

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

conceit been leading us. We thought we must needs make out for thy dear Son—dear, also, to us, because he hath come to bring us life—some wisely-framed doctrine, bearing the stamp of our own wise thought and science, not so familiar and so merely practical as thy choice words of sacrifice. But we have wearied ourselves in the greatness of our way. We have raised long controversies and held learned councils and contrived exact articles; and, though we have seemed to settle many things wisely, yet nothing is either settled or wise; but whatever we devise turns dry, looks empty, disappoints the craving of our wants, creating, after all, only such consent as consists in a common discord.”

ARTICLE XI.

NOTES ON EGYPTOLOGY.—NEW THEORY OF THE EXODUS BY PASHA BRUGSCH.

BY JOSEPH P. THOMPSON, D.D., LL.D., BERLIN.

BELIEVERS in the divine authority of the Hebrew scriptures should not be over eager in accepting the seeming confirmations of their story which from time to time are brought forward from Assyrian and Egyptian monuments, and from other collateral sources. Such confirmations undoubtedly exist, and in the progress of archaeological research we may confidently look for more. They are valuable chiefly as side-lights, illuminating certain incidental points in the biblical narrative, and by throwing these into clearer relief, giving an extraneous confirmation to the whole story with which these stand connected; but they should never be magnified as the central light of the story itself, the conclusive evidence of its authenticity. The trepidation of some biblical critics at the alleged antiquity of the zodiac of Denderah, and their subsequent exultation over its comparatively modern data and significance, were alike unseemly, and betrayed an undue sensitiveness to the value of such testimony upon either side. That the Pentateuch is steeped in the atmosphere of Egypt and of the desert, that its narratives breathe the air of Oriental life, and its laws and customs reflect, now the stable civilization of Egyptian society, and now the rude freedom and simplicity of the wilderness, are strong internal proofs of the historical truth of the

¹ *La Sortie des Hébreux d'Égypte et les Monuments Égyptiens Conférence par Henri Brugsch-Bey, Vice-Président des Écoles Libres, Gratuites et Universelles de la Ville du Caire. Publiée sous les Auspices de S. A. le Prince Ibrahim-Pacha. 8vo. pp. 47. Alexandrie: A. Mourès. 1874.*

books of Moses ; but when some single discovery, or chain of discoveries, in Egyptian archaeology is vaunted as settling the fact that the Hebrews were in Egypt, and made their exodus to Canaan by way of the desert, the exaggeration of such extraneous evidence seems to imply the previous dubiousness of the biblical narrative, and, moreover, rests its support upon what may prove to be a fancied analogy or the theory of an enthusiastic explorer. Thus the view of the Hebrew exodus lately propounded by Dr. Brugsch — formerly a Bey, now a Pasha of the Khedive — from Egyptian monuments, has been received by a portion of the religious press as if it were a new revelation accrediting the old ; and yet this theory can be maintained only by discrediting a portion of the narrative which it is adduced to confirm.

Whatever Dr. Brugsch may have to say upon such a question is deserving of most serious consideration. His *Geographische Inschriften Altägyptischer Denkmäler*, his *Recueil de Monuments Égyptiens*, his *Histoire d'Égypte*, and his translation of the Book of the Dead, *Das Todtenbuch der alten Aegypter* — the last two yet unfinished — have contributed indirectly to the elucidation of the Pentateuch, and have awakened much expectation for the promised work of the same author, *Bibel und Denkmäler*, in which he proposes to treat in detail of the relations between the Hebrew scriptures and the Egyptian monuments. The above-mentioned works, together with his *Hieroglyphisch-Demotisches Wörterbuch* and his *Hieroglyphische Grammatik*, place Dr. Brugsch in the first rank of Egyptologists, and justify his assumption of authority in matters of fact concerning the monuments and their inscriptions ; yet he has sometimes shown a propensity to theorize and to frame conclusions from insufficient data, and this causes one to hesitate in following his authority as an interpreter and leader, and to scrutinize his steps before accepting his results. His theory of the exodus, first broached in a popular lecture in Cairo, then published at Alexandria in French and in Arabic, and afterwards repeated before the Congress of Orientalists in London, has excited the hopeful interest of the religious world through the plausibility of its arguments, the seeming pertinency of its identifications and discoveries, and the fascination of its style. We are loath to dismiss it as only a theory, not borne out by the facts adduced in evidence, and for which important links are wanting ; and we are none the less grateful to the author for an attempt which we are constrained to pronounce premature and unsatisfactory.

