

Names of those who are willing to make this effort are sent to the Editor at Kinneff, Bervie, N.B. There is no fee or other obligation.

As the study proceeds, Members may send short papers (if they so find it convenient) on some passage in the books chosen. If possible, the best of these papers will be published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. But whether they are published or not, the best ten papers will be chosen at the end of the session, and books will be presented to their writers, selected by themselves out of a list which the publishers will send them.

Papers received during the session 1895-96 have now been examined, and those sent by the following are judged to be most meritorious:—

- Rev. Martin J. Birks, Brinnington Rise, Stockport.
 Rev. Hugh H. Currie, M.A., B.D., Keig, Aberdeenshire.
 Rev. J. Edwards, 14 Whetley Grove, Bradford.
 Rev. E. Hall, Poole, Dorset.
 Rev. J. Harries, M.A., Wesleyan Manse, Dundee.
 Rev. Alfred Huddle, M.A., Leyton Rectory, Essex.
 Rev. F. Jarratt, Goodleigh Rectory, Barnstaple.
 Rev. D. Macfadyen, M.A., Hanley.
 Rev. J. MacGillivray, B.A., B.D., Montreal.
 Rev. H. Northcote, The Vicarage, Feudalton, Christ Church, New Zealand.
 Rev. John Reith, B.D., Rickarton Manse, Stonehaven.
 Rev. James Smith, M.A., Tarland.

Papers were received from laymen also, but they did not reach a high standard this year. The twelve volumes will accordingly be sent to the above by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, who will arrange with the writers as to their selection.

There is considerable difficulty always in the choice of the portions of Scripture for a new session. Many things have to be taken into account; but perhaps the most important thing is this, that at least one reliable modern commentary should be available for study. Now it is generally recognised that the ablest commentary that has ever been published in English on the *Book of Deuteronomy* is Professor Driver's in 'The International Critical Commentary' series (T. & T. Clark, 12s.). We have used the book daily since its issue, and with ever fresh surprise at its completeness, accuracy, and devotional suggestiveness. It is no doubt somewhat expensive to the working student; but it is worth a library of lesser books. We have accordingly chosen *Deuteronomy* as the Old Testament portion of study for the coming session.

The same consideration has fixed *St. Mark's Gospel* for the New Testament. Professor Gould's commentary in the same series (10s. 6d.) is not the masterpiece Dr. Driver's is. But there is little doubt it is the best in existence in English. To those, however, who wish a less expensive and less exhaustive work, Professor Lindsay's volume in the 'Handbook' series may be recommended. It is published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark at 2s. 6d., a very small price for an excellent book.

Merenptah and the Israelites.

I.

BY PROFESSOR F. HOMMEL, Ph.D., LL.D., MUNICH.

THE recent sensational 'find' of the Merenptah inscription has already formed the subject of discussion by the discoverer, Flinders Petrie, as well as by Spiegelberg, Steindorff, and others. My own investigations have led me to the following results, which are of the highest importance for the history of Israel:—

The newly-discovered text mentions a disaster that has overtaken *Isir'al* (written with the determinative for 'people'; cf. for the form of the word the Assyr. *Sir'il*). This reference must certainly

be understood of the Israelites, but *Merenptah himself was never in Palestine*, and neither Seti I. nor Ramses II. (his immediate predecessors), in describing their Palestinian campaigns, make any mention of that people. Hence we must think of *the Israelites as not yet settled in Palestine at the date of the inscription*. In other words, the Exodus must have taken place shortly before—favoured probably by the complications which arose upon the death of Ramses II. (Ex. ii. 23). This becomes clear when we compare the two accounts we pos-

