

## THE EXODUS.

AMONG the four or five papers on the Exodus in your last *Quarterly Statement*, I am greatly pleased at the contribution by Mr. C. Pickering Clarke. He accepts, at page 23, as distinctly even as I have done myself, what I have so long contended for, viz., that the fifth and sixth Anastasi papyri are distinctively papyri of the Exodus : that is to say, that masses of Semitic people are described therein as flitting backwards and across the scene. Mr. Clarke (p. 23), talking of the marshy country east of the fortress set up by the Regent Hotep-hi-ma, or Bai-n-Ra, says, "The administration of the eastern marshes is clearly set forth in the Egyptian papyri, having its bureau at the royal city Pi-Rameses ; 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."

The reason, however, why I can hardly quite agree in this flowery description is that when the Semites rose in insurrection, the government was no longer central, but anarchical. Both Rameses II and Seti II died blind (see Pliny, Herodotus, and Diodorus), and practically everything fell into the hands of the great regent Bai-n-Ra, who died tributary to the Hittites, and thus eventuated the Exodus. Unfortunately, to the best of my knowledge, only two people in England would be able to read off Hieratic. There may be others, of course. Let them tell us, yes or no, was the military earthwork Tabnet cut out in twenty-three days, or was it not ? Was it or was it not dug out avowedly for the accommodation of the foreigners in the temple of Nebt-hotep ? Was or was not a four days' journey arranged for the Semites ? Were 178 royal robes given or loaned out by Egyptian officers to the foreigners for the occasion ?

These things are not quite clear, and it is curious that from about the middle of the papyrus (6th Anastasi) the Regent and his friendly Shasu are brought forward from Edom. Perhaps it is a symptom of the last struggle that poor old Seti sent down an architect from Thebes to put things right. Truly, however, let us allow he was probably the greatest architect that this world has ever known, viz., Bek-n-Chonsu.

DUNBAR J. HEATH.

*Esher, Surrey.*

## VARIETIES.

I WISH to point out one or two points in Captain Conder's recent observations :—

1. In incorrectly saying (1883, p. 102) that I seem to identify *Ephron* with *Ephrath*, he has confused the former name with

- Ephraim*. This name (52) may easily have taken the place of *Ephrath*, by the final ת being altered (as I said) into יב.
2. *The Garrison* (1883, p. 101). Samson's last exploit was breaking Philistine pillars. But that Jonathan's first had to do with pillars erected by the Philistines is an idle fancy on the part of Captain Conder. If he is satisfied about the rocking of the *pillar*, what is meant by "Both of them *discovered themselves unto the 'pillar'* (!) of the Philistines?" (1 Sam. xiv, 11.) Should the grammar allow the words in xiv, 15, to be rendered "all the people of the *pillar*," the lexicon certainly will not, since the word *מִצֵּב*, used seven times in this episode, never means a "pillar." It is an entire mistake to say "it is rendered 'pillar' in other passages of the Old Testament."
  3. *Gath* (1880, p. 216). Captain Conder made a strange mistake when he said that I had "fallen into the same error with Mr. Saunders in supposing the *Gh* or *Ghein* to represent the Hebrew Gimel." Apparently he overlooked the small but important word *if* at the beginning of the sentence.

W. F. B.

---

## THE TOMB OF DAVID IN THE CITY OF DAVID.

If Captain Conder be right (N.B., I do not for a moment believe that he is) in his identification of the Tomb of Nicodemus (so called) with "the monuments of the Kings of Judah (1883, p. 73), including the Tombs of David and Solomon," then this is certainly the grandest discovery yet made at Jerusalem.

Mr. Fergusson in 1878, having four ill-sorted kings to dispose of, made them up into one lot and said ("Temples," p. 56), "These four may have been buried in those sepulchres always known to have existed under the western boundary of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre." Captain Conder, always striking, but sometimes missing the mark, seems to have seized on these tombs for a nobler object, and says in the "Handbook" (p. 342), "It seems quite possible that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre preserves the monument of the nine chief kings of Jerusalem."

This "possible" of 1879, developed into "hope to show" in 1882 (*Quarterly Statement*, 157), and has now in 1883 culminated, "after ten years of study," in a "fact" (!!). Surely error grows apace.

Since 1877 I have believed that the Tomb of David was on Ophel (so called), and as the newly discovered aqueduct clears up the Siloam mystery, I do not hesitate (after groping awhile in the dark) to assert that the tomb is on that hill somewhere between Siloam and the Virgin's Fountain. Since 1878 it has been patent to me that the City of David was solely and