Dr. Brugsch does not profess to have found upon Egyptian monuments any direct and positive reference to the exodus of the Hebrews ; on the contrary he clearly recognizes the improbability of the Egyptians recording upon public monuments for the information of posterity such a disaster to an Egyptian army as the Hebrew scriptures attribute to the intervention of Jehovah at that time. "Il n'est guère probable que les

Pharaons aient pris soin de rappeler, sur leurs monuments, des souvenirs qui auraient fait connaître à la postérité la défaite d'une armée égyptienne. La découverte d'une inscription quelconque qui raconterait les événements de l'Exode à l'égyptienne, ne renfermerait, probablement, que de gros mensonges."¹

Several years ago the writer of this Notice, alluding to the same point, said : " To the biblical account of the exodus itself it has been objected that there is no mention of it in Egyptian history ; but Egyptian history is as yet so far fragmentary that the absence of any clear and positive reference to such an event need excite no surprise. Moreover, nations are not accustomed to record and commemorate their own disasters ; and where the history of a nation is made up almost entirely of pictorial and monumental chronicles of its kings, prepared by their order, or that of their immediate successors, it is not likely that untoward events would find a place among the representations of victories and triumphant festivals. The galleries of Versailles exhibit the pictorial history of France in all its points of grandeur and triumph, but not in scenes of disaster. One sees there the coronation of Louis XVI., but not his decapitation ; the victories of Napoleon, his marriage, his coronation, but not his defeat at Waterloo, nor his confinement at St. Helena ; the coronation of Louis Philippe after the revolution of 1830, but not his flight from the revolution of 1848. Solferino is there ; but neither the surrender of Louis Napoleon at Sedan, nor the proclaiming William Emperor of Germany in the hall of mirrors, will ever find place upon those walls. The absence of any monument or record in Egyptian history touching the destruction of Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea, would be no argument against the fact stated in the Hebrew scriptures. But that history is not altogether silent concerning the exodus of the Israelites."²

It is the *indirect* testimony of the Egyptian monuments to the exodus of the Hebrews that Dr. Brugsch attempts to weave together into a theory. The facts adduced are curious and significant ; some of these have been given in previous Notes in the Bibliotheca, others are of recent discovery ; Dr. Brugsch has combined them with dexterity ; but we cannot agree with him that the facts themselves " are of a character to satisfy entirely our curiosity " upon the question, nor can we accept his construction of them as conclusive. The points of the investigation are thus concisely stated by Dr. Brugsch : " First, Moses having obtained from the Pharaoh of his time permission for the Hebrews to go into the desert, there to celebrate a feast to Jehovah, set out with his people from the Egyptian city Ramsès ; secondly, he led them, station by station, through several places of Egypt to the sea ; thirdly, that the Hebrews

¹ pp. 7, 8.

² Lecture on Moses in the " Boston Lectures " for 1871, pp. 120, 121.

crossed the sea dry-shod, while the army of Pharaoh that pursued them, composed of chariots of war and horsemen, was swallowed up by the waters of the sea. And the question is, whether the Egyptian monuments and their inscriptions have preserved any traces that have reference to these events, and if so, whether such monumental traditions agree with the historical narrative given in the sacred books." ¹

Dr. Brugsch first turns his attention to the Pharaoh of the Exodus, whom he identifies with Meneptah I., the son and successor of Ramsès II., whose reign commenced about 1341 B.C.² The grounds of this identification have been brought to the notice of the readers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* in previous numbers of these Notes, and it will be sufficient to summarize them here. (1) Ramsès II. built the city of Ramsès in the delta, near the water, between Egypt and Palæstine. This capital rivalled Memphis and Thebes in the splendor of its temples and palaces and in the abundance of its luxuries.³ (2) The Hebrews are mentioned in sundry papyri as employed upon the public works at Ramsès, under the supervision of Ameneman, captain of the guard, who is known to have held this office under Ramsès II. The evidence upon which Dr. Brugsch here relies is the well-known series of reports, in the Museum at Leyden, concerning "the rations supplied to the soldiers and to the Apouriou (or Ebouriou) who haul stone for the great fortress of the city of Ramsès."⁴ This text shows, certainly, that workmen of a foreign race were employed in building Ramsès; and another scrap of the papyrus says of these workmen that "they make their tale of bricks, day by day, without relaxing their toil." Such allusions, taken in connection with the well-known picture of the brickmakers, working under taskmasters with whip in hand,⁵ vividly illustrate the story of the Hebrews, and show that the historian of the Exodus had before him a truly Egyptian scene. But the reading of *Apouriou* as the Egyptian transcript of *Hiberim* has not yet received a sufficient *consensus* of Hamitic and Semitic philologists to be accepted as final. The probabilities are that Messrs. Chabas and Brugsch are correct in regarding this as an explicit mention of the Hebrews at work in Ramsès, confirming in a remarkable manner the biblical narrative, that the Egyptians "did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure-cities,

¹ p. 7.

² See *His. Canon Chronologique* in Brugsch's *Histoire d'Égypte*, i. 291.