ness of the events of Merenptah's fifth year (B.C. 1277). The first of these, an inscription that has been long known, gives a detailed narrative of the expulsion of the Libyans and their allies from Egypt, which took place in the month Epiphi of the said fifth year. All the peoples are enumerated who, in conjunction with the Libyans, ravaged Egypt during the first years of Merenptah's reign;—the *Luku* (Lycians), *Akaivas* (Achæans?), *Turs* (Tyrrhenians), *Saklus* and *Sardin* (Sardinians). These were sea-robbers from Asia Minor and Europe, of whom the Sardin are already known in the so-called Tel el-Amarna period (c. 1400 B.C.) as Phœnician auxiliaries, and under Ramses II. as Egyptian mercenaries, while the Luku figure as allies of the Hittites during the great Hittite war of the last-named monarch (B.C. 1343 ff.). It was upon *Egyptian ground* that the decisive battle was fought in Merenptah's fifth year, and we have a specially detailed account of the flight of the Libyan king, Mauriuji the son of Did. There is emphatic mention also of the ingratitude of the sea-robbers and the Asiatics (who are designated generally 'people of the bow,' *Pidti-shu*). Although Merenptah had permitted the latter to carry Egyptian corn in their ships to 'the land of Cheta' (i.e. the district of Asia Minor inhabited by a section of the sea-robbers), yet they had invaded Egypt. From this important notice we gather (1) that by *Pidti-shu* it is especially Phœnicians that are meant, for they alone were engaged in transporting grain by sea, and (2) that Semites from Asia, especially Phœnicians, had taken part in the attacks upon Egypt directly or indirectly (perhaps by supplying provisions to the invaders). Finally, there is an enumeration of the prisoners and the spoil along with the trophies of victory. In this instance, however, only the Libyans and the above-mentioned sea-robbers are named, which again indicates that the Phœnicians were only indirectly concerned. Had the latter taken part in the war directly, or had Merenptah marched against them to Palestine, this must have been mentioned in the inscription.

A strictly parallel account is contained in our new text. If the inscription of Karnak, just described, is of a poetical character, that on the recently-discovered stele belongs still more clearly to the same category. Of this the merest novice may convince himself by an unprejudiced comparison of the two. The new inscription is like-

wise dated in the fifth year of Merenptah, and indeed on the third day of the month Epiphi—the very day on which the decisive battle was fought. It relates in bombastic fashion the defeat of the Libyans and the flight of their king, Mauriuji; but strangely enough mentions none of the sea-peoples, but in their stead the land of Phœnicia (*Zahi*). The latter indeed comes before the Libyans, near the commencement of the long-winded inscription.¹ This circumstance is readily explained by the fact that the sea-robbers came for the most part *viâ* Phœnicia, and were provided with supplies by the Phœnicians. It was thus unnecessary for the narrator to name the strange peoples from the north who had caused such alarm and commotion in Egypt. We thus get at the same time the key to the understanding of the quite general terms of the close of the inscription:—

'The princes are cast to the ground, while they cry *shalôm*. Not one of the peoples of the bow lifts up any more the head. *Libya* is laid waste; *Cheta* (the home of a section of the sea-robbers) is brought to rest; *Kana'an* (the name of a Can.-Egypt. frontier town) is captured with (?) every wicked one; *Ashkelon* is led captive; *Gezer* (in Philistia) is taken; *Jeno'am* (near Tyre) is brought to nought; *Isir'al* is *fekt*,² he has no fruit more; ³*Chor* (Palestine, not Syria, especially the part of it bordering directly upon Egypt, the Goshen of Josh. x. 41 and xi. 16) has become a widow (*chor*, a play upon words) of the land of *Ta-mera* (i.e. Egypt); all the countries are at peace. Every marauder has been chastised by the king'. . . (here follow the name and title of Merenptah).

It will be observed that by a poetical licence, instead of *Zahi* (Phœnicia), which was used before to designate a section of the sea-robbers, the text now introduces a number of prominent places on the Phœnicio-Philistine coast, already known from the wars of Seti I. and Ramses II. That the Pharaoh had ever actually engaged in war with these is neither stated, nor is it to be read between the lines; nay, if we take into account also the Karnak

¹ The passage in question runs, 'he (Merenptah) who has pierced the land of *Zahi*.'

