retired. The next year the Hittites conquered Naharin. In 1375 B.C. Abd-ashirta died, and his son was called to Egypt; this gave Othniel his opportunity, and he delivered his people from the yoke of Naharin (Mesopotamia, *i.e.* the country between the *Orontes* and the Euphrates). The next forty years was "rest" for Israel, *i.e.* 1375 B.C. to 1335 B.C. (Judges iii, 11). Now this was the very period of the weakening of Egyptian rule in Palestine under Akhenaton, and their abandonment of the country, till Horemheb restored it, in about 1345 B.C., by his treaty with the Hittite king Shubbiluliuma.

The Israelites were good Egyptian subjects, always keeping within Egyptian jurisdiction, and they were the only people in the Egyptian dominions who were out-and-out monotheists, whose leaders, at any rate, were bent on establishing the supremacy

of Jehovah. It is absurd to suppose that this could be unknown to the king and queen. Who could serve better for the establishment in Canaan of the new religious faith? That Akhenaton did seek to plant his religion in Canaan is evident from the fact that he built an "Aton-city" there, as he did in Egypt and in Nubia. So long as the Israelites were faithful to Egypt, why help to defend the idolatrous Canaanites against such good monotheists? This explanation seems to me to fit the case perfectly.

But these favourable conditions came to an end with the fall of the Aton-cult in Egypt. Under Tut-ankh-amen came the revulsion to the old religion, which was firmly restored by Horemheb. The ideal monotheism of Akhenaton was stamped out, never to rise again; it even became a lasting object of hatred to the Egyptians. The repercussion was not long in falling upon Israel.

By the treaty with the Hittites of 1345 B.C., Naharin and Amurru were left in possession of the Hittites, while Canaan and Phenicia were confirmed to Egypt. But the Israelites would get no protection from Horemheb. Accordingly the Moabites under Eglon had a comparatively easy task in invading and conquering Judæa in 1335 B.C., and in holding it for eighteen years—till 1317 B.C. Horemheb, however vigorous at home, was unable to do anything in Asia. In 1317 B.C. Ehud murdered Eglon, and Israel rose against the Moabites. In 1315 B.C. Horemheb died, and the energetic XIXth Dynasty arose with Rameses I. But he died, too, within a year, and Seti I, his son, came to the throne in 1314 B.C.

In his first year he marched into the country. Undoubtedly, the first to welcome him, protesting their constant fidelity to Egypt, and, more important still, eagerly offering their tribute and help, were the Israelites. Their monotheism, or at any rate their national enthusiasm for it, had by now sadly declined. The protection of the Egyptian king would be well worth the price. Under the stern rule of Seti I and Rameses II (1292 B.C. to 1225 B.C.), Canaan enjoyed the "pax ægyptiaca," which secured to Israel the 80 years' rest spoken of in Judges iii, 30 (1317 B.C. to 1237 B.C.), followed by 40 years more of rest under the judgeship of Deborah, 1237 B.C. to 1197 B.C. (Judges v, 31), making 120 years in all. It is true that the extreme northern tribes, Asher, Naphtali and Zebulon, about "Galilee of the Gentiles," suffered for twenty years during this time from the

oppression of a Canaanite kinglet, Jabin of Hazor; but this was quite local, and there was a good reason for it.

The treaty of Rameses II with the Hittites in 1272 B.C., followed by the marriage alliance of the king in 1259 B.C. with the daughter of Khattusil, resulting in the friendliest relations, set free once more the southward pressure of the Canaanites below the Lebanon mountains, during the feeble old age of Rameses, and while the Hittite kingdom, which was already beginning to decay, was occupied with the invasion of Syria by the rising power of Assyria under Tukulti-Enurta and Ashur-nasir-pal.

Accordingly we find in 1257 B.C., Jabin, the Canaanite king of Hazor, which 150 years before had been the leading state in the Lebanon district (Joshua xi, 1–13), raising his head again, and reasserting the ancient position of his state. Ehud was dead, and under Shamgar anarchy prevailed in the north (Judges v, 6), while Sisera, Jabin's general, devastated Naphtali and Zebulon for twenty years. In 1257 B.C. Deborah aroused Barak to revolt, and, by the slaughter of Sisera by Jael, the freedom of the north was restored, and Deborah judged Israel in peace for forty years, to 1197 B.C.

It is true that Merneptah, who succeeded Rameses in 1234 B.C., made a devastating raid through Palestine three years later (1231 B.C.), a boastful account of which he engraved on the back of an old stela of Amenhotep III; but the damage he did to the Israelites was at least grossly exaggerated. With indiscriminate ferocity he smashed everything in his path, and after his return in triumph to Egypt collected all the names he could find in a long list in his exultant stela; but it is significant that the name "Israel" is accompanied by the sign that denotes a foreign people. Israel lived still mostly in the mountains, but they doubtless had settlements in the plains which must have suffered. But so little did the raid affect the nation as a whole, and so small and transitory were its effects, that there is no mention of it in the Bible. Possibly, too, the Israelites, as good Egyptian subjects, took it in good part. The description of Palestine as a "widow" is perhaps a scornful allusion to Deborah.

But Merneptah's gallant struggle, though successful for a time, was in vain. Hordes of mixed peoples form the north-west poured down on Palestine and Egypt, a wholesale invasion which introduced a totally new state of affairs in all the Near East. These northerners also descended into Libya, and some even

poured into the Delta of Egypt, where anarchy had ensued on the death of Seti II, 1205 B.C. Setnekht, 1200 B.C., eventually restored the kingdom, but he reigned only about two years, and was succeeded by his son Rameses III (1198 B.C.). At first this vigorous king had his hands more than full with things at home and threatenings of invasion from Libya. Meanwhile, profiting by the practically entire absence of Egyptian rule in Palestine, and after the death of Deborah in 1197 B.C., the Midianites, and Amalekites and other "children of the east" poured into Judæa and filled the land, hunting the Israelites into the dens and caves of the mountains (Judges vi, 1–10), and "brought Israel very low."

