

The Date of the Exodus

RALPH M. EARLE, JR.

According to Ussher's chronology, which has been used widely in editions of the King James Version of the Bible, the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt under Moses took place in 1491 B. C. Ussher's work, of course, was based wholly upon Biblical data. Modern archæological excavation has provided a new set of controls for Old Testament chronology. However, it is interesting to note that archæology has confirmed the approximate correctness of many of Ussher's dates. This is especially true of his dating the life of Abraham, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the entrance of Joseph into Egypt.¹

I. THE PROBLEM

Archæological discoveries have seemingly served only to complicate the problem of the date of the exodus and of the conquest of Canaan. Equally eminent authorities have reached distressingly different conclusions from the available archæological data. Burrows calls it "one of the most debated questions in all biblical history."²

The excavations of Naville in 1883, which he felt had uncovered the ancient store city of Pithom, seemed to identify Rameses II as the Pharaoh of the oppression, and his successor, Merneptah, as the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Since the latter began his reign in 1225 B. C. it was concluded that the exodus from Egypt took place at about that date.

Then came Garstang's excavations at Jericho which convinced him that the destruction of that city by Joshua and the Israelites took place at about 1407. That would date the exodus at 1447 B. C.

However, Garstang's conclusions have not been universally accepted. Albright has carefully reworked the data from Jericho and reached different conclusions from those of Garstang. At the same time such scholars as Theophile Meek have gone over the whole problem and arrived at still other results.

We shall want to notice five theories with regard to the date of the exodus. The first holds to a date around 1580 B. C. The second is that of Garstang, who places the event at about 1440. The third, defended by H. H. Rowley, goes to the opposite extreme by dating the exodus after the middle of the thirteenth century, at around 1240 B. C. The fourth is that held by Theophile Meek, of the University of Toronto. He proposes two invasions of Canaan: first by Joseph tribes, which had never been in Egypt, under the leadership of Joshua crossing the Jordan sometime around 1400, and a second one into Judah from the southern desert in the second half of the thirteenth century. This second invasion would agree with Rowley's date. The fifth theory is that advocated by Albright. He, too, suggests two phases or stages of the conquest. But he differs from Meek in holding that both conquering groups came out of Egypt. There was an exodus of the Joseph tribes between 1550 and 1400. This second group conquered Jericho between 1375 and 1300. The second

¹ Burrows, Millar: *What Mean These Stones?* pp. 71f. This volume hereafter referred to as WMTS.

² *Ibid.*, p. 72.

group left Egypt at about 1290 and conquered Lachish and Debir about 1230 B. C.

II. PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

1. *The Earliest Date.*

Some scholars have held that the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt took place at the time of the expulsion of the foreign Hyksos rulers. This took place between 1580 and 1550. The Hyksos domination of Egypt lasted about one hundred and fifty years, and Burrows argues that this is the most reasonable length of time for the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt.³

But it appears evident that a date around 1580 is impossible. That would imply a date for the conquest of Canaan before 1500 and thus require a period of some five centuries for the times of the judges. That seems unreasonably long. So we shall have to reject the date of 1580 as being much too early.

2. *Garstang's Theory.*

As has already been noted, Garstang dates the exodus at about 1440 or 1447 B. C. He bases this partly upon the pottery found at Jericho. Speaking of the level at Jericho which gives every evidence of having been the city destroyed by the Israelites, he says:

Among the thousands of potsherds characteristic of the period, found among and below the ruins, not one piece of Mycenaen ware has been observed. This fact suggests that the fourteenth century had not begun at the time the walls fell.⁴

He confesses to finding one piece of Mycenaen art, a vase, but holds that it does not properly belong to the ruins of Jericho destroyed by Joshua. He writes concerning this vase:

It pertains, as the evidence shows, to a partial reoccupation of the northern extremity of the site, outside the former limits of the upper city and above the debris that marks its fall.⁵

Garstang dates this vase at about

1300, but thinks some houses were built on the edge of the ruins of Jericho some time after Joshua's day. He concludes his study of the destruction of the city by saying: "The evidence all points, then, towards the year 1400 B. C. for the fall of Jericho."⁶

In his preliminary discussion of "Chronology and Dates" he places the date of the exodus a little more definitely at 1447 B. C., basing this upon the passage found in I Kings 6:1.⁷ The significance of this passage will be noted a little later.

In *Bible and Spade* Caiger supports the date of Garstang, which makes Amenhotep II, rather than Merneptah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Caiger presents an array of English scholars in support of this early date.⁸ One gets the impression that recent English scholars tend to favor the early date. This is not true of American archaeologists today.

