

front of them ; for the chariots and chariot horses (wrongly rendered horsemen) of Pharaoh could have covered the ground at least twice as fast as the women, children, flocks and herds of Israel.

As we went up the canal we witnessed an Exodus which had something in common with that of Israel. The poor peasants of Port Said and Ism'ailieh had been taught to expect every sort of outrage from the ferocious Franjis. Even when they learned the humanity of the English they were still (as they assured me) "only afraid of the booms," or cannon shot. The women, with great bundles on their heads, their blue robes tucked up, their babies hung behind them in their veils ; aged men helped by their sons ; the family property on a little donkey ; the weeping children and the hungry-looking men, recalled strangely the idea of that motley host which accompanied the armed men of Israel ; and the slow progress of the departing Fellahin, even though left quite uninjured by our troops, gave a practical example of the impossibility of Brugsch's theory of a forty mile march. With the chariots of Pharaoh dashing over the pebbly desert to the north, or down the valley behind ; with sand dunes covered only with dry tussocks of grass to north and south, with the swampy river-mouth in front and the sea to the right, the yellow hills of the wilderness beyond the sea, the dry wind from the north-east burning their lips, what position could have been humanly more hopeless than that of the children of Israel when Moses "stretched out his hand over the sea?"

CLAUDE R. CONDER, *Captain R.E.*

II.

WHEN one has read Mr. Scarth's pleasing paper (*Quarterly Statement*, October, 1882) on the "Route of the Exodus," has one arrived at any probable conclusion as to that route? I think not. The suggestion is, doubtless, a novelty—that the course of the Israelites from the encampment near Migdol was *westward*. Naturally, therefore, the question may be asked, Where would they be supposed to be going? Such a course is neither the "way of the wilderness," nor that road to Palestine which is called "the way of the land of the Philistines." So much light is being thrown gradually on this not unimportant biblical subject, that one almost wishes a sort of standard might be set up—a literary Nilometer—to show how far we had safely got in our investigations from time to time.

As one reads, for instance, Herr Brugsch's essay on "The Exodus and the Egyptian Monuments" (1874), and Mr. Greville Chester's paper (1880), one thinks such antagonists can never come to terms. The addenda and notes to either production show how little space of real difference lies between the two historians.

Now there are very reasonable geographical boundaries to the subject, viz., "Ramses" and "the wilderness of Sin." There are boundaries also in *time* for the passage between these two places,—“and all the congrega-

tion of the children of Israel came into the wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai, on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing out of the land of Egypt" (Exod. xvi, 1).

Much has to be accomplished by the historical inquirer, however, within these boundaries. One asks first, What was the object of their whole journey? God told Moses that He would deliver His people out of the affliction of Egypt, and bring them up into a good land, specially Canaan "The Lowlands"). To Moses, doubting his own power, God promised a sign, viz., that the Israelites should worship Him in Horeb.

To reach Canaan from the Delta of Egypt there seem to have been two great roads in frequent use—though there may have been, and most likely were, caravan routes used at certain seasons of the year. Starting both of them from the royal and central city of Tanis (the modern Sân), the one led by Pithom and Pelusium, and then along the course which Mr. Chester followed, keeping the shore side of Mount Casius, to El Arish; the other through the Succoth district to Khetam and Migdol, and then passing (as does the short desert route now) to the south of the Serbonian Lake, bore up north-east to El Arish. These two routes, but especially the latter, must have been well constructed roads. Armies like those of Seti I, setting out, with chariots and all the impedimenta of war, to fight against the Shasu and Kharu warriors, from a country in a proper state of defence, with protecting and corresponding towers and fortresses along its frontiers, would be sure to be able to commence its march along military roads. Ramses II would not neglect in any way the defence of his frontier on the eastern side, or the communication between his fortresses. Besides this, the great roads leading to the country of the Khita, and those leading through the south and right away to the Euphrates, would be regarded as international undertakings, essential to the development of commerce.

We know from the letters of the court scribes, written from Pi-Ramessu (Tanis), that the celebrated treaty of peace between Ramses II and the King of the Khita was regarded as an epoch in the world's history. One may then conclude that Ramses's reign reached the summit of its glory when this great alliance was formed, and that at this time probably the new city of Pi-Ramessu, adjoining the old Zoan (Tanis of the Greeks), or Zor, and looking over those wide plains and lagoons which Mr. Macgregor so well described in "Rob Roy on the Jordan," as far back as 1868, was built. At Zoan (Zor) we stand on very firm ground. This, the ancient capital of the Hyksos kings, had been abandoned by the kings of the 18th Dynasty, the regenerators of Egypt, but had been again exalted to capital rank by the clever Ramses II. Not that he merely resuscitated Zor, or Zoru (the "strong" place, or places), the central post of those many fortifications which give the name Muzur, or Mazor ("fortified") to the whole district, but he built close to it another city—Pi-Ramessu ("the city of Ramses"), and there he established a fresh "cult," that of "Sutekh, or Baal," a deity of the Hyksos kings—whose blood probably ran in his veins.