By this time, no doubt, the ruthless destruction of trees in Sinai had desiccated the peninsula into almost its present condition, and the nomad tribes there were drawn to the fertile valleys of Palestine just as the Israelites had been 250 years before. For seven years they devastated the land until the Lord raised up Gideon and delivered Israel by him, 1190–1150 B.C. During this time Egypt was invaded by the Libyans (1194 B.C.), and Rameses III, though he was successful in driving them out, had a severe task which taxed all his resources, and forced him to relinquish all his Asiatic possessions. He had scarcely returned in triumph home, when the whole great wave from the north descended upon him (about 1191 B.C.), both by land and by sea. Rising gallantly to the occasion he defeated them both by land and by sea.

In this crisis Gideon, surnamed "Jerubbaal," with his little band, had his small share in helping the Egyptian overlord. The story is graphically told in Judges vi and vii, and it bears all the indications of truth. Ephraim and the other tribes joined in after Gideon's initial victory, and the deliverance was complete. Although the action of Rameses made this possible, the Book of Judges, which is a "Philosophy of History" rather than a bare narrative, true to its purpose, ascribes it solely to the guidance of Jehovah.

Again the "pax ægyptiaca" reigned in the land for a time, though Rameses soon found it necessary to appear again in Syria with his army, and he organized the Asiatic possessions of Egypt as stably as possible. After a reign of thirty-one years of success, Rameses III died in 1167 B.C. Under his successors Egypt rapidly decayed.

In 1150 B.C., Gideon died and family dissensions arose, but the

general prosperity of the country subsisted. Abimelech, son of Gideon, was " prince over Israel three years " (Judges, ix, 22)—(1150–1147 B.C.). He was followed by Tola, who judged Israel twenty-three years (Judges x, 2)—(1147–1124 B.C.). Then arose Jair the Gileadite for twenty-two years (1124–1102 B.C.).

We must revert now, for light on after-history, to the great invasion of the northerners in 1196 B.C. This had brought with it a new settlement in the coastland of Palestine of colonists from Caphtor (*see* Jer. xlvii, 4, and Amos ix, 7). There had been settlements of " Casluhim " in Philistia from the days of Peleg (2420 B.C.) (*see* Gen. x, 14 ; xxi, 32, 34 ; Exod. xv, 14 : xxxii, 31 ; and Judges iii, 3). To these Moses, writing in the fifteenth century B.C., had given the name of " Philistines." The "Casluhim" have not been identified, but it would seem that they came from Caria and Lycia. Some of these, or near relatives of theirs, also settled in Crete, if " Caphtor " is identical with the Egyptian form " Keftiu," as seems probable ; but they were not originally Cretans, that is to say, Minoans, from whom they differed in certain particulars. A body of Cretans is recorded in Deut. ii, 23, as having invaded Palestine at a very early date, and as having displaced the aboriginal " Avvim," and " dwelt in villages as far as Gaza."

The Philistines, who now settled in Palestine, are described as true Caphtorim, no doubt on account of their long residence in that island. But both the earlier immigrants from Caria, and the later ones from Crete, seem to have borne the one name of " Pulesati," " Peleset " or " Pelishtim," and to have been of the same character, religion, customs, and costumes. How near the Philistines came to annihilating Israel, and the long struggle that brought out Israel as victorious in the end, with its poignant vicissitudes, is dramatically told in the Books of Judges and Samuel.

Meanwhile another result of the great invasion soon made itself felt in the north-east and east of Palestine.

Mesopotamia and Assyria were under the domination of Babylon from about 1210 to 1174 B.C., but Merodach-Baladan I could do little in Naharin. In 1174 B.C. Ashur-Dan I of Assyria succeeded in turning the tables, with the help of Shutruk-Nakhunte of Elam, on Zamama-shumiddin of Babylon, and shortly afterwards the long-lived Kassite Dynasty of Babylon came to an end (1170 B.C.).

About sixty years afterwards Nebuchadrezzar I of the new

Dynasty of "Pashe," tried to recover the lost dominion of Babylon over Assyria, but he was heavily beaten in two successive campaigns. Again, in 1107 B.C., Marduk-nadin-akhi tried conclusions with Tiglath-Pileser I of Assyria, with disastrous results. There was nothing for it but submission, a course which was wisely taken by Marduk-Shapikzerim of Babylon in 1090 B.C., who thus secured peace and prosperity for his kingdom.

But the successful revolt of Ashur-Dan I had restored to Assyria the provinces west of the Euphrates, though the wars with Babylon kept him from exerting his power in that direction. The invasion of the northerners had passed southwards, and the moment was opportune for the establishment of a strong confederation of Aramæans in Syria. "Damascus was now become the centre of an Aramæan state, and gradually in course of time the Amorites and Hittites of the Orontes valley and northern Syria were swamped and absorbed or driven out by the steady pressure of the Aramæans. On the south the new-comers came in contact with the Hebrews, the boundary between Hebrews and Aramæans being on the coast of Jordan the Yarmuk, while on the west it ran northwards up the Jordan valley to the mountains where the tribal territory of Asher marched with the sea coast of the Phenicians" (Hall, p. 400). The effect of this was soon manifested in Gilead and all the Israelite country beyond Jordan. While the newly arrived Philistines were trying to push inland on the west (Judges x, 7), the Ammonites, in 1126 B.C., invaded Gilead north of Jabbok, and "vexed and oppressed the children of Israel that year, eighteen years oppressed they all the children of Israel that were beyond Jordan in the land of the Amorites which is in Gilead" (Judges x, 8). They even crossed the river into Judah, Benjamin, and Ephraim. Their excuse was an ancient claim to the land which had been taken by Moses from Sihon three hundred years earlier (Judges xi, 13 *ff.*). From this oppression the Gileadites were finally delivered by Jephthah in 1108 B.C., the Aramæan kingdom being meanwhile raided by Tiglath-Pileser I of Assyria.