Professor G. Ernest Wright in his excellent article, "Epic of Conquest," in the *Biblical Archaeologist*, gives a good summary of Garstang's view. In the city cemetery at Jericho Garstang found many Egyptian scarabs in the tombs. The latest Pharaoh named on these scarabs is Amenophis III, who reigned about 1413 to 1377 B. C. (1415-1380, Burrows). Professor Wright discounts this evidence. He says: "Every Palestinian and Egyptian archaeologist knows that scarabs are not good evidence, since they were handed down as keepsakes and charms, and were widely imitated even centuries later."⁹

The other main argument used by Garstang was that of the pottery, as we have noted. Practically no Mycenaen ware was found in the ruins of

⁶ *Ibid*, p. 147.

⁷ *Ibid*, p. 55.

⁸ Caiger, Stephen L., *Bible and Spade*, p. 192.

⁹ *Biblical Archaeologist*, III, 3 (Sept., 1940), p. 34.

³ WMTS, p. 72.

⁴ Garstang, John: *Joshua-Judges*, p. 146.

⁵ *Joshua-Judges*, p. 147.

Jericho. Since this form of pottery did not appear much in Egypt and Palestine until after 1375 B. C., Garstang argues that the destruction of Jericho took place before that date.

But three pieces of this pottery were actually found on this site. As we have noted, Garstang believes that a later settlement was made on the edge of the ruins of the city. This idea Professor Wright rejects. He says: "There is little evidence, however, for such a reoccupation, and, as far as the writer is aware, no other leading archaeologist who is a pottery specialist accepts this view."¹⁰

The pottery unearthed at Jericho has been examined carefully by Professor W. F. Albright and Father H. Vincent, whom Wright labels "the two greatest authorities on Palestinian pottery."¹¹ Neither of these two scholars accepts Garstang's conclusions. Professor Albright thinks that the city was destroyed between 1375 and 1300 B. C. Father Vincent argues for a date around 1250. Professor Wright openly rejects Father Vincent's arguments, but finds himself in accord with Albright. He concludes: "One thing seems certain; the city fell after 1400 B. C., but how long after must remain an open question."¹²

One very important advantage of Garstang's date is that it fits the biblical data in Judges 11:26 and I Kings 6:1. In the latter passage we are told that Solomon began to build the temple "in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel came out of the land of Egypt." It is also indicated that this was in the fourth year of Solomon's reign. Assuming that this was 962 B. C., it would give a date of about 1442 B. C. for the exodus.

In Judges 11:26 Jephthah is quoted

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 35. See also his discussion in the *Westminster Historical Atlas*, pp. 37-40.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 36.

as saying that the Israelites had occupied the territory of Moab for three hundred years. If Jephthah lived at about 1100 B. C., which appears most reasonable, that would give us a date around 1400 for the conquest of Moab by Moses, shortly before the entrance into Canaan. However, this date for the occupation of Moab is questioned seriously by scholars today, on the basis of recent archæological discovery.

The Amarna letters have been taken by some as evidence in favor of Garstang's date. These letters were written by Canaanite kings in Palestine and Syria to Amenophis IV, who reigned about 1377-1359. Abdi-Hepa, King of Jerusalem, complains that certain people called the Habiru (or Khabiru) are invading his territories. The name occurs over and over again on these tablets, while on those of other Kings the invaders are called SA-GAZ (cutthroats). These Habiru are pretty generally identified with the Hebrews. But the evidence here is somewhat confused, especially since the names of the kings of Canaan on the Amarna tablets do not agree with those listed in Joshua.

George L. Robinson holds to this early date for the Exodus. He places the fourth year of Solomon's reign at 965 B. C., which would give a date of 1445 B. C. for the Exodus. He seeks to show that that harmonizes with the statement in Exodus 12:40 that the Israelites were in Egypt for 430 years (1875-1445).¹³

3. *The Latest Date.*

Back in 1883 Naville excavated what he took to be the site of Pithom, one of the treasure cities of Rameses II. The identification is disputed, but many scholars have concluded from the Egyptian excavations that Rameses II was the Pharaoh of the oppres-

¹³ Robinson, Geo. L., *Bearing of Archaeology on the O. T.*, pp. 55f.

sion. This view is well expressed in the article "Chronology of the Old Testament," by E. L. Curtis, in *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*. There we read:

