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Abstract: The Exodus, however we define it, cannot be called “historical.” In other words, so diffuse is the evidence, the biblical narrative cannot be adequately tested by the historical method. This paper compares and contrasts another mythic tale of improbable, miraculous salvation: the “Angel(s) of Mons” from World War I, where abundant information enables us precisely to sift truth from fiction and set both in historical context. For the Exodus, we must simply resign ourselves to ignorance.
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Context within this volume: Archaeologists and textual historians agree that the biblical narrative is not contemporary with purported events, has a complex literary prehistory, and does not fit comfortably with known ancient Near Eastern history. Over the millennia, it has become collective cultural memory—but memory of what?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

In order to address the question, “Is the Exodus history?” we must define “Exodus” and “history.” According to the Hebrew Bible, the Exodus is the departure, in a single night sometime in the 15th century BCE, of 600,000 adult Hebrew males and their families, embarking upon a trek from slavery in Egypt to freedom in Canaan. It’s hard to imagine how that would work spatially, but that’s what the text says.

As for History, Thucydides, the father of the historical method, begins his work as follows: “Thucydides, an Athenian, wrote the history of the war between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians.”[[1]](#footnote-1) It is easy to overlook the importance: an actual author is claiming personal credit and responsibility for what he is about to relate.[[2]](#footnote-2) In place of an anonymous, omniscient narrator, such as one finds in Homer—who, admittedly, claims inspiration from a Muse[[3]](#footnote-3)—Thucydides interposes himself and his new, critical method between the facts and the reader.

As Thucydides demonstrates, both time and space tend to distort the transmission of information. And so does poetry. For this reason, although he begins his history in the Age of Heroes, Thucydides is skeptical of the supernaturalistic myths prevalent among the Greeks--even if he assumes (as we do, too) some historical basis behind the traditions of migration and the Trojan War.

For events of recent history, Thucydides proposes a better method: research.

And with reference to the narrative of events, far from permitting myself to derive it from the first source that came to hand, I did not even trust my own impressions, but it rests partly on what I saw myself, partly on what others saw for me, the accuracy of the report being always tried by the most severe and detailed tests possible. My conclusions have cost me some labour from the want of coincidence between accounts of the same occurrences by different eye-witnesses, arising sometimes from imperfect memory, sometimes from undue partiality for one side or the other. The absence of romance in my history will, I fear, detract somewhat from its interest; but if it be judged useful by those inquirers who desire an exact knowledge of the past as an aid to the interpretation of the future… I shall be content.

In contrast with Homer, Hesiod, Herodotus and the tragedians, and as part of his critical stance toward the mythic mindset, Thucydides avoids attributing divine causation to epochal events such as migrations, wars and plagues. What, then, would he have made of the Torah and its story of the Exodus, which probably reached its current form across the Mediterranean in the Athenian’s own day, in the 5th century BCE? As he did with Homer, Thucydides would no doubt have assumed a historical core to the tradition, minus the fantastical elements: hungry Hebrews from an unstable climatic zone migrated to fertile Egypt, where they thrived, threatened to overrun the country and were enslaved. Eventually they rebelled and departed for their native country, which they conquered with the sword. But, as with Homer, Thucydides would have felt frustrated by the narrative’s fanciful aspects, the prominent divine role, and the lack of authentication.

Unlike theologians, Thucydides would *not* be chagrined that the Torah contradicts itself. His method takes that into account. He would also expect the Torah to be biased and selective. He would perhaps suspect that, like Homer, the Torah just tells too good a story, and might well reiterate his insight that the truth tends to be blander than fiction. He would surely assume that the dialogue, at least, had been fabricated, inasmuch as he himself admits to making up his own.

Thucydides would probably be more troubled by the Torah’s anonymity. There is no historian claiming responsibility for what is recounted, nor does the mysterious author cite sources. Homer and Hesiod at least invoke Muses; the Torah just demands (and generally has obtained) readers’ credulity. For two-and-a-half millennia Jews, joined later by Christians, have assumed that the narrator is omniscient because, as an article of faith, the Author is Omniscient.