Meanwhile the Israelites in Canaan continued to enjoy comparative quiet under the failing rule of Egypt, giving them a certain degree of autonomy, while judged by Tola and Jair, the latter governing Cis-Jordania until 1102 B.C., while Jephthah governed Gilead beyond Jordan till the same year. Ibzan followed them over all Israel till 1096 B.C. It was during his judgeship that Eli was high-priest and ecclesiastical judge,

and the birth of Samuel may also be placed in this period. All was still quiet. Babylon and Assyria were on good terms, which lasted for many years. The XXth Dynasty of Egypt had decayed rapidly under a succession of feeble Ramessides, until in 1100 B.C. Herihor, a priest of Amen at Thebes, took the reins and founded the XXIst Dynasty. He was, however, unable to control all Egypt, and a dynasty of Tanites under Nsibanebded established themselves as kings of the Delta.

In 1095 B.C. Ibzan was succeeded by Elon as judge of Israel, and in 1085 B.C. Abdon followed him till 1077 B.C.

But the dark cloud that had been rising in the south-west of Palestine now loomed up black and threatening. We may place the rise of Samson in about 1079 B.C., the man with a character strangely mixed of strength and weakness, who was destined to play a large part in the lurid drama. He acted as military leader for twenty years, under Eli and Abdon, with some success at first, until he went down, captive and blind, not long before the death of Eli in about 1059 B.C.

While Abdon was judging Israel, the Philistines on the Mediterranean coast had by now organized themselves and had become a formidable force. Finally, in 1077 B.C., the storm broke over Israel which came near to annihilating the nation. For forty years the Chosen People, who had woefully degenerated from being what Moses and Joshua had tried to make them, with no help from any outside source—their patron Egypt being all but prostrate also—bore the brunt of the determined efforts of the Philistines to subdue them.

In 1059 B.C. a disastrous battle ended in the capture of the Ark, the death of the two sons of the high-priest and the consequent death of old Eli himself. The superstitious Philistines, however, smitten with fear of plague, soon returned the Ark, which was deposited in the house of one Abinadab (1059 B.C.). Meanwhile his foster-son Samuel had taken on the reins from the falling hands of Eli, and with unfailing faith held fast to the anchor of hope—though almost alone. Despairing Israel, left without a leader after the collapse of their hero Samson, looked to some man to deliver them, and, at last, decided to stand out as an independent monarchy. In spite of Samuel's protests, he was directed by God to humour the people in so far as to give them a lesson in the futility of the remedy of their own choosing. The choice fell on Saul, a big, commanding Benjamite, and in a private interview in 1052 B.C. this man was anointed by Samuel

as "prince" or "captain" (*nagid*, not king, *melek*) of Israel (1 Sam. x, 1). He does not seem, however, to have taken an active part in defending the people till some twenty-five years afterwards, when he came forth and led the people to victory over Nahash the Ammonite at Jabesh-Gilead, 1027 B.C., after which he was publicly acclaimed as king by the whole people (1 Sam. xi, 15).

Before this it was Samuel who judged the people. After the Ark had been for twenty years in the house of Abinadab, the people began to "lament after the Lord" (1 Sam. vii, 2). Samuel gathered them at Mizpeh and organized reforms. Then, in 1037 B.C., an attack by the Philistines was repulsed in a decisive battle at Ebenezer: "so the Philistines were subdued, and they came no more into the coast of Israel," thus ending the forty years of oppression by the Philistines of Judges xiii, 1. The Israelites even recovered "the cities which the Philistines had taken from Israel, from Ekron even unto Gath; and the coasts thereof did Israel deliver out of the hands of the Philistines" (1 Sam. vii, 14). There was also peace between Israel and the Amorites.

This happy state of peace between the belligerents lasted for twelve years, until the second year of Saul's reign as king, *i.e.* 1025 B.C. (1 Sam. xiii, 1), when Saul attacked the Philistines at Michmash. He was now a middle-aged man with grown sons, the youngest of whom, Ishbosheth, was twenty-five years old. Another son, Jonathan, showed fine qualities, and, had he lived, would have made a first-class king. But God had other designs, and was preparing "a man after his own heart." The story of David is a little difficult to piece together chronologically. As he was thirty years old when he began to reign in Hebron (1 Sam. v, 8), in 1012 B.C., we know that he was born in 1042 B.C., ten years after Saul was anointed by Samuel as "leader." If we place David's slaughter of Goliath in the year after the Battle of Michmash in 1025 B.C., he would be about eighteen years old when he performed that exploit. It was before this (1 Sam. xvii, 15) that he used to play the harp for Saul. From the state of Saul's mind on those occasions it is not surprising that he did not connect the young musician with the hero of the great exploit on Goliath.

Though the temporary successes of Saul and Jonathan showed what could be done with the united people, the Philistines, when thoroughly roused, could generally master them with comparative

ease, and the gallant efforts of Saul and Jonathan ended in disaster on Mount Gilboa (1012 B.C.).

The Philistines seem to have been content with this victory, and Ishbosheth carried on his father's work quite undisturbed by them for seven years, till he was murdered in 1005 B.C. Meanwhile his brethren of Judah had crowned David as their king at Hebron, on the death of Saul. After the death of Ishbosheth, all Israel combined to make David king. His first act was to capture the still unsubdued citadel of the Jebusites in Jerusalem. This he fortified, and then made Jerusalem the capital of the country. Here he reigned for thirty-three years, to 972 B.C. With uniform success he conquered all the enemies of Israel, and left to his son Solomon a consolidated and independent realm which secured to Israel the position, for the time being, of one of the acknowledged powers of the Near East.

As the history of Israel now enters on a new phase, we will draw our rapid sketch to a close at this point.

There are very many other points of contact of which much might be said. They all show that the history given in the Bible is in minute concordance with such facts as have been definitely ascertained of the history and chronology of the surrounding nations. All that is required is to stick closely to the actual text of the Bible, in all its figures as well as its words, to see that it is literally true.

