contests, and an agreeable diversity of opinion, but from henceforth I believe that the theory of Brugsch, that the Pharaoh's host was swamped by the setting in of the waters of the Mediterranean in the Serbonian marsh, must be given up, and the old theory that the escaping tribes went along the valley of the sweet-water canal must be regarded as firmly established.

And now we are passing out of the region of vain conjectures into the region of historical realities.

There is another point. Tell-el-Maskhuta is not only the Pithom and the Succoth of the Bible, but a very interesting place, of which we read in the Septuagint version. When Joseph went to meet Jacob, and Judah was sent to meet Joseph on behalf of his father, the meeting-place was Heroopolis. The identity of the spot is pointed out by Roman inscriptions there, with the name ERO, ERO CASTRA. The derivation of the name given by M. Naville is very interesting, namely, the Egyptian word "Ar," a storehouse, of which the plural is "Aru," identical with the Greek HPOY found on the spot. Thus the name is found, and the road is found, by which Jacob came and Judah went on before him. I may say besides that there is a very curious confirmation of the Biblical account of the work of bondage. The walls are very well built. The bricks are of Nile mud, and embedded in mortar, which, reminds us that the Egyptians "made the children of Israel to serve with rigour, and made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar and in brick" (Ex. i. 14). There are three kinds of brick used, the first made with straw properly provided; the next are made with reed (the "stubble" of our Bible, and the word used is pure Egyptian, Kash; arundo, calamus); and the third kind are made of sheer Nile mud, when even the reeds were exhausted. All these M. Naville has found at Pithom.

I will only add a few words more in following the illustrious Engineer officer, Sir Charles Wilson, whom I am happy to see here in the interest of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and that is that I am a humble member of the committee of the Egypt Exploration Fund, not by way of rivalry, for I have been a local secretary of the Palestine Exploration Fund, for many years. The one is the complement of the other. Sir Charles Wilson is himself on the committee of the Egypt Fund. I will therefore only make the shortest possible appeal, and ask, Is it not worth while to pay for pickaxes, to get at the wisdom of the Egyptians?

THE FORTRESS OF CANAAN.

In the last Quarterly Statement (Oct., 1883, p. 175) my friend Captain Conder, R.E., has made a very important and interesting identification (as it seems to me), viz., that of Khirbet Kan'an, near Hebron, with the fortified post of Kanäna, taken by Seti I in his first year from the Shasu.
It is curious, indeed, that the renowned name of Canaan should be found alive only at this one spot. There is no difficulty in its site on the hills, for there were Canaanites dwelling in the hill country of that very region (Num. xiv, 45), even at Hebron itself (Judges i, 10), and one great Canaanite king had his headquarters at Arad (Tell-Arad), in the hills about sixteen miles south of Khurbet Kan‘ān.

I do not think Seti’s march lay through the “vicinity of Gaza,” but by the other road through Beersheba. For we now know the starting-point, as well as the object of attack. Whether the Rebatha of Seti was Rehoboth, Ṛrubbah, or may be doubted, for the name Rebatha lacks the radical ר, and more resembles a Rabbath. Can it be represented by Khurbet Rābūd (Sheet XXI, Name Lists, p. 401; “Memoirs,” Vol. III, 360), where there are ruins, walls, and caves? Perhaps the pool or tank could hardly have been near; but it is on the right road.

And now I may say something of the great military route followed by the Pharaohs of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties into Syria.

We must shake off the teaching of Brugsch as to his supposed identity of the great key-fortress of Tsar, or Tsaru, with Tsān (Zoan, Sān), and revert to his own former and right view. I gladly quote from the learned Dr. Haigh, whose labours have been too much overlooked (Zeitschr., f. äg. Spr. 1876, 54):—“Here, therefore, he (Seti) enters Egypt at the close of his campaign, as hence he had set out at its commencement. It was, in fact, Egypt’s eastern gate; hence Thothmes III departed on his first expedition to Asia; here . . . the Mahar began his foreign travels; and the same place was . . . the gate of entrance for the Shasu on their way to the pools of Pi-tum. Its frontier character is still farther indicated by the text I have cited from Genesis xiii, 10: ‘The land of Egypt as thou enterest לארשי (Tsār); by its title ‘the seal;’ and by its having the determinative sometimes of Egyptian, sometimes of foreign, places. Then Dr. Brugsch has cited a text which says that the canal which flowed through it connected the Nile with the water Akeb, and shown that this canal must be that which Pliny says flowed from the Nile through Babylon and Heroopolis, and had received the name of Trajan, and may still be traced from the site of Babylon to the ruins of Mugfar, where it entered the Birket Timsah. Indeed, the identification of this place with the later Heroopolis, and the Mugfar of to-day, seems to me to have been irrefragably established by Dr. Brugsch. Later, however, he has abandoned this strong position, and identified Tsār with סן (San), which can never have been the eastern gate of Egypt, and which stands on one of the channels of the Nile, not on a canal connecting the Nile with a lake.”

