

authorities, lay to the west of the Sinaitic peninsula. In any case the two names refer to two different districts. That spelt with *samech* being referred to in Exodus xvi and xvii; that spelt with *tsade* in Deuteronomy xxxii, 57; Numbers xiii, 21; xxvii, 14; and Joshua xv, 3, these being connected with Kadesh-Barnea.¹

In reference to the statement of St. Paul, it is not difficult to understand why he places Mount Sinai in "Arabia." The term was doubtless used by the Apostle in a general sense to include the vast region of desert-land lying to the south and east of Judæa. Mr. Greene himself sees the difficulty of accounting for the fact that Mount Hor should be associated with the lesser event of the death of Aaron rather than with those stupendous manifestations of Divine power which were connected with the giving of the Law.

Again, if Elim be Akabah, how can this be reconciled with the statement of Numbers xxxiii, 10, that the Israelites "removed from Elim and encamped by the Red Sea," inasmuch as Akabah is actually by the Red Sea? Other difficulties might be cited, but the above are probably sufficient to show that Mr. Baker Greene's identification cannot be admitted.

Nor can I admit that Kadesh-Barnea is Petra. From personal experience of the difficulties of the mountain pass leading from the Arabah Valley to Petra, I may safely affirm that it would have been impracticable for the Children of Israel when on their way to the Promised Land.

EDWARD HULL.

Dublin, November 18, 1884.

II.

PROFESSOR HULL having been good enough to place at my disposal a proof-sheet of his objections to my view of the Exodus, I gladly avail myself of the opportunity of replying to them forthwith. Negatively it is a source of satisfaction to me that, with this exception, no one of the many members of the Palestine Exploration Fund has challenged the soundness of my arguments.

I must confess, however, that I find considerable difficulty in knowing how to deal with Professor Hull's criticisms. I have no right to complain that he has not read my book before entering the lists, but not having done so, I think I may justly complain that he should have assumed that I did not take the trouble of studying with ordinary attention the subject of which I treated. He tells me how to ascertain the distance from Suez to Nakhl; quotes Professor Palmer as to the waterless character of the country around the last-named place;² he attributes to me "a

¹ The Rev. Dr. Stubbs, of Trinity College, Dublin, has kindly verified the originals for me.

² Kalaat el Nakhl, with its fort and wells, has been frequently mentioned and described by travellers for centuries past. See Thevenot's account, quoted

confusion" between the wildernesses of Sin and Zin; he gravely informs the readers of the *Quarterly Statement* that the initial letters of these words are different, and with equal gravity adds in a footnote that my respected friend Dr. Stubbs has verified the fact by reference to those passages in the Hebrew version where the names occur. He somewhat authoritatively asserts that personal observation of the country is pre-eminently required for the settlement of the points in issue, and, with what most persons will be inclined to think singular infelicity, refers to the late Dr. Beke's pilgrimage in search of the true Mount Sinai. Finally, he refers to the authority of a number of persons as to the identity of Jebel Mûsa with Mount Sinai,¹ and airily adds that after this consensus of opinion it might have been supposed that nothing more remained to be said. To measure small things by great, I may remind the Professor that there was a still greater consensus of opinion against Galileo when he maintained that the earth moved, and against the first geologists who ventured to deny that the creation of the world was effected in six solar days.

And now to deal with Professor Hull's objections in detail:—

He says that little value can be attached to the identification of Elim with Akabah because of the presence of palm-trees at the last-named place. I would go farther, and say no value whatever could be attached to such a ground of identification taken *per se*. But if he will turn to my contribution to the last *Quarterly Statement* he will find that I wrote, "I cannot give here in detail the many reasons, Scriptural, philological, historical, and geographical, for my identification of the Elim of Exodus xv, 27, with the Elath of Deut. ii, 8, and 1 Kings ix, 26," and the modern

by Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 14. He crossed the desert from Suez to Akabah in 1658, the journey occupying six days, of which sixty-seven hours were spent in travelling, which closely corresponds with the estimated time in the "Tabula Peutingeriana" (sixty-eight hours). See also Dr. Shaw, "Travels in Barbary and the Levant," 1721, p. 477; Dr. Pococke, Bishop of Meath, "Description of the East," 1743, i, 265. Nakhel is the half-way house on what Captain Burton describes as the oldest route in the world, and it has never been surveyed.