[*N.B.*—For the purpose of this paper the subject has been treated from the purely political point of view. That the hand and mind of the All-Mighty was behind all the movements discussed, as revealed in the first ten Books of the Holy Scriptures, is the author's firm belief. The rich spiritual lessons of types and doctrines are made none the less valuable by being thrown out against the dark background of Israel's failure and the strivings of the nations.]

Discussion.

The Chairman (Lieut.-Colonel F. Molony) said: This is one of the most learned and relevant papers for the purposes of the Institute that I remember to have heard read. There are many original theories advanced in it, and they seem to be of a constructional character which will strengthen our faith in the accuracy of Scripture.

We are asked to alter our long-held ideas as to the position of the land of Goshen and other matters, but these ideas, to begin with, were not based on plain readings of the Bible.

Many have been puzzled as to what could possibly have caused seven years of famine in Egypt. Mr. Michell advances an interesting and tenable hypothesis as to how this might have come about, but he does not say that there is any historical evidence, apart from Scripture, whether it *did* come about in this way or not. I hope that he will add some remarks on this point in his general reply. Sir William Willcocks, K.C.M.G., M.I.C.E., in his book on *The Assuân Dam and Lake Moeris*, gives plans and levels of the Fayoum, and many facts from which we may gather that the famine in Egypt in Joseph's time may well have been caused by a power hostile to lower Egypt diverting the Nile flood into the Fayoum. He quotes Diodorus Siculus as follows: "King Moeris dug a lake which is amazingly useful and incredibly large. For as the rising of the Nile is irregular, and the fertility of the country depends on its uniformity, he dug the lake for the reception of the superfluous water, and he constructed a canal from the river to the lake 80 furlongs in length and 300 feet in breadth. Through this he admitted or *let out* the water as required." Then King Amenemhat of the XIIth Dynasty "widened and deepened the canal."

Sir William Willcocks describes how this "mighty inland sea" (2,500 square kilometres) "was quite capable of reducing a very high flood to moderate dimensions; and if injudiciously or maliciously opened in a low flood, it was capable of depriving Lower Egypt of any flood irrigation at all, and mind, in those days, they had practically no irrigation except flood irrigation. . . . The history of Joseph's famine becomes quite intelligible. . . . It may be that during some of these years the Nile was experiencing a series of low years such as we have had since 1899. In this case the famine in Egypt, aggravated by the opening of the Lake Moeris dyke, must have been severe indeed."

Sir William appears to hold that the drawing back of the water of the Lake during low Nile, plus infiltration into the sand, plus loss by evaporation, would so reduce the level of Lake Moeris during low Nile that it could take the flood discharge for several years in succession, provided that no extra heavy flood came down. From

figures he gives, in another work, it appears that the summer discharge of the Nile is only one-twelfth the average flood discharge. It is therefore clear that, if the canal was wide and deep enough, a quantity of water could be drained back at low Nile, which would be useless for irrigation purposes in the Delta.

Our author confirms all this from the chronological and historical side.

(A vote of thanks having been accorded for the paper, the discussion proceeded.)

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said: The paper to which we have listened is, of course, very difficult to follow because it cuts vertically and horizontally all the chronology which we have learnt from youth upward. We still regard Usher, with all his faults, as the father of Biblical chronology, and when one considers the limited material he had to work upon we must regard his work as really wonderful. There is, however, one branch of Biblical chronology which seems to have been neglected, but which I feel sure would be a fruitful field for investigation, and that is the Jubilees and the Sabbatical years.

It is generally conceded that we have four dates about which we are tolerably certain—these are Sabbatical or Jubilee dates—*viz.* 590, 163, 135 and 37 B.C. Upon the face of it, it is quite clear that 163 and 135 cannot both be Jubilee years, but may be Sabbatical years, because the difference between 163 and 135 is not 7×7 (equals 49) but only 28 years (4×7). From these figures it is easy to make, with absolute certainty, a list of all the Sabbatical years, going backward or forward seven years at a time for any of these dates. For example, if you start at 37, and count back the Sabbatical years seven at a time, the dates are 44, 51, 58, 65, and you come back to 135. If you start at 135, and take seven years backward, you get 142, 149, 156, 163 B.C. If then you work backward from that, you will come to 590 B.C. Further, if you work backward from that, you come to 1003 B.C., the generally accepted date for the consecration of the Temple of Solomon.

The difficult years to discover are the Jubilee years, and for that we have practically little data. If we can only be sure of but *one* Jubilee year, then all other Jubilee years are easily calculated. I

am going to suggest that A.D. 26 was a Jubilee year, and I do it on several grounds: I have before me Lindo's Jewish Calendar, giving the sections of the Law and Prophets to be read on every Sabbath, which list is supposed to have been derived from the work of Ezra. The section for the Sabbath numbered 51, which comprises the reading of Deut. xxix, 10, to the end of chapter xxx, was on the Sabbath called Nitzabin (taken from the first word of the Lesson), read together with Isa. lxi, 10-lxiii, 10. The Lesson called Nitzabin is always in *every* Jewish year read on the last Sabbath of the year—which is generally about the middle of September. That is followed, about ten days later, by the Day of Atonement, which generally begins early in October, and is ten days later, being the 10th day of the month Tishri. Now on that memorable Sabbath when our Lord went into the synagogue, and after the reading of the Law had handed to Him the roll of the Prophet Isaiah, instead of beginning to read from verse 10 of chapter lxi, he read verse 1, a passage which, apparently, had never before been read in public, because I suppose no one ever felt he could say that the "Spirit of the Lord was upon him." In this verse you have the words "the acceptable year of the Lord," which is a Jewish term for the Jubilee. There is a passage, Luke vi, 1, which seems to suggest that there were two Sabbaths between Luke iv, 32, and Luke vi, that the second Sabbath was a Great Sabbath and the Sabbath nearest to the Day of Atonement. At any rate that is the view of some who have studied the Greek text.