Dr. Dümichen has dealt decisively with this matter in his “Geschichte” (in Oncken’s Collection), pp. 257, &c., concluding “that the identification of it with Tanis-Zoan, so strongly maintained by Brugsch, absolutely cannot be brought into accordance with the data found in the Egyptian texts as to its situation.”

Now Heroopolis has been found by M. Naville (not at Mugfar, indeed, but) about six miles further west than Mugfar, at Tell-el-Maskhuta. And
I think the ancient road found by the lamented Rev. F. W. Holland in 1879 (Quarterly Statement, 1879, p. 59), “running” (as he wrote to me) “due east from Ismaïlia,” and by which he was convinced that Abraham and Joseph and Jacob entered Egypt, was evidently the route of Thothmes III, and Seti I, and Râmeses II, to the Negeb; and, perhaps, of Aahmès I long before, when he chased the routed Hyksôs to Sharuhen; and probably of Amenemha I against the Seti, and still earlier of Pepi Meri-râ against the Herusha, whose name again occurs among the foes of Seti I. For let us remember the great antiquity of Tsar, or Tsaru. The treatise in praise of learning (“Records of the Past,” VIII, 145) “is attributed,” says Dr. Birch, “to the period of the twelfth dynasty; but the name of Pepi, the same as that of a monarch of the sixth dynasty, may indicate that it is of the earlier period.” This curious treatise is “made by a person of Tsaru ... to his son Pepi.”

Now Tsán is as old as Pepi of the sixth dynasty (and was “built seven years after Hebron”) and I little doubt that Tsar is of about the same high antiquity, and probably the work of the same founders; and it seems very highly probable that this great key-fortress stood where the ancient eastward road entered the Wâdy Tumilât. Is it out of hope that it may still be found, and monuments recovered bearing the name of Tsar?

I will not enlarge on this at present, since my purpose is just now to urge a further examination of the ancient road itself, strewn with flint flakes, among which Mr. Holland found “several beautifully-made arrowheads.” The splendid tableaux of Seti I at Karnak give the names of more than half-a-dozen halting-places, with forts and wells, or pools, on his route to Kanâna, and it may be hoped that some of these may be ascertained. We want a supplemental survey from Beersheba to the Suez Canal.

Dr. Haigh came to the conclusion that the fortress of Kanâna lay in the Arâbah south of the Dead Sea, and Brugsch seems to follow him in this (“Hist. of Egypt,” Eng. ed., II, 13).

But now that Kanâna is found, we have much more to go upon; and Professor Palmer’s journey in 1869 (Quarterly Statement, 1870, with map), and Mr. Holland’s in 1879, with supplemental and more recent travels, such as Mr. Pickering Clarke’s, recorded in the last Quarterly Statement, may help to make out the route of Seti to the Hebron region. The fortified watering-stations on this eastward route in Seti’s tableaux bear mostly Semitic proper names, but unluckily some are surnamed with Pharaonic titles, which would soon be lost. The names recorded in the travels of the Mohar; some of them parallel with those of Seti’s inscriptions, have been studied by the late M. Chabas (“Voyage d’un Egyptien,” 1866), by Dr. Haigh, and by Captain Conder (Quarterly Statement, 1876, p. 74) and doubtless more light will be thrown on them by future researches. The discovery of Seti’s Kanâna should encourage such inquiry, as it distinctly limits the area of search when taken in connection with the ancient road, and the true position of Tsaru.

It is a remarkable thing that we find in the great Harris papyrus (“Re-
cord of the Past,” VI, 34) to which Captain Conder refers, that Rāmēses III, in whose time the Philistines established themselves strongly as his subjects in the south-west of Palestine, built a fortified temple at Kanāna, of which the god was “Amen of Rāmēses hiq-An” (Rāmēses III), whither the people of the land, the Rutennu, brought their tribute. This was probably in the time of the Judges, and it agrees well with the insolence of the Philistines towards the Hebrews at that time. The intimacy of the Philistines with the Egyptians, whose enemies, auxiliaries, and allies they were in rapid succession, is curiously let out in 1 Samuel iv, 8; vi, 6, where the Philistines and their diviners make familiar reference to the obstinacy of the Pharaoh and his counsellors, and the destruction of the Egyptian forces on the desert frontier.