¹ It is not of much consequence, but as a matter of fact Burckhardt identified Jebel Serbal, a mountain thirty miles to the westward of Jebel Mûsa, with Sinai, an opinion shared by Lepsius and others. Captain Burton thus pithily sums up the respective claims of the various mountains in the peninsula to be "the true Sinai:"—"It is evident that Jebel Serbal dates only from the early days of Coptic Christianity; that Jebel Mûsa, its Greek rival, rose after the visions of Helena in the fourth century; whilst the building of the convent by Justinian belongs to A.D. 527. Ras Sufsaveh, its rival to the north, is an affair of yesterday, and may be called the invention of Robinson; and Jebel Katerina, to the south, is the property of Rûppell." ("Midian Revisited," i, 237.) I have the best reason for knowing that Professor Palmer had accepted my views of the Route of the Exodus before he left England in 1882, and that he would probably have taken the first opportunity of avowing his change of opinion had he returned.

Akabah. I cannot be expected to summarise the contents of an octavo volume of nearly five hundred pages.

Professor Hull urges the impossibility of the thousands of Israel, with their flocks and herds, finding a supply of water at Nakhel, and the improbability of their making the journey from Suez to that place in three or four days. Unfortunately for his inference he proves too much. There is no place in the desert of the Tih, where they are said to have wandered for forty years, where water could have been obtained for such a multitude. It is generally supposed that the released captives, including old men, women, and children, numbered between two and three millions. If such was the case, and they had formed a column ten abreast, allowing only a yard depth for each rank, the caravan, exclusive of flocks and herds, would have reached from Suez to Akabah. I believe that the released captives were not in such excessive numbers as to preclude the possibility of their doing what is annually done by the Egyptian Haj, namely, crossing the desert to Akabah in about a week's time. Professor Hull says that from his personal experience of the difficulties of the mountain pass leading from the Arabah to Petra, he can safely affirm it would have been impracticable for the Children of Israel on their way to the Promised Land. This objection, like the preceding one, rests, I presume, on their supposed numbers. But let us glance at certain admitted historical facts. At some period of their journeyings the Israelites were beyond all question in the middle portion of the Wâdy Arabah. They desired to pass through Edom, which throughout is a very mountainous region, in order to reach Moab and the Trans-Jordanic country to the north. The Edomites refused permission, and "came out against Israel with much people and a strong hand" (Numb. xx, 20, 21), "wherefore Israel turned away from him." But where did Israel turn? It is conceded on all hands that on quitting Mount Hor, the Israelites descended the Arabah "by the way of the Red Sea," by which is here meant beyond all dispute the Gulf of Akabah (Deut. ii), and, passing Ezion Gaber and Elath, "compassed Mount Seir," that is, Edom, and following the east "coast" of that country pursued a northerly direction to Moab. About this portion of the route followed by the Israelites there never has been any question. But the reason they took this circuitous course was because they were not enabled to pass through Edom, and this inability depended not upon the physical characteristics of the country, but on the hostile attitude of the Edomites. But the difficulties of this particular pass by which Professor Hull proceeded from the Arabah to Petra would have been equalled if not exceeded by those of the other "wâdies" debouching from the Idumean range into the Arabah. So that we must either reject as unhistorical the statement that the Israelites would have crossed Edom from the Arabah if they had been permitted to do so, or admit that those physical difficulties on which Professor Hull lays such stress would not have been insuperable.

Professor Hull says it is not difficult to explain St. Paul's placing

Mount Sinai in Arabia. "The term was doubtless used by the Apostle in a general sense to include the vast region of desert land lying to the south and east of Judæa." But this is begging the whole question. There is not a tittle of evidence that St. Paul ever thought or heard of the so-called Sinaitic peninsula. I affirm without fear of contradiction that no human being ever dreamt of extending Arabia west of the Arabah until Ptolemy, at the close of the second century, introduced what he called Arabia Petraea, an innovation which was never sanctioned or recognised by the Arabian geographers. It is not unreasonable to conclude that St. Paul, being a highly educated man, knew what he was writing about, and when he referred to Arabia meant the country which was so designated by his contemporaries. For the explanation of the curious fact that the association of Mount Hor with Aaron's death should have apparently survived those arising from the tradition of the law I must refer to the "Hebrew Migration." It should not be forgotten that, wherever situated, Mount Sinai fell into oblivion among the Jews. No pilgrimages were made to it, and its exact site was certainly unknown to Josephus, or he would have fixed its locality by its proximity to some well-known place.

The "confusion" which Professor Hull attributes to me respecting the wilderness of Sin and Zin supplies an opportunity, of which I may be permitted to avail myself, not only of satisfying the Professor that he has done me an injustice, but of bringing under the notice of the readers of the *Quarterly Statement* some interesting facts respecting Sin and Zin which will, I believe, lead them to share my opinion that they were identical.

