

surrounding nations (2 Kings xxiii, 13), *may* have been the Mount of Olives, since there was an old high-place on the top of it (2 Sam. xv, 32), but it may also have been on the western side of the city. Gareb (Jer. xxxi, 39), which was over against Jerusalem on the side of the Tyropœon, must be the hill on which the Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands, and perhaps derived its name rather from Gareb the Ithrite, one of David's bodyguard, than from its "scabrous" appearance. Goah will be the district opposite to it on the eastern side of the city, and possibly denoted that part of the valley of the Kidron which lay to the north of the Virgin's Spring. The "king's dale" (2 Sam. xviii, 18; Gen. xiv, 17) ought to have been in the neighbourhood of the royal gardens.

A. H. SAYCE.

I append a rough sketch-map, in order to illustrate my restoration of the topography of præ-exilic Jerusalem.

THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS.

I.

I SUPPOSE that the excavations which have been made within the last few weeks in Egypt will have turned the attention of many to a different point for the passage of the Israelites to that which has lately been advocated in the *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Society. I have felt for some time the difficulties connected with any route near to, or north of, Kantara; and I trust that very soon the matter will be much clearer to all who are interested in the truth of Biblical statements. When I went down the Suez Canal, and returned by it, some years ago, all I could say to myself was, that I *had* been over the spot where the Israelites crossed, but *where* that spot was I did not know. I hope that the discussion which has been proceeding will start from a new basis.

I start, therefore, by stating that I believe that the great debouching of the Israelites was not by way of Kantara, and the edge of the Mediterranean, but by way of Wâdy Tumilat, and the neighbourhood of Lake Timsah. The southern end of the land of Goshen ran up to the west of Wâdy Tumilat; the recent excavations at Tel-el-Maskhuta go to prove that Pithom and Raamses of Exodus i, 11, were at the eastern end of Wâdy Tumilat: the Wâdy Tumilat then must have been well known to the Israelites. I believe that when the command was given them to go forth out of Egypt they poured forth by Wâdy Tumilat. Thus doing they would be confronted by Lake Timsah. They would desire to turn northwards along its edge towards Kantara, the usual road to Syria, being also "the way of the land of the Philistines, which was near" (Exod. xiii, 17). But God did not desire that they should escape by that road; therefore, in Exodus xiv, 2, He bids them "turn." These two words, "near" and "turn," seem to give us two keynotes. Does not the first word, "near," point out that the escape was not from the northern end of Goshen by way of Kantara—for that would better be described as "direct," or as "directly

opposite"—but that rather it was by Wâdy Tumulat, which would rightly be called "near" to those who were at Lake Timsah? And does not the word "turn" just express the action of those who, being at Lake Timsah, were endeavouring to escape by its northern edge, but are now bidden to plunge into the difficulties that must meet them at the Red Sea?

In prehistoric times the river Nile must have poured the mud of Ethiopia into the Gulf of Suez by way of Wâdy Tumulat: this gulf would then be open, through the Bitter Lakes, up to Lake Timsah, if not further. In process of time the passage between the Bitter Lakes and Lake Timsah would be silted up; and as the channel of the Nile in Wâdy Tumulat was shallow, that would also be silted up, leaving Lake Timsah as a deep depression of *fresh water*, and so still the "Lake of Crocodiles," as its name imports. From this mud of the Nile, in Wâdy Tumulat, the Israelites made their bricks for Pharaoh. The continuance of Lake Timsah would make the silting up between it and the Bitter Lakes to be but imperfect; hence *quicksands* would be naturally expected—indeed, when M. Lesseps was making his canal, "the Great Bitter Lake" was a morass full of reeds, and marsh plants, and the Arab name for it was "the Valley of Reeds." Thus we are led to expect the existence of a "Pi-hahiroth," *i.e.*, "the place of quicksands."

This, then, is the position of the Israelites: they have "turned" from their most ready means of escape from Egypt—thus doing they come upon "the quicksands of Pi-hahiroth;" south of them appear the Bitter Lakes, then forming the upper end of the Red Sea. They are indeed "entangled."

Their last "encampment" before crossing is "by the sea;" further excavations may give us the true positions of Migdol, and Baal-zephon. Possibly this "encampment" was near the junction of the greater and the lesser Bitter Lakes, and there the crossing was effected. What we require is (1) sufficient water to become "unto them a wall on their right hand and on their left;" (2) not too deep a depression for the Israelites to pass over easily with wives and children: where this spot is likely to be the soundings of the lakes must suggest.

Let me recommend on this subject the most interesting articles by Miss Amelia B. Edwards, on "Is Ramases II the Oppressor of Exodus?" contributed to "Knowledge," in 1882-3; the "Cities of Egypt," by Reginald S. Poole; "La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes," 3rd edition, by the Abbé Vigoureux.

ADAM CLARKE SMITH.

II.

MAY I be allowed to make two remarks on the papers which have appeared on this subject?

If, after the passage of the Yam Suph, the Israelites found themselves on the shores of the Mediterranean, it is very strange that no indication of that fact is to be found in the narrative.