We should not overlook the interesting point that like so many other ancient names, Kanāna seems to have travelled down from Northern Syria, where it is found in Assyrian records, as Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch remarks, and whence it seems to have extended as the well-known Biblical name Canaan to the whole coast-lands of the Mediterranean down to the Egyptian frontier. Here, then, is Kanāna in the hill-country west of the upper Euphrates, and the identical name as far south as Hebron, with the sons of Heth in both. (“Wo lag das Paradies?” 104, 270.) Whether the name still lives in the northern as in the southern soil it will be interesting to inquire, for the Hittite land of Northern Syria is as yet almost unexplored. It is fair to say, however, that Schrader does not agree with Delitzsch in the view he takes of this name (“Die Keilinschriften, &c.,” 2nd ed., p. 90).

I must add that M. Naville's discoveries at Tell-el-Maskhuta have shown that it was for Rāmēses II that the Israelites built Pi-tum and Rāmēses, and have thus confirmed definitely the general opinion of Egyptologists that he was the Pharaoh of the great oppression, and his son, Mer-en-Ptah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Therefore the attack of Seti on the fortress of Kanāna must have preceded the Exodus by more than forty years.

In the same series of scenes Seti I conquers the Shasu from Tsar to Kanāna; the Kharu (Syrians); the Kheta (Hittites); and Amaru (Amorites); and takes the fortified town Kadesh in the land of Amar of the Amorites), and overruns the country to Naharina. Thus Seti effectually prepared the way for his son Rāmēses, whom he took with him in his wars, and established fortified posts in the desert and in Syria, and especially wells and tanks fortified. Such a well-spring, so protected, might be fitly called “a fountain sealed,” מליון חותם (Cant. iv, 12), for Khetam is the very word in Egyptian for a fort, still found at Sarabit-el-Khadem, the Egyptian military mining station in Sinaiic Arabia.

An account of Seti's triumphal reliefs at Karnak may be found in Professor Lushington's paper in “Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch.,” Vol. VI, 509; and the tableaux are excellently reproduced from Rosellini's large plates in M. Lenormant's new edition of his “Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient,” Vol. II. I am very glad to know that Professor Maspero is now engaged on a
HIDING-PLACES IN CANAAN.

V. THE CAVE OF ADULLAM, OR OLM, NOT NEAR ADULLAM, BUT AT KHUREITUN.

Josephus says this cave was near the city of Adullam, but William of Tyre identifies it with the well-known and often described cave of Khureitun, four miles south-south-east of Bethlehem.

I propose to show that, for once, mediæval credulity proves victorious over antiquity, ability, and the numerical superiority of its opponents. The explanation is simple enough: the Crusaders’ rough practical knowledge of David’s outlaw wants was a far more reliable guide than the subtler acumen of literary critics.

The cave is named in two Biblical episodes.

(1) “David departed thence (i.e., from Gath) and escaped to the cave (of) Adullam” (1 Sam. xxii, 1).

(2) “Three of the thirty captains went down to the rock to David, into the cave of Adullam; and the host of the Philistines encamped in the valley of Rephaim. And David was then in the hold, and the Philistines’ garrison was then at Bethlehem” (1 Chron. xi, 15, 16). In 2 Samuel xxiii, 13, a copyist’s error gives “in the harvest time” for “to the rock.”

Hence we learn that there was near the cave some conspicuous rock or eminence, as well as some hold or fortress.

It seems to me that this same hold is referred to in the following passages:—1 Samuel xxii, 4, 5; 1 Chronicles xii, 8, 16; 2 Samuel v, 17; and just possibly 1 Samuel xxiv, 22.

PART I.

Ten points have been named in favour of the cave having been near the city of Adullam (in the Sheplehah), identified by M. Ganneau with the ruins of Aid el Mieh, near Wady es Sur.

(a) The Bible speaks of the “Cave of Adullam,” and mentions only one city of that name. But “the oak of Tabor” had nothing to do with Mount Tabor, and so it does not follow that the cave of Adullam had necessarily to do with the city of Adullam.

Further, as in (1) and (2) the precise words are “to the cave of (not at)