This new city, with its marvellous temples, the tributary Israelites—

quartered near to it in the land of Goshen—helped to build. Here Moses faced the proud Pharaoh of his day, and hence went up the first notes of that terrible great cry which told of the execution of the judgment of Jehovah.

We know that the Israelites dwelt in the midst of and mingled with the Egyptians, else there had been no need to mark their houses with the blood; and it is not far-fetched to suppose that there had been for some time, since the day when Moses and Aaron first appealed to them, an excited longing for liberation and freedom amongst the twelve clans. In the treaty (already alluded to) between Ramses and the Khita, there is a curious allusion to runaways and fugitives from Egypt, who might be caught in the Khita country, and their extradition. One may almost imagine that even then there were signs of a coming rising on the part of some distressed tributary people.

Are we obliged to allow only three days after leaving their homes before the Israelites make their encampment at Pihahiroth? The Bible account does not say so! Still, as Brugsch has shown, the encampments successively mentioned agree wonderfully well with the stations mentioned in the Report of a certain scribe sent out to retake two fugitive servants, of which he gives us a translation. The writer lived at Pi-Ramessu, and wrote in the reign of Mineptah III (*circ.* 1266 B.C.). The stations mentioned by him are the "fortress or barrier of Thuku" (Sukoth), in one day's journey, and "Khetam," after two days. At Khetam the scribe receives news that the fugitives have already passed the "rampart" to the north of the Migdol of King Seti Mineptah. Now I don't think this "Report" proves anything as to the course taken by the writer on his journey one way or the other, or as to the time spent. What he writes suggests, possibly, that he first took the upper road from the royal city towards Pitom, then turned south and came into the great royal road at one of its stations, "Khetam," where further and perhaps conclusive news of the fugitives was received. Still it gives us "Etham" and "Migdol," and it mentions, too, that the report which settled the course of the fugitives came from men who had come from the "sedge city (city of Suf)."

What has been learned about Succoth then? The ancient divisions of Egypt—beyond that division with which all the royal buildings and tombs make the most unlearned traveller in Egypt so familiar, "Upper" and "Lower"—were retained by the Greek conquerors, and called "nomes," distinguished from each other by names which were supposed to translate the Egyptian designations into words harmonised to the Greek ear. In the "Sethroitic" nome, the north-easterly division of Lower Egypt, was preserved the Egyptian word which signified "the region of the river mouth," and was applied to the whole region of the north-east Delta. The capital of this nome Brugsch thinks to have been Pitom (the "Heracleopolis Parva" of the Greeks), which, as though there were more than one, is distinguished as "Pitom in the country of Sukot." The whole of this district, the eastern border-land, was full of lakes and waters, and these, we may be certain, have changed in form and volume in the intervening centuries, owing to the neglect or destruction

of dykes, canals, &c. It formed the camping ground of various aggressive tribes from the East, and derived its foreign name, "Suko" or "Sukot" (Thuku or Thukot), meaning a "tent" or "tent camp," from this fact. In a letter quoted by Brugsch (vol. i, 247) there is a report of an inferior officer as to the permitting Bedawin of Edom to pass through the fortress, "Khetam of King Mineptah-Hotephmaat" (Mineptah II), situated in the land of Sukot, near the lakes of the city of Pitom, which is situated in the land of Sukot, in order to pasture their flocks, &c., on the lands of Pharaoh. The administration of these eastern marches is clearly set forth in the Egyptian papyri, having its bureau at the royal city Pi-Ramessu; and the foreign people again were under the control of regularly appointed officers of their own, who were responsible, we may suppose, to the central Government of the country.

Succoth, then, suggests a "region," rather than any one city; and at some fixed point in that region we may suppose the Israelites to have rallied when Moses sent out his final summons from Pi-Ramessu, and there to have made their first encampment.

For "Etham" we may require some more definite localisation. The children of Israel are to be led to the land of the people called "Canaanites;" the great royal road, made famous as a road of victory in the annals of the kings of the 19th Dynasty, leads there.

Brugsch, without hesitation, assimilates the Egyptian word Khetam (a "fortress") with the Bible name Etham. Of this Khetam, situated in the province of Zor, there is a representation on the walls of the Great Hall of Seti I at Karnak. The city appears built on both sides of a river (the Pelusiac branch of the Nile probably), and these two portions are connected by a bridge. Hard by is the town "Tabenet," for which the Greeks found a name, Daphnai, perpetuated in the Tel-Defenneh of to-day, with its ancient canal, and the ruined town beyond this canal. Mr. Chester has fully described Tel-Defenneh (Dephneh) and its surroundings: he has pointed out the ancient dyke leading across the artificial lake to the west of the Tel, in the direction of Pi-Ramses, an easy two days' journey, its commanding position on the "edge of the wilderness," and then its propinquity, less than a day's journey, to the spot which he takes to be Migdol.