Now at the time of the Jubilee it was the custom for all debts to be forgiven by the pious Jews, and for all persons to be restored to their ancestral lands: this explains several passages in the Gospels, and notably that in the *Paternoster*, which says "forgive us our debts as we also forgive our debtors." Supposing that I am right, and that the list which I have drawn up is correct,* then from the time of the first keeping of the Jubilee in Palestine, say, 1444 B.C. to A.D. 26, there would have been 210 Sabbatical years and 30 Jubilees—1444 plus 26 equals 1470, divided by 7 equals 210, and divided by 7 equals 30; and if we assume that the call of Moses was the first day from which to reckon the Jubilee year (two years before the Exodus, forty years in the wilderness, and seven fighting for

* *See* List on p. 95 *infra*.

the land, you get another forty-nine). You then make up that list to approximately our own day, that is, A.D. 1937, and you will have seventy Jubilees, or 3,430 years.

It must be confessed there are very few traces of the Jubilees in the Bible, but there are certain events which are better understood if we connect them with these Sabbatical or Jubilee years. If you take the case of Ruth, which is generally dated 1312 B.C., you will see that the next Jubilee is 1297 B.C.; therefore the land of the family had to be redeemed at a value to be based on the next Jubilee. If the date when David was in the Cave of Adullam was 1062 B.C., the next Jubilee would be 1052, or 10 years later, and we may assume that the Shylocks of that day were very insistent upon getting in their money before the Jubilee could "wipe the slate" and cancel debtors' obligations; so in the language of the Hebrew, there were a number of desperate men who gathered to David who had a creditor or were bitter of soul. If you take the widow whose son was going to be seized by a creditor and put the date at 895 B.C., the next Sabbatical year would be 891 B.C.; so her son would be for four years under the dominion of some person who had purchased him. The Shunamite also, dated at 885 B.C.; the next Jubilee is not till 856, or 29 years later, yet the king commanded that the land should be returned to her.

There is a famous case of 590 B.C., which is referred to in Jer. xxxiv, but this is obviously not a case of a Jubilee but of a Sabbatical year, and 590 was a Sabbatical year. Coming down to later times, the Jubilee year was due in A.D. 75, or five years after the fall of Jerusalem, and two years after the Sabbatical year, and it may have been the Sabbatical festivities which caused Jerusalem to be so full of fanatics at the time of the outbreak which lead to the downfall of Jerusalem. One thing, however, is on record, that the beginning of the rebellion was when a number of wild and desperate men attacked and destroyed the archives of Jerusalem and all records of debts.

Finally, I would like to say that there is a very strange coincidence. From this last date A.D. 26, we find that 1839 would be a Jubilee year, and that on August 1st, 1838, possibly, if we could really get the very day, we should find it exactly fell on a Jubilee day that slavery was finally and for ever abolished in the British Empire. There

seems nothing, however, under the subsequent dates which in any way connects Jubilees or Sabbatical years with the taking of Jerusalem on December 9th, 1917, the date when England became at once the liberator and the protector of what is yet to be the renewed Jewish Kingdom or State.

Mr. G. WILSON HEATH: Mr. Michell has evidently given the subject much thought and careful study. I rather think that he has endeavoured to solve an impossible problem, and I say this after some considerable study of the subject. The paper easily makes openings for kindly criticism; but as the whole theory seems to rest on chronology, I will direct my remarks to this.

I am convinced that true Bible chronology and that of "ancient nations" will never be found to agree. The records on stone, baked bricks or papyrus, are conflicting, whereas the chronology of the Bible, if gathered up with care and without prejudice, is never contradictory. It is well known that the kings or rulers of "ancient nations," in order to attain their own personal ends, had a bad habit of altering or obliterating records of dates, and at times they destroyed the records entirely. They kept, of course, all such records in their own libraries, and under their own charge, and were thus able to do exactly as their particular policy might indicate. Not so with Bible chronology; it remains absolutely dependable, as God breathed it.

Usher's dates, as given in our Bibles, up to the end of the Book of Joshua, are, I believe, as nearly correct as may be; I have taken some trouble to verify this. Throughout the Book of Judges, Usher seriously fails, by allowing a curious error to creep in, and apparently Mr. Michell does the same. Both seem to make their "bench-mark" the 480 years mentioned in 1 Kings vi, and both of them, possibly, forgetting that the Apostle Paul in Acts xiii gives the number of years covered by exactly the same period as 573 years, this being the correct number in *anno mundi* years.

It appears to me that the lecturer, like Usher, by taking 480 instead of 573 years, starts with false premises and of necessity arrives at false deductions; and this, in exactly the way Usher's dates, after the Book of Joshua (*i.e.* in Judges), confuses many issues; so does Mr. Michell. For instance, we are told that Joseph died

1808 B.C., and that 400 years afterward Joshua led the children of Israel into the promised land of Canaan; this is stated to fulfil a promise given to Abraham. I will not labour the point that this was not the promise given to Abraham or to anyone else, but I suggest that the date, 1808 B.C., is arrived at by a method of calculating *backward* from 1 Kings vi, and is therefore seriously incorrect. If the chronology had been calculated from the known "bench-mark"—Adam's age as given in Gen. v and thence forward—than which nothing can be simpler, for the Genesis ages are all clearly stated—it would have been found that Joseph died in 1635 B.C. (at the age of 110) and not in 1808 B.C.. In Exod. xii, 40, 41 (and this is where the 400 and 430 years come in), we are reminded of God's promise to Abraham in Gen. xii, in 1921 B.C., from which time the 430 years can easily be calculated as being reached exactly as stated in Exod. xii, in 1491 B.C., the "sojourning" in Egypt being 215 years and the "dwelling" 215 years, or 430 years in all: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years. And it came to pass at the end of 430 years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." This, I submit, contradicts the suggestion that the 400 years must be calculated from the death of Joseph to the entrance into Canaan under Joshua, which is said in the paper to have taken place in 1409 B.C., but which I believe to have been in 1451 B.C. The quotation in Exod. xii, 40, 41, settles the question for me.