³ See the description of the city given by a poet who witnessed the entry of Ramsès II. into his new capital. — *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. xxii. p. 686. Chabas, *Mélanges Égyptologiques*, No. 2, and Maspero, *Du Genre Épistolaire chez les Anciens Égyptiens*.

⁴ See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. xx. p. 882, and Vol. xxi. p. 666.

⁵ See plate in Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, Vol. ii. p. 99.

Pithom and Raamses."¹ But we are not yet prepared for the confident and sweeping conclusion of Dr. Brugsch: "If Ramsès II. is the Pharaoh who built the city of Ramsès, he was necessarily the contemporary of Moses. The years of this king's reign, numbering sixty-seven, accord perfectly with the age of the Jewish legislator, who, an old man of eighty, led forth the Hebrews under the reign of the son and successor of Ramsès II., Meneptah I. Thus indisputably do we identify Ramsès II. as the Pharaoh of the Exodus, as the founder of the city of Ramsès, and as the oppressor of the Hebrews, whom the texts of his epoch designate by the name of the Epriou."² But, as Karnac at Thebes was the growth of successive reigns, so public works, requiring many laborers, may have been carried on at Ramsès long after the foundation of the city. Louis Napoleon built a new Paris; Victor Emanuel is creating a new Rome. Hence activity in building alone does not determine the reign of Ramsès II. as the date of the exodus. But the time of the exodus, and the Pharaoh under whom it took place, are here of secondary importance; it is the route of the Hebrews on their way out from Egypt with which Dr. Brugsch's *brochure* is chiefly occupied.

Some of his proposed identifications are curious and striking. The first in order is that of Ramsès with Zân, the Zoan of the Hebrew scriptures. The Museum of Egyptian antiquities at Boulaq contains a number of statues and tablets, excavated, under the direction of Mariette-Bey, from the extensive field of ruins in the vicinity of Lake Menzaleh known under the name of San. Several of these represent Ramsès II. and record incidents of his reign; and there are two statues, in particular, covered with hieroglyphic texts which acquaint us with the fact that this king gave his name to Tanis, which he adopted as his capital. Zan was built upon both sides of the Tanitic branch of the Nile, which at that time was large enough to admit sea-going vessels to the harbor of the city. This identification sheds light upon a passage in the seventy-eighth Psalm: "Marvellous things did he in the sight of their fathers, in the land of Egypt, in the field of Zoan."³ Zan was apparently the name of a nome or district, as well as of a city. If Ramsès was but a later name of Tanis, then we have ascertained the point of departure for the exodus⁴ considerably farther to the north than has been hitherto supposed, and a location which would require that the vast multitude of the Hebrews should cross the easternmost or Pelusiæ branch of the Nile on their first day's march to Succoth. This is the second identification of Dr. Brugsch. To the east of Tanis, between this and the desert, was the district known to classic authors as Séthroïtès, and which appears upon Egyptian

¹ Exod. i. 11.

² p. 16.

³ Verse 12, and again verse 43, "wonders in the field of Zoan."

⁴ Exod. xii. 37.

monuments under the name of Thuku or Thukut. Dr. Brugsch gives several examples of the change of the Egyptian sound of *th* into the sibilant of the Hebrews and the Greeks, e.g. Tebennuter = Sebennytos; and hence he infers that Thukut was Soucoth or Succoth; and, curiously enough, this Egyptian district of Thukut had a chief city of the name of Pitom. And, as a coincidence still more striking, among the papyri in the British Museum known as the Anastasi collection, is one which reports the arrival of certain Bedouin tribes of Edom, to whom, in time of famine, permission had been given to settle on the border of the lakes of the city of Pitom in the district of Soucoth.¹

The next identification is so elaborate that it can be appreciated only by placing before the reader an exact translation of Dr. Brugsch's argument: "South of the two governmental districts, the capitals of which were Pitom and Ramsès, was a third district lying adjacent, which the Greeks called the Arabian nome, designating as its chief place a city called Phakusa, Phaccussa, Phacusai, or Phacussan. Arabian authors, retrenching the final syllable of this name, adopted the Greek appellation, and hence it is that, even to-day, this city figures on the map of modern Egypt under the name of Faqus. In the official lists engraved upon the monuments, especially on the foundations of the temples, this same city appears under the name Gosem, which in no way differs from the Goshen of the holy scriptures, which the Septuagint renders now by Gesen, then by Gesem, once with the addition Gesem of Arabia, that is to say, the Arabian district of the geographical lists. According to a usage of the Egyptian language long since recognized, it was allowable to supply geographical names designating cities and countries with the article of the masculine gender, Pha, as if we should say Caire and Le Caire. In this manner is to be explained the composition Pha-Gosem (*the Gosem*) of the Greek and Arabic names for the city Phacussan, -a, -ai — Faqus, which the Coptic books transcribe Qous, without the article."²