The wilderness of Sin was between Elim and Sinai (Exod. xvi, 1), and in Exodus xvii we have mention made of two very remarkable incidents which must have happened in, or in the immediate neighbourhood of, that wilderness, namely, the smiting of the rock with the production of water, and the battle with the Amalekites. Let us briefly consider all that is told us respecting these two incidents.

According to the account in Exodus xvii, the Israelites murmured through want of water, and obtained the miraculous supply from the rock in Horeb, the place bearing the name "Massah and Meribah, because of the chiding of the children of Israel, and because they tempted the Lord." We have, however, another account of this miracle in Numbers xx. It is there stated that "then came the children of Israel, even the whole congregation, into the desert of Zin in the first month, and the people abode in Kadesh, and Miriam died there." Whilst in this place "there was no water for the congregation." The people rebelled, and Moses, by command of the Lord, smote the rock, and the water came forth abundantly. "This is the water of Meribah, because the children of Israel strove with the Lord, and He was sanctified in them."

Now no one will seriously contend that there were two distinct miracles, performed under precisely similar circumstances, at an interval of nearly forty years, in places widely apart, and that the water produced bore in both cases the name "Meribah." But all doubt on the matter is removed

by referring to the language which was addressed by the discontented Israelites to their leaders. They demanded why they had been brought into the wilderness with their cattle to die, and asked "wherefore have ye made us to come out of Egypt to bring us into this evil place? it is no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates, neither is there any water to drink." This language was appropriate if used by people who had only recently quitted Egypt, and who "in the first month" (Numb. xx, 1) after their departure had arrived in a region where they were forced to submit to great privations; but it is hopelessly unintelligible as coming from people who had been thirty-nine years straying about in the wilderness, the generation which had quitted Egypt having by that time almost entirely died out.

The second incident recorded in Exodus xvii is the battle with the Amalekites, and if the accepted view that the wilderness of Sin was in the south-west region of the Sinaitic peninsula, this must have been fought close to the Gulf of Suez. The negative and the positive evidence against such an assumption are, however, overwhelming. The inscriptions on the steles at Sarbut el Khadem, which is close to the route which must have been followed by the Israelites if they entered the peninsula, prove that the mines in that neighbourhood were worked by the Egyptians for centuries before the Exodus took place, and for long afterwards.¹ If, however, this particular region was occupied by Egyptians when Moses led the captives away, it is in the highest degree improbable that he would have entered a place occupied by his enemies, and still more so that the circumstance of having done so should have been unnoticed in the Biblical records. But by what possible train of reasoning can the presence there of the Amalekites be accounted for? Who were the Amalekites? Amalek was the grandson of Esau, and one of the Dukes of Edom (Gen. xxxvi, 12). The Edomites and the Amalekites were frequently treated as identical. It was the Amalekites who barred the progress of the Israelites when on their way to the Land of Promise (Numb. xiii, 29), within a few months after this supposed battle in sight of the Gulf of Suez. But we have a specific account of a battle between the Israelites and the Amalekites, in which, however, the latter were victorious, and the scene of the engagement was in the wilderness of Zin near Kadesh (Numb. xiv), the same incident being referred to in Deuteronomy i, and it was this reverse which led to the return of the Israelites down the Arabah to Elath, and their subsequent journey by the east of Edom to Moab.

It is therefore simply inconceivable that the Amalekites, who beyond all question were Edomites, should have been found at the time of the Exodus in Egyptian territory, and then actually occupied by the Egyptians, and that they should, without any imaginable reason, have given battle there to the Israelites. In the battle recorded in Exodus xvii the Israelites were victorious, while in that mentioned in Numbers xiv and Deut. i they were vanquished. There can be no reason to doubt that these

¹ "Heb. Mig," p. 174.

engagements were consequent on the efforts made by the Israelites to pass through Edom, and were fought in the same region

It is worth while to ascertain what opinion a Jew living at the commencement of the Christian era entertained respecting the locality where the first battle with the Amalekites was fought. Josephus, in his paraphrase of this portion of the Biblical narrative, states that a coalition was formed against the Hebrews, and that "those who induced the rest to do so were such as inhabited Gobolitis and Petra: they were called Amalekites" ("Ant.," iii, 2). It is perfectly clear, therefore, that, in the opinion of the great Jewish historian, this battle was fought in Edom, and that the Sinaitic peninsula was wholly absent from his mind. He certainly had no opportunity of consulting those great modern authorities which place Mount Sinai between the Gulfs of Suez and Akabah.