On p. 68 we are told that Joseph was sold into Egypt in 1901 B.C., but by very simple Bible chronology it can be proved that this event occurred in 1727 B.C., when he was 18 years of age, and he died at the age of 110 in 1635 B.C. As far as I have tested the chronology in the paper I have failed to find a date upon which I could rely, and this is what I should expect from the method adopted by Mr. Michell. A starting-point or "bench-mark," as all compilers of figures and calculators well know, must be at one or the other end of a datum line. Mr. Michell, I judge, starts at 1 Kings vi, which is somewhere along his datum line, and works backward it seems, with disaster to his results and his Hyksos theory, with which I therefore cannot agree chronologically, though in large measure agree on other grounds. We must remember that Egyptology is at the moment in the melting-pot of revision.

As to the later part of the paper, may I say that to me confusion appears to deepen. I am sure that God's chronology is orderly, and I submit that, from the creation of Adam to the birth of our Lord, as most chronologers admit, there was an interval of, say, 4,000 or 4,100 years. I have no doubt it was $100 \times 40 = 4{,}000$ years, be these years of 360 or 365 days is immaterial. Further, the Kingdom was set up when Saul was anointed, and this, I suggest, was in 1000 B.C. Samuel had previously judged Israel for 40 years; then Saul, David and Solomon each reigned 40 years; and this number 40 (and its multiples) dominates the entire book (*see* the flood periods of 40, the Tabernacle details of 40, the wilderness journeyings of 40 years, the 40 stripes and many 40 days, etc.).

I am glad to agree whole-heartedly with the last sentence in the paper (p. 81): "All that is required is to stick closely to the actual text of the Bible, in all its figures as well as its words, to see that it is literally true."

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT: I consider the last two paragraphs are really the best part of this paper, and if only Mr. Michell had adhered more closely to the Scripture record throughout, his Lecture would have been much more valuable. For example, he speaks on p. 67 of the "400 years" affliction of the Hebrews as terminating when Joshua entered Canaan, while the Scriptures speak of "430" years, and tell us distinctly that the period ended, not when Joshua entered Canaan, but the day that Israel *went out from the land of Egypt*, or 40 years before Joshua entered Canaan! (Exod. xii, 41.)

Then, on p. 72, he speaks of the Egyptians doing "all they could to facilitate the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt," and that the Hebrews even "enjoyed the favour" of Pharaoh, as if they were all friendly together. This is not at all the impression one gets from reading the sacred Record. Indeed, it is just the opposite. For it was only after Egypt had been devastated by ten plagues that Pharaoh, at length, reluctantly let the people go (Exod. x, 7). Even then Pharaoh regretted that he had done so (Exod. xiv, 5), and actually later pursued after them (Exod. xiv, 8). As to the attitude of the Egyptian *people* toward the Israelites, it was only by divine intervention that they showed them any favour at all, as we read in Exod. xii, 36: "*The Lord gave the people favour in the*

sight of the Egyptians." Why the lecturer should have given us such a confusing account of these occurrences I cannot understand.

Miss HAMILTON LAW: May it not be that over and above any action of the rival princes in Middle and Upper Egypt, there really was a scarcity of water? If the sudd (a weed) up above Khartoum had grown to any very great extent, it would have trapped a good deal of the alluvial deposit which is in the Nile water, a natural dam would have been formed, and a vast quantity of water would have been held up. The force-weight of this volume of water might in time have rushed the sudd, broken through it, and caused great plenty. One has heard this suggestion put forward in Egypt.

Lieut.-Colonel A. H. C. KENNEY-HERBERT said: Any remarks that I can offer must be made without that consideration which this paper deserves. I was on the Headquarter Staff of the Army of Occupation from 1901 to 1906, and now speak from memory of any general information, picked up more than twenty years ago.

(1) *Re* the suggestion that the Israelites were settled south of Cairo, speaking as a soldier, I would ask how they could leave their homes after dawn on 15th Abib and reach Succoth that evening, Etham by next evening, and Pihahiroth the day after? It was physically impossible for any general to conduct an untrained rabble of slaves so long a distance in the time. True that they could have marched by moonlight.

(2) Once we carried out manœuvres at the very point generally supposed to be Rameses. We rode back to Cairo in one day from, if I remember right, Belbeis. Without meaning to do so, we competed with an old sheik on his donkey. His donkey never varied a running titup. Often we passed him at the canter, but he caught us up when we walked, and in the long run he arrived in Cairo before us, cool and undisturbed. My memory is that the day's ride did really take some nine hours or so. Add a further ten miles to the point suggested by the writer—ten miles through soft sand—and I submit that a rabble with women and children could not have done the march on foot in under two or three days. From where I speak of, Belbeis, there would be quite three days' further journey, *via* Succoth, Etham and Pihahiroth to any point of the Bitter Lake.

(3) I always understood that the Yusuf Canal was constructed by Joseph after he had been made a viceroy; that is to say after or during the seven years' plenty and the seven years' famine. If this be true, the canal could not have been used to divert the waters of the Nile to the Fayoum oasis. A better point for this suggestion would have been a marked valley, east of the Nile at Aswan.

(4) The holding back of the waters, if due to sudd, might have caused a shortage for the seven years' famine, but the bursting of the accidental dam of vegetation could not account for the years of plenty which preceded the year of famine. The plenty was, the famine was; I do not see anything very unusual or improbable in this.

I regret that I know nothing of Egyptology, and dare not criticize the writer's suggestions from that point of view, but I have spent some seven years in working out the chronology of the Bible, on the assumption that God Himself is the Author of it, and is responsible for every word and letter of the original. I find that the statements of time contained in the Bible can be pieced together without amending any text from that which has been generally "received." The scheme of chronology that results stands the test of the closest examination of moon dates and weekdays, and I can find no flaw in the harmony.

From the point of view of the student who is seeking exact dates compiled from the Bible only, I regard those of this paper as valueless. If the writer is content with a broad margin of twenty-five years either way, and if this margin justifies the harmony he proposes, personally I have no more to say. I think that he places the Exodus some twenty-seven years too late, and Solomon some eighteen years too soon. But I could not substantiate this opinion without data which would be wearisome to listen to.