Even though he would no doubt concede the possibility of real events underlying the Exodus tradition, Thucydides would feel much more at home in the biblical books of Samuel and Kings. During the account of David’s reign, there is almost no supernatural causation, but much political chicanery. For First and Second Kings, there is a detailed chronological framework, albeit slightly inconsistent in details, with many events susceptible of investigation from multiple perspectives—both within the Bible itself and from what we now know from archaeology and ancient inscriptions. Even if there is no “I” taking responsibility, the author of Kings at least cites written sources, especially the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel and Judah. For other, less mundane material, such as the tales of the prophets, he hints at the oral sources: “Now the king was talking with Gehazi the servant of the man of God, saying, ‘Tell me all the great things that Elisha has done.’” (2 Kings 8:4 RSV).

A naif might ask, “But didn’t Moses himself write the Torah?” Since the Renaissance, however, especially the literary detective work of Lorenzo Valla, we no longer accept traditional claims of authorship on trust; we use the tools of philology. As Baruch Spinoza (*Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*) argued at great length in the 17th century, and certain medieval Jewish commentators may already have suspected, when we apply the “Valla test” to the Mosaic authorship of the Torah, the tradition fails miserably. After all, the Torah never claims to be written by a participant in the Exodus; its stance is consistently retrospective, looking backward from a time when there were no longer Canaanites, when the Edomites had kings, when the location of Moses’ tomb had been forgotten, etc. Thus, vis-à-vis the supposed events of the Exodus, the Torah is at best a secondary source.

The fact that the Torah is a secondary source, indeed one that cites no documentary evidence of its own, makes it of limited value for the historian. Our best estimate for the final compilation of the Torah, around 400 BCE, is a millennium later than tradition dates the Exodus itself. To be sure, two centuries of philological research have revealed older sources hidden in the Torah, commonly called J, E, D and P. This analysis does take us slightly closer to the events, but these reconstructed documents, too, are secondary sources: D and P are based upon J and E and thus possess little independent historical value, while J and E are themselves from the Iron Age (cf. Friedman, this volume). And many scholars today would argue that some or all of these supposed documents are chimerical and that the texts are even further removed from the end of the Late Bronze Age, when the Exodus supposedly occurred (Berner, Römer and Schmid, in this volume).

However, inside of the Torah are a body of poems that some scholars think are older than their prose context. Among these is Exodus 15:1-18, the Song of the Sea (Russell 2009: 133-45; Hendel, this volume). Now, not everyone agrees that Exodus 15:1-18 is archaic; it resembles no form of Hebrew known from inscriptions and might rather be pseudo-archaic in the manner of the poetry of Job. But it is our best hope for a contemporary or near-contemporary documentary source. The poem describes Pharaoh’s chariotry sinking into the Red Sea (or possibly a papyrus marsh [Moshier, this volume]). While Thucydides’ reservations about poets would still apply, a few modern scholars have taken Exodus 15:1-18 to be an eyewitness response to a historical event. The problem is that we have no other data by which to interpret it, apart from a prose framework of questionable reliability and uncertain dating.

Another potentially archaic reference to the Exodus is found within the oracles of Balaam. Although the occasional archaism and obscurity of these texts have been cited as evidence of antiquity (Albright 1944; cf. Russell 2009: 81-103), these aspects are overbalanced by the reference to the Assyrian empire in Numbers 24:22. Without considerable apologies and gymnastics, we cannot date the oracles of Balaam earlier than the ninth century BCE.

If our sources do not elicit much confidence in terms of antiquity, might they still not contain real information, however passed down? To judge from his attitude toward Greek mythology, Thucydides would have given them the benefit of the doubt. There may after all be lost written sources; oral tradition is sometimes reliable—though, tellingly, we are always surprised when it is. In this case, how could we know? We could look for details in the text, e.g., techniques of brick making, place names, etc. that could have been known only in the second millennium BCE; or, alternatively, we could contemplate the overall sweep of the narrative, without binding ourselves to specifics of time, place and numbers. I am not a fan of the first method, which has been used to both support (Halpern 1993; Hoffmeier 1996) and discredit (Redford, this volume) the narrative in its details. I would look rather to the large events that might have left a trace in the historical-archaeological record.