The Pharaoh of the oppression, under whom the children of Israel built the treasure cities Pithom and Raamses (Ex. 1:11) was Ramses II. This fact, long conjectured, has been definitely settled by Naville's identification of Pithom, and discovery that it was built by Ramses II.¹⁴

This quotation will serve to show the attitude of finality taken toward this question by reputable scholars of a generation or so ago. For some of them it was "definitely settled" by the archæological discoveries in Egypt. This view is presented by the late George A. Barton in his monumental work, *Archæology and the Bible* (Seventh Edition Revised, 1937). He declares that Rameses II was the Pharaoh of the oppression.¹⁵ That would, as commonly inferred, make Merneptah the Pharaoh of the Exodus. One piece of evidence that is pertinent to the point is that the mummy of Merneptah has been found, buried like those of his predecessors. It could be seen in the Gizeh Museum at Cairo before the discovery of Tutankhamen's tomb. At least he was not drowned in the Red Sea, although some effort has been made to show that he was.

In connection with Merneptah it would be well to notice his pillar or stele, which was discovered by Petrie in 1896. It is of special interest as being the earliest inscription that mentions Israel outside the Bible. We quote part of the text as given by Barton:

Plundered is Canaan with every evil
Carried off is Askelon,
Seized upon is Gezer,
Yenoan is made as a thing not existing.
Israel is desolated, his seed is not;
Palestine has become a widow for Egypt.¹⁶

Holding as he does that the Israelites left Egypt in the reign of Merneptah, Barton is perplexed by their presence in Palestine at that time. It appears impossible to hold that all of Israel left under Moses during the reign of Merneptah. Either the Exodus occurred at an earlier date or in more than one section. The only other possible alternative would be that some Israelites did not go down into Egypt at all but stayed in or near Palestine. These last two possibilities have been suggested by recent scholars. The evidence of the Stele of Merneptah is thus definitely in favor of the earlier date for the Exodus and opposed to the late date theory.

While the Stele of Merneptah argues against the late date, there is another piece of evidence that seems to favor it very definitely. That is the mention of a people called "Apiru" on the Egyptian inscriptions. The name is identified by Burrows as "doubtless the Hebrews."¹⁷ Since Rameses II mentions these people as being employed by him in heavy labor it would argue that the Hebrews did not leave Egypt until probably the time of his successor, Merneptah. But this view is complicated by an inscription of Rameses IV which indicates that there were *Habiru* in Egypt at about 1160 B. C.¹⁸

The identification of the Habiru with the Hebrews is still a debatable point. Barton gives the form *prw* as equal to Aperu or Apuri. Burrows adopts the form 'Apiru. Wright prefers the form Khabiru. Cyrus Gordon cites the occurrence of the term on the Nuzu tablets and says: "Most scholars accept the identification of a people called Habiru in the cuneiform in-

p. 376. See also H. H. Rowley, "Early Levite History and the Question of the Exodus" in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, III, No. 2 (April, 1944), pp. 73-78.

¹⁷ WMTS, pp. 74f.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

¹⁴ *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. I,

¹⁵ P. 26.

p. 398.

¹⁶ Barton, Geo. A., *Archæology and the Bible*,

scriptions with the Hebrews."¹⁹

The main contribution of the references in the Nuzu tablets is to the effect that the Habiru were normally slaves. Dr. Gordon, in fact, contends that originally the term "Hebrew" referred not to a nation, a religion, or a language, but to a social status. He concludes by saying: "It is too soon to say what bearing the Habiru data may have on the study of the enslavement of the Hebrews in Egypt."²⁰

The Habiru appear prominently on tablets of about 1800 B. C. from the reign of Haran, in northern Mesopotamia, where Abraham lived for a time. We read of them as employed by the Pharaohs of Egypt at around 1300 B. C. Wright agrees with Gordon that the term refers primarily to social status.²¹

There is one other important result of recent archæological exploration which definitely favors the later date for the Exodus rather than the earlier one. We refer to the work of Dr. Nelson Glueck in Transjordan. Dr. Glueck has described his discoveries in Transjordan with admirable clearness in his recent book, *The Other Side of the Jordan* (1940). The main point which is pertinent to our discussion is that while he found abundant evidence of the existence of a settled population in this region before the time of Abraham, yet from about 2000 to 1300 B. C. there were no large towns or cities in the territories of Ammon, Moab, or Edom. The Biblical account seems clearly to indicate that there were well-established kingdoms there when the Israelites approached Palestine on the east.