I hope that the author will succeed in establishing his points for the benefit of those who would be happier to know that such a harmony is possible. Personally, I believe that the ox and ass may not be yoked together to plough this field of research.

Written Communication.

Colonel H. Biddulph, C.M.G., D.S.O., writes: The lecturer states, on p. 66: "the descent of Jacob to Egypt was 430 years

before the Exodus " (Exod. xii, 41), but this statement is open to some argument. The Biblical statements are (*a*) Gen. xv, 13, 16 : " Thy seed shall be a stranger . . . and they shall afflict them 400 years " (quoted in Acts vi, 6) . . . " but in the fourth generation they shall come hither again " ; (*b*) Exod. xii, 40 : " Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years " ; (*c*) Gal. iii, 17 : " The covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was 430 years after, cannot disannul."

These statements, viewed superficially, appear to be discordant ; but the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX throw a different light on Exod. xii, 40. " Now the sojourning of the children of Israel and of their fathers, who dwelt *in the land of Canaan* and in the land of Egypt, was 430 years " (Sam. Pent.). The LXX reads practically the same, and the Palestine Targum explains the 430 years in the same way as the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX. If this is correct, and there is at least a *prima facie* case in its favour, the 430 years would seem to date from the call of Abraham (*æt.* 75) (Gen. xii, 1), and the 400 years from the mocking of Isaac by Ishmael (a typical historical fact), which was some 30 years later (Isaac *æt.* 5, and Abraham 105). The descent of Jacob into Egypt would then be 215 years before the Exodus. This chronology does not seem to be in disaccord with the Bible statements, viewed typically, and removes the apparent difficulties. If correct, the lecturer's dates and chronology of this period would require serious modification.

Author's Reply.

I am grateful for Lieut.-Colonel Molony's kind appreciation of my paper, but I regret that so little attention was paid to the real subject of my thesis, and that the discussion on it was so largely diverted to side issues.

My purpose was by no means to propose a " harmony," but to examine the Comparative Chronology of *Ancient Nations* in its bearing on Holy Scripture. The Bible does not require harmonizing either with profane history or with profane science. It is the revealed Truth of God, and the standard by which all man's works and thoughts are to be judged.

I must decline to discuss here rival schemes of Bible chronology, which are in no way relevant to my subject.

I have taken the chronology of the Bible as it stands in the Massoretic text, and stuck closely to all its figures as well as its words. This is why I reject the chronology of Usher, which requires the alteration of some of the figures, and which later information has shown to be imperfect.

I find it stated in 1 Kings vi, 1, that the period from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple was exactly 480 years. I also find it stated in Exod. xii, 40, 41, that the sojourning of the children of Israel, which they sojourned in Egypt, was 430 years. I take these statements to be the inspired words of God, and that is quite enough for me. I cannot pit St. Paul's incidental and indefinite remark against the positive statement in Kings, which I believe to be equally inspired with the Apostle. And I interpret St. Paul so as to accord with Judges, Samuel and Kings. St. Paul says nothing whatever about 573 years, which are an unwarranted intrusion into his text.

Neither can I admit the authority of the late and very faulty translation of the LXX, nor of the Samaritan, against that of the Hebrew text. Mr. Iverach Munro has shown that the Samaritan was extensively revised (*Transactions of Victoria Institute*, vol. xlv, p. 187). And I take the "confirmation" of Gal. iii, 15, 17, to refer to the assurance given by God to Jacob at Beer-Sheba on his way to Egypt, as recorded in Gen. xlvi, 1–4.

I stick to the Bible statement that the *sojourn* of the Israelites in Egypt lasted exactly 430 years, from the descent of Jacob to the Exodus. The 400 years of *affliction* in Egypt is quite a different matter. It manifestly began *after the death of Joseph*, before which time the Israelites were in the very contrary condition to affliction. It ended when the Israelites *ought* to have entered into rest in the Promised Land (Heb. iv, 8). It is misleading to confuse the two different periods, as Mr. Sidney Collett does. I am sorry he finds my account confusing. If he will take the trouble to set out my figures on a sheet of paper in tabular form, I think he will see the account to be clear enough.

The answer to Lieut.-Colonel Molony's question whether the Fayoum depression would hold the crest of five or six Nile floods is given in the affirmative by the extract from Sir William Willcocks' *The Assuân Dam and Lake Moeris*. The whole question is thoroughly discussed in Sir William's *From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing*

*of the Jordan**. With regard to the *outlet* from the Fayoum to the Nile, none exists now. It was silted up centuries ago. It is now represented by the Magnuna Canal, north of the Gebel Abu Sir, and originally fell into the Nile a little south of Wasta, along the immense bank, built by Menes, now known as the Salîbat Qusheisheh. The causes of this silting up it would be too long to give here, but I shall be happy to furnish Sir William Willcocks' explanation of them to anyone who will be good enough to write to me (c/o The Nile Mission Press, Sharia Manakh, Cairo).

The Nile brings down so much silt that its bed rises about four inches in a century. It is now, therefore, about 13 feet above its level in the days of Amenemhat III (1970 B.C.). The lowest point of the Fayoum, now the Birket Qarun, is about 170 feet below sea-level. The level to which the water rose in Lake Moeris is marked by uniform lines of Nile shells at 22·5 metres (about 74 feet) above sea-level.

As for historical evidence that the famine of Joseph's time did come about in the way I have described, some people have thought that the famine " lasting many years " recorded in the inscription on the tomb, at El Kab, of one Baba, an official under Seqenen-Ra III of Thebes, was that of Joseph. But the " short chronology " now accepted (with the addition of 120 years on account of the change in the Egyptian calendar before the XVIIIth Dynasty), makes this impossible, as it is 270 years too late. Another long famine occurred in the time of the last Pharaohs, and again another in A.D. 1065. The latter lasted for seven years, till A.D. 1071. The conditions on all these occasions make it practically certain that they arose from the cause I have advanced.