While the Torah itself does not provide a chronological anchor—unless you think the world really is 6,000 years old—1 Kings 6:1 gives a date for the Exodus relative to the reign of Solomon, placing the departure from Egypt in the mid 15th century BCE, the richly documented heyday of the Egyptian Empire. Do we look for evidence of an Exodus there? Or do we suspend judgment over the date, and just seek more broadly?

Now, in fact there are numerous known historical events from the ancient Near East that rather resemble the Bible’s account of the Exodus (Galvin, Geraty, this volume). In chronological order, here are the most prominent:[[4]](#footnote-4)

**18th-12th centuries BCE.** Throughout these centuries, we find ample evidence of sheep- and goat-herding semi-nomadic pastoralists whose migrations recall the Israelite ancestors as portrayed the Torah (Fleming, this volume). In addition, unruly groups called `Abiru or `Apiru are attested throughout the ancient Near East. To judge from their names (often Hurrian, sometimes Semitic), they do not constitute an ethnic group but are rather a social class, their name meaning something like “freebooter.” The word may survive in biblical `*ibri,* “Hebrew,” the term Israelites used to describe themselves to foreigners (Greenberg 1955).

**17th century BCE.** The huge volcano of Thera erupts, creating perturbations in Mediterranean weather and tides (Harris, Salomon, Ward, this volume). Egypt is ruled by the foreign, Asiatic Hyksos (Bietak, this volume), whom later propaganda, prefiguring Roman critiques of Judaism and Christianity, will describe as near atheists, worshiping only Seth--here a cipher for the Canaanite storm god (de Moor 1997: 76,102). The Bible still remembers the foundation of their capital, Tanis (Numbers 13:22). And one of their rulers, Ya`qub-har, could be an inspiration for the Jacob-Joseph traditions of Genesis.

**16th century BCE.** Ca. 1550, the Hyksos are expelled from Egypt, with some sources mentioning accompanying meterological portents (Redford 1992: 420).

**16th-15th centuries BCE.** Most of the large cities in Canaan are destroyed by the 18th dynasty Pharaohs as they create an empire in Asia.

**16th-11th centuries BCE.** Many Asiatics live in Egypt, whether as slaves, hostage princes or ordinary citizens. Some of these are probably Hyksos who stayed behind (Bietak, this volume), others would be new immigrants. Whether they lived in Canaan or Egypt, for much of this time all Canaanites were essentially slaves to Pharaoh (Hendel, this volume).

**14th century BCE.** East of the Arabah lurk various nomads (Shasu), including one group called the Nomads of *Yhw3* (Weinfeld 1987: 304-5; Redford 1992: 272-73; Mullins this volume). In Egypt, Akhenaten claims there is no god but the sunlight; one may worship no graven images, Akhenaten himself being the sole divine form and embodiment (Propp 2006: 762-94). Simultaneously, some `Apiru are making trouble in Canaan (on the “Amarna Period,” see Benz, this volume).

**13th-12th centuries BCE.**  Ramesses II builds the cities of Pithom and Ramesses, mentioned in Exodus 1:11.

**13th century BCE.** The Late Bronze Age international order collapses. In Canaan a new, burgeoning population occupies the highlands; to judge from their artifacts and language, they are largely indigenous and foster an egalitarian ethos (cf. Dever, Faust, Mullins, this volume). Over-optimistically, Pharaoh Merneptah claims to have eradicated an ethnic group called “Israel” in this region.

**12th century BCE.** The Philistines, mentioned in Exodus 13:17: 15:14, arrive and settle the Canaanite littoral. About this time, the Egyptians end their rule over Canaan; the natives are free at last (Hendel, this volume).

All this might sound like good news: we have so much evidence of the Exodus! In fact, it is bad news. An event cannot be spread across half a millennium! Therefore, many scholars nowadays argue that the Israelites and their traditions reflect the amalgamation of diverse groups and their experiences throughout the second millennium, and even into the first (Benz, Faust, Hendel, Mullins, Redford, this volume). We cannot prove that either, but it is much easier to imagine than a historical Exodus event.