As a result of his explorations in this region Dr. Glueck has come to the conclusion that the earlier date for

¹⁹ *Biblical Archaeologist*, III, 1 (Feb., 1940), p. 12.

²⁰ *Loc. cit.*

²¹ *Biblical Archaeologist*, III, 3 (Sept., 1940), p. 31. See also R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 215.

the exodus is untenable. He writes:

It becomes impossible, therefore, in the light of all this new archaeological evidence, particularly when studied in connection with the deposits of historical memory contained in the Bible, to escape the conclusion that the particular Exodus of the Israelites through southern Transjordan could not have taken place before the 13th century B. C., . . . Had the Exodus through southern Transjordan taken place before the 13th century B. C., the Israelites would have found neither Edomite nor Moabite kingdoms, well organized and well fortified, whose rulers could have given or withheld permission to go through their territories.²²

Glueck's findings are corroborated by Gordon. In a very interesting chapter on "Exploring Edom and Moab" he says:

An examination of hundreds of sites showed that the countries were heavily occupied from the twenty-third to the nineteenth century B. C. Then there was a virtual blank with no occupied cities until the thirteenth century B. C. Now the historic importance of that is obvious to any Bible student because it is stated that the children of Israel wandered through that territory only to meet with opposition on the way to the Promised Land. Until the thirteenth century there could have been no such opposition because the land was devoid of a settled population. Therefore, the fifteenth century date of the Exodus that most scholars had been adhering to is quite out of the question, and we are obliged to return to the traditional date of the Exodus and Conquest in the thirteenth century.²³

In his *New Light on Hebrew Origins*, J. Garrow Duncan gives no less than nine arguments in favor of dating the exodus at around 1226 B. C. Several of these do not seem to us to be very convincing. But we mention two. The first is that chariots of iron are mentioned in Joshua 17:16, whereas iron was not commonly used in Palestine until the twelfth century. The other has to do with the reference to Philistines in Joshua 13:2. Duncan maintains with most scholars that "according to present results of archæology the Philistines were not present in force till the twelfth century."²⁴

²² Glueck, Nelson, *The Other Side of the Jordan*, pp. 146f.

²³ Gordon, Cyrus H., *The Living Past*, pp. 36f.

²⁴ Duncan, J. G., *New Light on Hebrew Origins*, pp. 188f.

J. N. Schofield in his book, *The Historical Background of the Bible* (1938), emphasizes these two arguments. With regard to the appearance of iron in Palestine he writes:

A fairly accurate date for the introduction of iron through Asia Minor into Egypt is given by the discovery at Boghaz Keui of the cuneiform copy of a letter from Ramses II to Hattushil, the Hittite king in the first half of the thirteenth century, asking him to supply him with smelted iron.²⁵

There is another argument used by Duncan which is set forth more clearly and fully by Schofield. That is, that the Egyptians were in control of Palestine until the time of Rameses III or from about 1600 to 1200 B. C. Why is it that their presence and domination is never mentioned in the Biblical record? But Schofield admits that the actual Egyptian rule of Palestine may have been slight, so that it could have been passed over in silence by the Hebrew chronicler.

The thirteenth century date for the exodus is further supported by the excavations at Bethel, Lachish, and Debir. The excavation of Bethel by Albright in 1934 indicated that there was a prosperous city there which was destroyed by fire, probably in the first half of the thirteenth century. Of course this date, offered by Albright, would place the Exodus considerably earlier than 1226 or 1240, but would still permit it to be left in the thirteenth century.

Apparently Lachish (now identified with Tell Duweir) was destroyed in the latter part of the thirteenth century. Among the ruins of this city was found a bowl bearing a date in the fourth year of some Pharaoh. Egyptologists are agreed that the writing comes from about the time of Merneptah and Albright dates it definitely thus at 1231 B. C. Hauptert holds that his argument on this point

is "almost irrefutable."²⁶

The third city, Debir, or Kiriath-sepher, has been identified with Tell Beit Mirsim, where excavations have been carried on for several seasons by Professor Albright. Here again it has been discovered that the city was destroyed at about the time of Lachish.

The evidence found at the ruins of Ai is much more difficult to handle. It does not harmonize with any date for the exodus and conquest. For excavations at the probable site of Ai indicate that it was a flourishing city between 3000 and 2200 B. C., but that at the latter date it was destroyed and abandoned. The evidence seems clear that, regardless of where we put the date of the exodus, the place was in ruins when Joshua and the Israelites entered Canaan.