El-Kantâra, on the canal, is evidently an ancient place, and its name (the "bridge," or "ford") suggests that in this very name we have preserved for us sufficient evidence that here was the highway by which the Egyptians passed on through swamp and intricate country to Syria. A direct line makes it about ten miles from Tel-Dephneh to Kantâra. There are ruins very near Kantâra, which seem to Mr. Chester to be those of Migdol, as probably as those suggested by Brugsch, hard by Tel-es-Samût. But still more does Tel-el-Hîr seem to him to be, from its position commanding the marshes, and from the extent of the ruins (amongst which are the remains of a massive tower), the likely Migdol. Migdol means "tower," and we know, both from the monuments and from the Bible (cf. the proper reading in the margin of Ezek. xxix, 10), that, like as

in the case of "from Dan to Beersheba," "from Migdol to Syene" described popularly the boundaries of Egypt.

Brugsch places at Tel-el-Hîr, quoting from Lepsius, Ha-u'ar ("the house of the leg," a name found in other parts of Egypt, and connected with the worship of the leg of "Osiris"), and points out Ha-u'ar's positive identity with Avaris, the great frontier city of the Hyksos kings, where was fought the battle which resulted in the expulsion of the Hyksos kings from Egypt.

Brugsch goes further than this, and argues the probability of this Ha-u'ar being the "Baal-Zephon" of the Bible—"Sutekh," the tutelary god of the Hyksos, being the same as the Phœnician "Baal." If this be so, we may place, *conjecturally*, Pihahiroth (the word means "entrance to the gulfs") near, opposite to, in the face of, "Baal-Zephon," and find Migdol near to or at El-Kantâra;—or might we not suppose Migdol to be the tower of some outlying work protecting Baal-Zephon?

To-day, as one steams up the canal to Port Said, it is difficult looking westward to distinguish Lake Menzaleh from the Mediterranean, or, as one gets beyond Kantâra, to settle for one's self, looking away towards the north-east, where to place the coast-line of the long-wished-for sea. The brightness of the air and the glare on the sand doubtless add to the confusion of objects. Still I fancy that there must have been always such an intricate spreading out of lagoons and shallows and marshy lands to the east of the Pelusiatic branch of the Nile, and just within the boundaries of the shores of the Mediterranean (from which the Tels and Gebels would rise like islands), that the term "sea" might come to have a somewhat indefinite application.

If Baal-Zephon be the same as Ha-u'ar, and if this again agrees with Avaris, I think that much stress should be laid on the inscription in the tomb at El-Kab (Upper Egypt) of the Aahmes family. The inscription, as translated by Brugsch (vol. i, 283), tells us this:—He was a captain of the sailors to the king who founded the 18th Dynasty, and who roused Upper Egypt to war against the aggressive foreigners, the Hyksos, who had so long held Lower Egypt. I have alluded already to the capture of Avaris. Avaris, Takem, and Sherohan are all mentioned as towns besieged and captured. But of the battle at Avaris it is said that they fought *on the lake Paset-ku*.

But where are the Israelites? It is after their encampment at Etham that they are told to *turn*. But which way? I suppose we may accept the verdict of critics who see in Exodus xiii, 17, 18, the hand of a later compiler annotating Moses's narrative. His explanation then would run thus:—"The march of the Israelites was commenced along the 'way of the land of the Philistines.' They marched in military order. God, however, altered their course, so that they turned out of the royal road, with its stations and fortresses all in due state of defence against incursions of Phœnicians or Arabs, and He led them through the wilderness of the Red Sea." It is this turn, either at or after Migdol is passed, towards Pihahiroth—"the entrance of the gulfs" (which, I take it, was situated on a road leading up

from Memphis to the north-east, and running parallel with the canal, by which Aahmes would advance in his ship against Avaris, the canal of which we have such good evidence in somewhat later times)—which would suggest to Pharaoh their entanglement in the land. The road was an intricate one, owing to the nature of the ground, and beyond this watered country, running down into it, was the desert—that feature of the whole land of Egypt which is most remarkable. What Jehovah did for His people is, I think, described in Exodus xiv, 16. The lost way does not matter; a new road is made through the midst of the sea, the waters are divided, and Israel goes through on dry ground.