To complicate matters even further, we know that over the course of time the Israelites came to associate their departure from Egypt with an old Amorite myth, first attested at 18th- century BCE Mari, according to which in primordial times the storm god had established his kingship by defeating and drying up the sea and slaying the sea’s minions, especially a seven-headed serpent the Hebrew Bible calls Rahab, Leviathan, or simply The Serpent (Propp 1999: 554-61). This myth, recovered over the past 150 years from Mesopotamian and Canaanite sources, is alluded to dozens of times in the Hebrew Bible and survives into later Judaism (Cassuto 1975: 69-109). Several of biblical passages make an explicit connection between the Combat Myth and the Exodus: e.g., Isaiah 51:9-10; Psalm 77:11-20, etc. Other texts equate Pharaoh with Leviathan (Ezekiel 29:3; 32:2). Thus, the tradition that Yahweh created his people and established his kingship by fighting a battle against the sea, in the process drying or splitting it, was likely influenced by a pre-Israelite myth (cf. Batto, this volume).

Some scholars, perhaps the majority, suppose that the similarity of the Exodus to the creation myth dawned only gradually upon the Israelites. For others, a historic salvation by the sea immediately assumed mythic resonances to its very participants (cf. Cross 1973: 79-90). For yet other scholars, the Exodus story is simply another version of the myth, recast as pseudo-history (e.g., Kloos 1986: 158-212).

I wish to leave the riddle of the Exodus for a moment in order to develop a contrast with a miraculous redemption much more amenable to historical analysis. Over the 5,000 years of known human history, there are hundreds if not thousands of records of supernatural salvations during military crises, of which the Exodus is but one example. Here is another, almost within living memory:

On August 22-23, 1914, the [British Expeditionary Force](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_Expeditionary_Force_%28World_War_I%29) first engaged German troops at Mons, Belgium, in order to cover a French retreat. Despite outnumbering the British by more than 2.5 : 1, the Germans were initially repulsed. They quickly regrouped, however, and forced the British into a long retreat, during which the Allies also reassembled and eventually repulsed the Germans at the Battle of the Marne (September 5-12, 1914), thereby saving Paris. The Expeditionary Force’s near brush with annihilation, at first concealed by censorship, was reported on August 30, 1914, and converted by propaganda into a qualified victory (which it was), as well as a call to enlistment.

The salvation was seen literally as miraculous. On April 24, 1915, the [*Spiritualist*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spiritualist) magazine published reports of [visions](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vision_%28religion%29) of a [supernatural](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supernatural) force that intervened to help the British at the decisive moment of the battle. Other corroboratory accounts followed, some describing further wonders throughout the retreat of the British and the French. Some recalled a luminous cloud, others described medieval [longbow](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Longbow) archers fighting alongside [St. George](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St._George), while most reported a host of angelic warriors. By May and thereafter, the miracle was bruited in publications and sermons as evidence of divine favor for the Allied cause, and soon the tale was circulating internationally (Clarke 2004: 37-63). Curiously, French soldiers had similar memories, except that instead of St. George they had seen St. Michael and St. Joan of Arc—the latter apparently having made her peace with the English (Clarke 2004: 135-45). Today this curious episode in the Great War is referred to as either the Angel or the Angels of Mons.

Right from the start there were cynics. Soldiers are notoriously superstitious; frightened, hungry, battle-fatigued men, high on adrenaline and intensely indoctrinated, do not make the best witnesses. Stories of divine interventions on the battlefield, moreover, are as old as Homer, as old as the Bible, as old as the royal inscriptions of Egypt and Mesopotamia, doubtless as old as war itself. Further investigation proved that all early accounts were second-hand hearsay, some from soldiers who hadn’t even been at Mons. Thus, the [Society for Psychical Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Society_for_Psychical_Research) concluded in 1915 that there was no credible eye-witness testimony or any evidence at all of the supernatural (Clarke 2004: 122-24).