Several theories have been offered to account for this disconcerting discovery. The name Ai in Hebrew means "the Ruin." So some have suggested that the story in Joshua is a later invention to account for the presence of this ruin. Father Vincent has advanced the theory that the people of Bethel—which was a mile and a half away—occupied Ai temporarily to form an advance guard against the Israelites. A third suggestion combines the other two by saying that the story of the conquest of Bethel (which is omitted, strangely, in Joshua) was transferred to Ai to account for the ruins there. This last theory has been set forth by Albright. It has also been suggested that there actually was a city there, which was not discovered by the excavators. Burrows favors Albright's view, though allowing the bare possibility that another city may yet be discovered at the site.²⁷ He makes the sanguine remark that "the peculiar problem of the conquest of Ai is more difficult for the modern exe-

²⁵ Schofield, J. N., *The Historical Background of the Bible*, p. 79.

²⁶ *Biblical Archaeologist*, I, 4 (Dec., 1938), p. 26.

²⁷ WMTS, p. 273.

gete than it was for the children of Israel."²⁸

Kenyon offers another escape from the difficulty. He says:

It is, however, not certain that the identification of Et Tell with Ai is correct, and archaeologists are by no means unanimous in their interpretation of the evidence. It is to be remembered also that the transference of a name from a ruined or abandoned site to another near by is a common phenomenon in Palestine.²⁹

Frankly, the suggestion of Kenyon appeals most to us, as doing least violence to the historicity of the Biblical account. The matter is not closed, and further light on the problem may yet appear. In the meantime, we make no apology for accepting the record given in Joshua.

Burrows feels that the bulk of the archæological evidence from Palestine favors a late date. He says:

With the exception of Jericho, therefore, and perhaps of Bethel, the cities which have been excavated testify to a date for the conquest which agrees with the evidence that the exodus took place about 1300 B. C. or a little later.³⁰

It is readily apparent that each of the three dates discussed thus far is beset with almost insuperable difficulties. It is for this reason that Meek and Albright, seeking to take into consideration all the available archæological data, have adopted more complicated theories in place of the simpler datings. We shall note briefly their suggestions.

4. *Meek's Hypothesis*

Theophile Meek has won a wide hearing for his theory in recent years. He holds that the coming of the Habiru into Palestine, mentioned in the Amarna letters, was just one of the invasions of the Bedouin from the desert into the Fertile Crescent. One

group, under Joshua, conquered Jericho in the fourteenth century. Other groups formed the kingdoms of Ammon, Moab, and Edom. Some of the Bedouin went down into Egypt and were led out of that country by Moses at about 1200 B. C. This latter group invaded Palestine directly from the south, instead of going east of the Dead Sea.

Meek's theory thus calls for two invasions of Palestine: one by the Joseph tribes under Joshua at around 1400 B. C.; the other by Moses in the latter part of the thirteenth century.

The most obvious objection to this reconstruction is that it clearly cannot be harmonized with the Biblical account. The most glaring divergence is that it places Joshua about one hundred and fifty years before Moses. It also denies that the Joseph tribes were in Egypt, which is contrary to the Biblical record.

While a considerable number of scholars have accepted Meek's view, it is doubtful if it will gain universal approval. Some of its foundations are very flimsy. Like most such reconstructions it is built with the rather copious use of speculative material.

Graham and May, in *Culture and Conscience*, came to this conclusion in the matter:

The status of this problem does not permit one at present to commit one's self absolutely to any of these views. Yet the consensus of judgment seems to be moving toward the later date for the exodus; and it seems increasingly probable that the final reconstruction of the political and cultural history will be distinctly indebted to the ideas of Professor Meek and of those who stimulated him.³¹

In favor of Meek's basic contention we could perhaps say that the traditional treatment of the conquest of Palestine has sometimes failed to take into account all the varied data of Joshua and Judges. Certainly the pic-

²⁸ *Ibid*, p. 272.

²⁹ Kenyon, Frederick, *Bible and Archaeology*, p. 190.

³⁰ WMTS, pp. 77f.

³¹ Graham, W. C. and Herbert G. May, *Culture and Conscience*, p. 74.

ture there is not as simple as it has often been assumed.

5. *Albright's Theory*

While granting the force of some of Meek's arguments, Professor Albright is the exponent of a view which accords rather better with the Biblical account.

Albright maintains that the exodus from Egypt took place in two sections. The first consisted of the Joseph tribe or tribes, which left Egypt soon after the expulsion of the Hyksos, i.e. after 1550. This group conquered Jericho between 1375 and 1300, the time of the destruction of that city according to Albright. The second group, led by Moses and Joshua, left Egypt about 1290 and conquered Lachish and Debir at about 1230 B. C. It will thus be seen that Albright puts the main exodus from Egypt at about 1290 B. C.