² Written with the determinative for 'vile things.' The meaning can only be guessed at, for the word (as a substantive) does not occur elsewhere. Perhaps it is = 'a waste,' or possibly = 'a horde,' from *fk*, 'march to war.'

³ Literally, 'his fruit exists not,' i.e. he has fruit no more, (either literally, alluding to the Sinaitic peninsula, or figuratively).

inscription, such a notion is absolutely excluded. A new people, however, and one that appears here for the first time in an Egyptian inscription, is mentioned—Israel—which is viewed by the Pharaoh as implicated in the troubles of the preceding years. The circumstance that *Chor* (Palestine) is mentioned immediately after Israel may point to the Palestinian origin of that people, which naturally was well enough known to the Egyptians, and is called in question only by modern pentateuchal criticism.

While, then, the meaning of Merenptah's allu-

sion to the Israelites is involved in considerable obscurity, the fact remains that they are named, and that, too, in the connexion I have explained. This is extremely important, because it lends new support to the old conjecture that Merenptah was the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

In conclusion, I would only remark that neither in Ex. xiv. 26 ff., nor in the unquestionably ancient song of Ex. xv., is it said that the Pharaoh himself perished in the Red Sea. These passages speak only of his host and his chariots.

II.

BY SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, LL.D., MONTREAL.

Referring to your notice of this interesting and important discovery in your June number, and to the article of Professor Flinders Petrie in the *Contemporary*, I beg to offer a few suggestions as to its import and relation to biblical history, and in favour of one of the explanations proposed by the discoverer.

To begin, I cannot believe that Merenptah was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. He was one of the Pharaohs of the Oppression, but the Exodus itself apparently took place in the short reign of his successor Siptah, the last king of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and the immediate predecessor of the time of anarchy recorded by Rameses III. in the 'Harris Papyrus,' and which led to the rise of a new dynasty. A few years following Merenptah's death were occupied by Seti II. and by a usurper; and the short and inglorious reign of Siptah, the next legitimate king, who seems to have left no issue, may have terminated abruptly in the Red Sea. With him in any case the great Nineteenth Dynasty, whose kings knew neither Joseph nor Jehovah, ceased from the earth.

To turn to the inscription itself. It is evident that it relates chiefly to the war against the Lybian invaders, which is treated in great detail, and with the usual grandiloquence of Egyptian official bulletins. The part relating to Palestine and to Israel is quite subordinate and supplementary, and relates to the sequel of the great war. It was not unnatural that certain of the Canaanite dependencies of Egypt should take advantage of the Lybian invasion either to assert their independence or to inaugurate revolutionary disturbances which had to be quelled on the expulsion of the Lybians.

The reference to Israel is even less definite, and may well have applied to the people when resident

in Goshen and its eastern extension to the head of the Red Sea.

During the Lybian war, if there was excitement among the Canaanites, this must have been felt even more strongly by the Israelites on the eastern frontier, who would watch the conflict with hopes of deliverance from their bondage, either by the victory of the Lybians or by the weakening of the Egyptian power, and may even have been tempted to overt acts of rebellion or to treasonable plots. At the close of the war, and after the suppression of the Canaanite revolts, these would be punished, possibly by the execution of some of the headmen, and by the plundering of some of the Israelite towns or settlements supposed to be most disaffected, and not improbably by the revival or re-enactment of some of the old edicts of Rameses II. respecting the destruction of the male children, as well as by the increase of the forced labour required of the people,—a measure the more suitable, because of the necessity of repairing the damage caused to towns and temple enclosures by the Lybian invasion.

The question next occurs—Is there any reference in the Bible to all this? The great Lybian war is not mentioned explicitly; but there are traces of its effects to which the discovery of Professor Flinders Petrie should now direct attention.

One possible reference is that in Ps. lxxviii to misconduct of the Ephraimites at this period, which, whatever it was, is recalled in connexion with their selfish policy in far later times. Ephraim was no doubt the leading tribe in the age immediately succeeding that of Joseph, and may have had some military organisation for defence against the Eastern nomads. In the troubled reign of Merenptah the Ephraimites may have been