In the early 20th century, there was also the added factor of new methods of controlling information via censorship and propaganda. For the true believers in the miracle, any skepticism was simply evidence of a cover-up. On their part, skeptics assumed that the War Office was exploiting a supposed mass hallucination for its own propagandistic purposes. Besides the Angels of Mons, we know of numerous wild rumors circulating in wartime Great Britain, most of which had nothing supernatural about them but were nonetheless mistaken, even absurd. Some may indeed have been deliberately implanted to assist the war effort (Clarke 2004: 67-85).

And there is one more factor to consider:

On September 29, 1914—notably, the Feast of St. Michael and All Angels--one month after the first press reports of Mons, Welsh author and journalist [Arthur Machen](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arthur_Machen), who wrote both factual accounts of the war and also fantasy and fiction, and was himself inclined toward neo-medieval, mystical forms of Christianity, published a very short story in the London *Evening News* (Clarke 2004: 85-99, 247-50). “The Bowmen,” conceived while Machen was dozing at church, drew inspiration from recent published reports of the Battle of Mons, and also the antiquarian Machen’s own familiarity with English traditions of angels and saints back through the Middle Ages. Machen probably also knew that, since the 15th century, St. George had been particularly venerated in Mons, the supposed site of the battle with the dragon (Clarke 2004: 17-36). And Machen was also a fan of the ghost stories of Rudyard Kipling.

The style of “The Bowmen” is first-person verisimilitude. The opening, “It was during the Retreat of the Eighty Thousand, and the authority of the censor is sufficient cause for not being more explicit,” hints at a truth even more fabulous than what is to be revealed. The narrator, a soldier in a beleaguered British army unit, calls upon St. George, whereupon phantom bowmen materialize and destroy the German foe. The 1227-word story ends,

In fact, there were ten thousand dead German soldiers left before that salient of the English army, and consequently there was no [German conquest of] Sedan. In Germany, a country ruled by scientific principles, the Great General Staff decided that the contemptible English must have employed shells containing an unknown gas of a poisonous nature, as no wounds were discernible on the bodies of the dead German soldiers. But the man who knew what nuts tasted like when they called themselves steak knew also that St. George had brought his Agincourt Bowmen to help the English.[[5]](#footnote-5)

 What happened next is best told in Machen’s own words, published in a 1915 reprint of the story:

[I]n a few days from its publication the editor of THE OCCULT REVIEW wrote to me. He wanted to know whether the story had any foundation in fact. I told him that it had no foundation in fact of any kind or sort.... Soon afterwards the editor of LIGHT wrote asking a like question, and I made him a like reply….

A month or two later, I received several requests from editors of parish magazines to reprint the story. I--or, rather, my editor--readily gave permission; and then, after another month or two, the conductor of one of these magazines wrote to me, saying that the February issue containing the story had been sold out, while there was still a great demand for it. Would I allow them to reprint THE BOWMEN as a pamphlet, and would I write a short preface giving the exact authorities for the story? I replied that they might reprint in pamphlet form with all my heart, but that I could not give my authorities, since I had none, the tale being pure invention. The priest wrote again, suggesting--to my amazement--that I must be mistaken, that the main "facts" of THE BOWMEN must be true, that my share in the matter must surely have been confined to the elaboration and decoration of a veridical history. It seemed that my light fiction had been accepted by the congregation of this particular church as the solidest of facts; and it was then that it began to dawn on me that if I had failed in the art of letters, I had succeeded, unwittingly, in the art of deceit. This happened, I should think, some time in April, and the snowball of rumour that was then set rolling has been rolling ever since, growing bigger and bigger, till it is now swollen to a monstrous size…. It was at about this period that variants of my tale began to be told as authentic histories….[[6]](#footnote-6)

The more Machen protested, the more resistance he received. He was anti-patriotic, he was anti-Christian; he must have at least subconsciously channeled soldiers’ actual experience!