A quotation from his book, *Archæology of Palestine and the Bible*, will put the matter clearly before us. He says:

There is now a strong tendency to date the Conquest about 1400 B. C. The writer's view is that the Conquest began in the time of the Patriarchs, as described in Genesis 34, 48:22, etc., and continued intermittently during the subsequent period, with one phase in the late sixteenth or early fifteenth century (Jericho and Ai), and a culminating triumph after the establishment of the Israelite confederation by Moses, in the second half of the thirteenth century.³²

In his chapter on "The Present State of Syro-Palestinian Archæology" in *The Haverford Symposium on Archæology and the Bible* Professor Albright writes:

The date of the Israelite conquest of Palestine still remains obscure, though the available evidence proves that the main wave of destruction fell in the thirteenth century and that the re-occupation of the more important towns must be dated between 1250 and 1150 B. C. Jericho clearly fell before the principal phase of the conquest, but it is by no means certain just what this fact indicates when applied to Hebrew tradition.³³

It is evident that Albright's view

seeks to face all the relevant facts and find a place for them. By postulating a lesser exodus previous to the main one this view accords with the evidence at Jericho and the testimony of Merneptah's Stele to the effect that Israelites were in Palestine during the reign of that Pharaoh. Also, by placing the main exodus in the thirteenth century, it finds itself in accord with the Egyptian evidence at Pithom and Raamses and the Palestinian evidence at Lachish and Debir.

III. CONCLUSION

Apparently we shall have to accept the dictum of the doctors and confess our inability to solve the problems created by the various data for the exodus from Egypt and the conquest of Canaan. One hardly dares to subscribe fully to either the fifteenth or thirteenth century date for the exodus. To do so one has to give the impression of ignoring certain relevant facts.

Of course the early sixteenth century date can be dismissed with little comment. It is not so easy to eliminate the theories of Meek and Albright. They at least have the virtue of facing the facts and seeking to account for them, though they tend seriously to discount the historicity of the Biblical data.

Perhaps I should record my own reactions on the subject. I began this present study with a strong bias in favor of Garstang's date, having been pretty well convinced by his arguments concerning Jericho. But I do not now feel entirely convinced either way. While the fifteenth century date has been held by the bulk of scholars in England in recent years, the trend now appears to be definitely away from that view in this country. Some have swung back to the traditional thirteenth century date, as expressed by Cyrus Gordon in the quotation given above. Others are finding a resting place for the time being in the theories of Meek or Albright.

³² Albright, Wm. E., *Archæology of Palestine and the Bible*, pp. 197f.

³³ p. 23.

Inasmuch as we are dealing with an event which antedates the period in which an exact chronology can be established, it seems the part of wisdom to avoid an undue dogmatism in holding to any of the above theories. I cannot close this article without calling attention to the fact that the fifteenth century date seems to accord best with the Biblical data. It must be remembered that difficulties are not the same as proved errors. Hence there is no valid reason for rejecting the Biblical

dating, which is reached by moving back from *established dates* (e.g. that of the establishment of the Monarchy) by the number of years indicated in the records as consumed by intervening events, in favor of dates which are themselves contradicted by other events in both Egypt and Canaan. It is possible that larger information may make a place in both the history of Egypt and that of Palestine and Trans-Jordania for an Exodus in the fifteenth century B. C.

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER

(Concluded from page 81)

A new department has been established in the field of Christian Education, offering the M.R.E. degree. Two new members have been added to the faculty in this department to assist Dr. B. Joseph Martin who heads the department. The new staff members in this department are James D. Robertson, Ph.D., and C. Elvan Olmstead, Ph.D., This new department meets an increasing demand in the field of Christian Education.

The Ministers Conference for 1947 will be held February 25-27. The two principal lecturers at the conference will be Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes and Dr. R. P. Shuler. Other special lecturers for the year will be Russell R. Patton, A.B., Th.B., B.D., in the field of Practical Theology, Dr. G. W. Ridout in the field of Biographies of Holiness Leaders, and Dr. Richard E. Day in a series on Beacon Lights of Faith. Holiness Emphasis Week, sponsored by the student body will be observed April 7-11, 1947, with Dr. Harry E. Jessop as speaker.

The year is full of promise at Asbury Theological Seminary and we earnestly request that our friends continue to undergird the institution with their prayers.