If one takes Israel northward from Kantâra and encamps them where Mr. Scarth places them (a distance of over twenty miles), and then does not adopt *his* proposed route, but a route which allows Mount Casius to be Baal-Zephon,—although by Mr. Chester's help we may understand far better the machinery of the miracle,—we are almost forced to turn them back after the destruction of the Egyptians along the same route. As an alternative we may take them past Mount Casius (the causeway along the shore not being broken through as Mr. Chester found it to be), between the Mediterranean and Lake Serbonis, make them double Lake Serbonis, and then, pursuing the line taken now by caravans from Cairo to Gaza, come into such a track as that by which we are led in "Eothen" from Suez to Gaza. Between the going out from Pi-Ramessu to the destruction of the Egyptians, and from that morning till the encampment was made in the wilderness of Sin, there is an abundance of time for marching and counter-marching. One need not put much pressure, then, on one's self in this respect—our difficulties are all topographical. This portion of the journey may be called the "Red Sea portion," of which the boundaries are conjectural as to localisation.

I do not see why we should regard the narrative in Exodus as continuous. For instance, I think that an entirely fresh paragraph commences after the account of Miriam's song (Exod. xv, 21). There is in the life of the people a new departure from the "great overthrow of Pharaoh." The corresponding passage (Num. xxxiii, 6-9) is confusing, as also is the designation "wilderness of Shur" (the name of that district through which the Egyptian Hagar passed when she fled from Sarai, and in which is placed the well Beer-lahai-roi). Who is the writer of Numbers xxxiii? Is he not a different person from the author of Exodus xiii, and from the author of Exodus xv? Between the author of Exodus xv, 22, and the author of Numbers xxxiii, 8, there is in common, however, a certain "three days in the wilderness," and from the narrator in Exodus we gather that they were marked and made memorable by scarcity of water. It is at Marah *after* "the wilderness" that we reach a definite place.

May we not, then, legitimately look to the other terminus of this portion of the journey, and see whether we have any certain points to make *from*? And may we not do well to take as a guide here the lamented Professor Palmer? The object of Moses is now to reach Horeb. The wilderness of Sin was reached, we know, one month after the departure from Ramses?

Professor Palmer gives us ("Desert of the Exodus," vol. I, chap. xiv) the conclusions arrived at by the members of the "Sinai Expedition," 1868-9. I do not know whether he modified his views as to the starting-point of the Israelites; I lay stress only on his itinerary for them from Ayún Músa.

They are moving from the Red Sea: Ayún Músa, with its ancient traditions, is a halting-place (on a straight line it would be about sixty-five miles from El Kantára). What does one see as one looks northward, with one's back to the blue water of the Gulf of Suez, towards the desert and the desolate lines of Jebels er Ráhah and Et Tih? The "wall-like escarpments" are the *salient features* of the landscape, and we need not wonder at the name "Shur" (in Hebrew signifying "a wall") being given to this track of the desert.

For three days from the "Wells of Moses," the ordinary traveller with baggage has to traverse a waterless region, till he comes to a small clump of dwarf palms, looking in the distance merely like a single bush, which overshadows Ain Hawwárah, a small pool with no water fit to drink. At a distance of two or three hours in a southerly direction you come, however, to the green tamarisks and grand old palm-trees of Wády Gharandel, and its perennial stream! Here or hereabouts Elim may be placed, and the present fertility of the spot, in the midst of a district which neglect and the destruction of vegetation tends to render dry and barren, is almost a guarantee for the antiquity of this fertility. The Israelites removed from "Elim" and encamped by the "Red Sea." It is exactly what one does now-a-days! If one chooses the Wády Feirán route to Sinai, one crosses from Wády Gharandel into the beautiful Wády Taiyebah, and, without over fatigue, on the same day one gets to the sea-shore a little north of Rás Abu Zenímeh, having turned the black headland of Jebel Hammán Far'ún ("Pharaoh's hot bath"). This strip of desert, fringing the coast south of Wády Taiyebah, may reasonably be taken for the "wilderness of Sin."

Making these remarks I don't lose out of sight that the whole narrative would be simpler if from Etham we could bring the Israelites by Lakes Baláh and Timsáh to the Bitter Lakes, and place the passage of the sea somewhere in the neighbourhood of Suez. Only as yet I do not think that we have got satisfactory sites for "Pihahiroth" and "Baal-Zephon," even if there would be no great risk in imagining a "Migdol" in these parts. The starting-points of the Exodus I think we have found, and I think that Professor Palmer has given us firmness of footing for the "wilderness of Sin." Little by little we may come to learn more of the Exodus, giving due weight to every reasonable theory which may be put forth, and not trying to make what *we* think should have been harmonise with what really was.

C. PICKERING CLARKE.

III.

THE following letter was written and published in the year 1869, on the author's return from a journey to Sinai:—