Moreover, much later, in 1931 Brigadier-General [John Charteris](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Charteris) published his memoir *At G.H.Q.*, according to which the wondrous apparition was a popular rumor among the troops as of September 5, 1914, *nineteen days before the appearance of Machen’s story.* Here we would seem to find proof that, despite his claims, Machen did not invent the miracle at Mons. In his preface, however, Charteris admits, “I had not kept a formal diary…where records were incomplete, *I have amplified them by my recollections*” (Clark 2004: 215, emphasis added)—and the General’s surviving correspondence from early September 1914 makes no reference to supernatural visions. Machen’s claim stands.

Incidentally, though I have not researched the matter thoroughly, I am not aware than anyone ever asked *Germans* present at Mons what they thought had happened. In 1930, however, a former member of the Imperial German Intelligence Service reportedly claimed that that the Germans had projected images onto white cloudbanks in a counterproductive effort to spook the British—even though no such technology existed, the battle occurred by day, and the German military could not confirm that the informant had actually been present or even existed (Clarke: 2004: 206-9).

The Angels of Mons was not the only literary fiction that was converted into actual memories of World War I. In 1915, the Reverend W. H. Leathem published a first-person story “In the Trenches,” in which a wounded soldier is nursed by a mysterious Comrade in White, who proves to be Christ. The whole pattern then recurred: numerous but nebulously attested visions of the Comrade in White, the celebration of the miracle in church sermons and religious and psychical publications, and the clerical author’s chagrined acknowledgment that, while miracles may happen, he had in fact made this one up (Clarke 2004: 177-83).

Various morals might be drawn from the comparison between the Angels of Mons and the biblical Exodus. The optimist would admit: okay, Machen made up the supernatural bit, but there really was a battle of Mons, the British really did escape from the Germans, there really was a Great War. Likewise the Exodus.

The biblical ultra-skeptic might rejoin, however, that just as Machen converted immemorial Christian miracle stories into a purported report from the battle lines, which then entered British popular consciousness as stone-cold fact, despite (or rather because of) the supernatural content--so the ancient myth of the combat between the storm god and the sea was transmogrified into a pseudo-historical tale of Israel’s miraculous salvation.

 But here is the moral I would draw. We know that the Battle of Mons occurred. We know its precise dates, we know its exact location, we know the historical context. We can date Machen’s story to the day. We can supply oral and written testimony from literally thousands, probably tens of thousands of diverse sources to gain a stereoscopic image of the times. In other words, we have precise reference points to support historical analysis.

From my perspective, the Exodus is not historical by definition, because it simply is not susceptible to the historical method. There is no paper trail of evidence, what literary sources survive are of uncertain date, and the story lacks a clear anchor in time. Our uncertainty factor is measured not in days, weeks or months, but in centuries. And *then,* there is also the problem of the supernatural—do you believe in miracles, or in the human disposition to believe in miracles (or both)? *Mundus vult decipi, “*The world wishes to be deceived.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

In such a situation, the only sane response--the philosopher’s response, the Buddha’s response--is to cultivate apathy. We should not care whether there was an Exodus, because wanting what we do not have, i.e., evidence, will make us unhappy.

For now, the cultural memory of the Exodus is alive and well, whereas the shining Angels of Mons are fading fast. They still have their devotees, but far fewer than the Old Testament enjoys. Why the difference? Obviously, the story of the Exodus is far older than the Angels of Mons and has had more time to diffuse. Because it arose in an age of technology and literacy, moreover, the 20th century legend spread like wildfire--but then incurred immediate doubt for exactly the same reason; whereas the story of the Exodus, whatever its true origins, arose and was propagated in an age when credulity was even greater than the early 20th century. And, crucially, the story of the Exodus has been embalmed in ritual--Bible reading among Christians, Bible reading plus the Passover seder among Jews—whereas World War I commemorations do not to my knowledge emphasize or reenact the Mons miracle.

To conclude: the historian must avoid the Exodus, put it into a black box, lock it up, and then hide but not discard the key, keeping it against the unlikely event that new evidence should emerge. Perhaps there was an actual event, or several events, that are commemorated in the Exodus tradition. But the data are just too diffuse, too sparse. In contrast, to doubt the historicity of the World War I Battle of Mons, solely because one rejected the attendant tale of supernatural rescue, would be to posit such a gargantuan hoax that it would be far easier to believe in the Angels.
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