Whilst the Israelites were still between Elim and Sinai they met with the Kenites and concluded a league with them (Exod. xviii). But the same insuperable objection to the transportation of the Amalekites to the Sinaitic peninsula, applies to placing the Kenites in the same region. This latter people, though distinct from the Amalekites, occupied with them the country on the east of the Arabah. They are positively referred to by Balaam (Numb. xxiv, 7); they aided Judah in the invasion of Southern Palestine (Judg. i, 16); and on the occasion of Saul's campaign against the Amalekites (1 Sam. xv), which beyond all question was fought in the region to the south of the Dead Sea, the Kenites at the request of the king separated themselves from the Amalekites. What imaginable reason could Jethro, who was the Sheikh of the tribe, have had for taking his people for a flying visit to the so-called Sinaitic mountains?

It will doubtless be urged that my identification of the wilderness of Sin with that of Zin is irreconcilable with the "Itinerary" (Numb. xxxiii), in which they are apparently distinguished from each other, and placed very far apart. My reply is, that the result of a critical collation of the Itinerary with the narrative of the principal events which marked the journeying of the Israelites from Egypt to the Promised Land shows that the former is a production of a more recent date, and was probably compiled either during or immediately subsequent to the Babylonian captivity. It is observable that the Itinerary tells us no new facts, though it furnishes names of places of which there is no mention elsewhere. It would be impossible for me to give here an exhaustive analysis in support of the inference of the comparatively late date of this composition, but one or two points may be noticed pertinent to the present matter. In the Itinerary the Israelites are said to have proceeded from Kibroth-hattaavah (which we know was in the wilderness of Sin, Exod. xvi) to Hazeroth, and thence to a number of places of which we have no mention elsewhere. But we learn from another source that on removing from Hazeroth the Israelites "pitched in the wilderness of Paran" (Numb. xii, 16), which is identified with that of Zin, from which the spies were sent forth. It is clear, therefore, that if according to the Itinerary the Israelites proceeded from Kibroth-hattaavah, in the wilderness of Sin, to Hazeroth which was

the next station to the wilderness of Paran, or of Zin, the deserts of Sin and Zin must have been contiguous, or were identical if the journey from Hazeroth to Zin marks the return to Elath at the head of the Gulf of Akabah. As, however, the spies "searched the land from the wilderness of Zin unto Rehob," the wilderness of Sin, which was close by, if not identical with, that of Zin, and which lay between Elim and Sinai, could not have been in the Sinaitic peninsula. I may add that one of the curious results of taking the statements in the Itinerary in their received sense is that, as the Israelites did not reach the wilderness of Zin until immediately before the death of Aaron, the spies who set out from thence could not have undertaken their mission until nearly forty years after the departure from Egypt. But the forty years' delay in the wilderness was declared to have been the punishment for the disobedience of the Israelites on the return of the spies (Numb. xiv).

There are many who regard the Pentateuch as a continuous narrative from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Deuteronomy, and who make it an article of faith to ascribe the authorship to Moses. I cannot understand why they do so, or why they consider it as incompatible with inspiration to admit that it may be the work of many hands. The Gospels do not speak with diminished authority because they are the productions of four different evangelists. On the contrary, the confirmation they respectively afford of the facts they record furnishes more conclusive proof of the sacred narrative than if the story had been told by only a single witness. And so it is with the various distinct records which have been welded together in the Pentateuch. By their substantial agreement in the main, no less than by their differences in details, in forms of expression, and in dialect, they give us, by what are termed "undesigned coincidences," the most absolute proof of the historical accuracy of this great movement of liberated Hebrews from Egypt to Palestine which was destined to exercise so great an influence on the human race. Carefully preserved by the different nations of which Trans-Jordanic and Cis-Jordanic Israel and Judah were composed, they were subsequently collected and presented in the form in which we now see them. The Mount of God was to some known as Horeb, to others as Sinai, and probably to all as the *Har-ha-har*, the Mount of Mounts. The Elim of the records of one section is the Elath of another, as the Hazarim of the one is the Hazeroth of the other, and in like manner the wilderness which by some was kept in their memories as that of Sin, was referred to by others as that of Zin.¹ These are, however, differences which, if viewed in a proper light, only serve the more conclusively to convince us of the authenticity and the antiquity of these precious records.

J. BAKER GREENE.

¹ We have an illustration of the difference in the use of sibilants by the Cis-Jordanic and Trans-Jordanic sections of Israel in Judges xii, 6. The Sibboleth of the former was the Shibboleth of the latter.