In reply to Colonel Kenney-Herbert's point (3), what is now the Bahr Yusuf canal was originally the western one of the two main channels of the Nile which enclosed the " Island Nome " of antiquity, now the Gebel Abu Sir. After the neglect of Lake Moeris as an overflow basin, this branch silted up. It was deepened by Saladin (Salah ed Din Yusuf ibn Ayub, Sultan of Egypt, A.D. 1171–93), and received its present name " Yusuf " from that monarch.

May I ask Colonel Kenney-Herbert whence he gets the impression that the Israelites left their homes at dawn, and reached Succoth that evening, Etham by the next evening, and Pihahiroth the day

* London: E. and F. N. Spon.

after ? I find these stages mentioned, but nothing as to the time they took to do the distances. The people took a whole month (Exod. xvi, 1) to reach the " Wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai," and there is no reason to imagine that they spent nearly the whole of that time at Elim. The docility of the people in turning back at Pi-ha Hirot shows that they were in no fear of recapture, and also that they were in no hurry to reach any particular place. I believe they drifted along at their leisure, the encampments mentioned being those of Moses' headquarters. This applies to the whole forty years. The Israelites did not pass Belbeis at all, nor the Bitter Lakes. They crossed the Nile by the Meadi ferries, passed Basatin, and along the Wadi et Tih, by Bir el Jeudali, directly eastwards to Suez past the Gebel Ataka, probably to the *south* of this hill. Père Sicard did this journey in 1716, in two days, on a donkey.

Of course, the attitude of Pharaoh and his people towards the Israelites was by Divine intervention, and Pharaoh was reluctant enough to let the people go. But after the hammer-blows of the plagues they were terrified, and only too anxious to get rid of Moses and his whole crowd. Israel marched out with, no doubt, an arrogant air. It was only when Pharaoh learned, by their doubling back at Pi-ha Hirot, that they were not intending only to perform their religious ceremonies in the Arabian Desert, as he had expected, but were leaving Egypt proper altogether, that he pursued after them. Till then he left them quite free. He had probably sent orders to his local authorities to give them every facility.

With regard to the sudd in the Nile, I know of no reason why it should have had any other effect in ancient times than it has now. But as the bed of the river was 13 feet deeper in Joseph's time, it does not seem probable that sudd collected then at all.

I quite agree with Mr. Wilson Heath that the number forty and its multiples dominate the history of Israel, and I add to his examples the following interesting facts :—

(1) The affliction of Israel in Egypt lasted 400 years (40 × 10).

(2) The period from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple was 480 years (40 × 12). I have no doubt that Solomon waited until the second month of his *fourth year* with the definite intention of beginning the Temple on the 480th anniversary of the Exodus.

(3) From the failure of the men of Judah to drive out the Jebusites

from Jerusalem, in 1404 B.C., to the success of David in doing so, in 1004 B.C., was also 400 years (40 × 10).

(4) From David's capture of Zion, in 1004 B.C., to Nebuchadnezzar's capture of it, in 604 B.C. (Jer. xxv, 1 ; Dan. i, 1), was also 400 years (40 × 10).

But I can find no Scriptural warrant for the surmise that the creation of Adam was 4,000 years before the Birth of our Lord.

With regard to the period from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple, we have an independent confirmation that it was exactly 480 years, as stated in 1 Kings vi, 1, in the argument of Jephthah in Judges xi, 26. He pointed out that it was then just 300 years since the Israelites conquered Heshbon. If the 40 years from the Exodus to that conquest, and the periods between Jephthah and the Foundation of the Temple, as shown in my paper, are added to these 300 years, they will be found to make exactly 480 years. Thus :— Wandering, 40 ; to Jephthah, 300 ; Jephthah, 6 ; Ibzan, 7 ; Elon, 10 ; Abdon, 8 ; Philistines, 40 ; Ebenezer to Saul, 10 ; Saul as *king*, 15 ; David, 40 ; Solomon's fourth year, 4 ; total, 480.

I have only to add that I shall be happy to send, gratis and post free, to anyone that cares to ask for it, a copy of my complete tables of the comparative chronology of the whole of the Old Testament.

Suggested List of Jubilee and Sabbatical Years.

By W. C. Edwards.

(*See* p. 84 and note.)

B.C.	**1444** (1437, 1430, 1423, 1416, 1409, 1402)	B.C.	**660** (653, 646, 639, 632, 625, 618)
	1395 (1388, 1381, 1374, 1367, 1360, 1353)		**611** (604, 597, 590, 583, 576, 569)
	1346 (1339, 1332, 1325, 1318, 1311, 1304)		**562** (555, 548, 541, 534, 527, 520)
	1297 (1290, 1283, 1276, 1269, 1262, 1255)		**513** (506, 499, 492, 485, 478, 471)
	1248 (1241, 1234, 1227, 1220, 1213, 1206)		**464** (457, 450, 443, 436, 429, 422)
	1199 (1192, 1185, 1178, 1171, 1164, 1157)		**415** (408, 401, 394, 387, 380, 373)
	1150 (1143, 1136, 1129, 1122, 1115, 1108)		**366** (359, 352, 345, 338, 331, 324)
	1101 (1094, 1087, 1080, 1073, 1066, 1059)		**317** (310, 303, 296, 289, 282, 275)
	1052 (1045, 1038, 1031, 1024, 1017, 1010)		**268** (261, 254, 247, 240, 233, 226)
	1003 (996, 989, 982, 975, 968, 961)		**219** (212, 205, 198, 191, 184, 177)
	954 (947, 940, 933, 926, 919, 912)		**170** (163, 156, 149, 142, 135, 128)
	905 (898, 891, 884, 877, 870, 863)		**121** (114, 107, 100, 93, 86, 79)
	856 (849, 842, 835, 828, 821, 814)		**72** (65, 58, 51, 44, 37, 30)
	807 (800, 793, 786, 779, 772, 765)		**23** (16, 9, 2. A.D. 5, 12, 19)
	758 (751, 744, 737, 730, 723, 716)	A.D.	**26** (33, 40, 47, 54, 61, 68)
	709 (702, 695, 688, 681, 674, 667)		**75**