Though this identification of Faqus with Gosem is novel, and perhaps fanciful, the determination of the district of Goshen is not new to scholars; and so long ago as 1838 Dr. Robinson had collated the views of modern geographers to the effect that "the land of Goshen lay along the Pelusiac arm of the Nile, on the east of the Delta, and was the part of Egypt nearest to Palestine — though Goshen probably extended farther west and more into the Delta than has usually been supposed. This tract is now comprehended in the modern province esh-Shūrkiyeh."³ This identification of the Goshen district has every probability in its favor; but it creates a difficulty with Dr. Brugsch's previous identification of Ramsès, as will be seen by glancing at the map which accompanies his

¹ Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. xxii. p. 686.

² pp. 24, 25.

³ Biblical Researches, Vol. i. sec. 2. For a good map of this district, see M. de Lesseps' Carte de l'Isthme de Suez, and Kiepert's Neuer Hand-atlas, No 34.

pamphlet. Faqus lies in latitude $30^{\circ} 45'$ longitude $29^{\circ} 27'$; and San almost due north in latitude 31° , being distant about fifteen geographical or eighteen statute miles. According to the Hebrew narrative Ramsès was the starting-point of the exodus, and probably Pharaoh was at that time residing in this capital. If the public works were unfinished, the presumption is that a large body of the Hebrew men were there as laborers. But what of the women and children? The district of Goshen was the abode of the Hebrews, and they were not confined to any one city; as, for example, Phaccussan, but "the land was filled with them." There is no evidence that the whole body of the people were deported out of Goshen to work upon a city in a district so far to the north as San; on the contrary, they were still in Goshen during the plagues;¹ and, though apparently near the capital, were living in villages in the open country, for they had flocks and herds.² In the plague of murrain "the Lord severed between the cattle of Israel and the cattle of Egypt,"³ and in the plague of hail, "in the land of Goshen, where the children of Israel were, was there no hail."⁴ The Hebrews had lambs for the passover, and they took with them from Egypt "flocks and herds, even very much cattle."⁵

It seems impossible to reconcile this condition of things with Dr. Brugsch's location of Ramsès. Here are the people, during all the plagues, and up to the night of the exodus, living in Goshen, in their accustomed houses, surrounded with their flocks and herds. We take Goshen to have been where he places it—the district lying south and east of the Pelusiatic branch of the Nile, of which Phacussan was the capital. Now Zan, which is his Ramsès, was not in this district of Goshen, but in the nome Tanites, on the Tanitic branch, near Lake Menzaleh; so that to reach this *rendezvous* the whole multitude of men, women, and children, with their cattle, must have crossed the Pelusiatic Nile and have marched nearly twenty miles north; then, on the second day, they must have recrossed the Pelusiatic branch, marching in a southeasterly direction, to reach Dr. Brugsch's Pithom in Soucoth, another district exterior to Goshen. But all these improbabilities vanish when we keep Ramsès and Pithom where Dr. Brugsch located them conjecturally in 1857, in his *Karte des alten Aegypten*,⁶ that is, in Goshen itself, in the neighborhood of Heroöpolis, on the line of the old canal. Then we may conceive of the Hebrews as peopling the country contiguous to these two cities, and within easy reach of either.

The difficulties that meet us at the outset in Dr. Brugsch's theory of the exodus increase as we advance along his route. He shows, with

¹ Ex. i. 7; viii. 27, "I will sever the land of Goshen, in which my people dwell, that no swarms of flies shall be there."

² Ex. x. 24.

³ Ex. ix. 4.

⁴ Ex. ix. 26.

⁵ Ex. xii. 38.

⁶ See *Geographische Inschriften*, Vol. i.

good reason, that the main route from Egypt to Palestine began at Tanis, and that the Pharaohs' were accustomed to concentrate their armies at this point for an eastern campaign. From indications furnished by monuments and papyri, we learn that this route touched at Migdol,— the Magdolos of the Greek writers,— a fortress on the edge of the desert supplied with wells.¹ Along this highway he would lead the Hebrews, making their first halt at Soucoth, and their second at Khatom, the first station east of Lake Menzaleh, which he identifies with Etham. The same valuable series of papyri in the British Museum (the Anastasi) which we have so often quoted, contains a remarkable letter from an officer who went in pursuit of two slaves who had escaped from a nobleman then living at Ramsès. From this letter Dr. Brugsch gives the following extracts: "I have pursued the two servants, having quitted the hall of the royal palace on the ninth day of the month Epiphi, toward evening. On the tenth day of the month Epiphi I arrived at the enclosure of Succoth I came to the fort Khatom. There one told me that a groom arrived from the country had said, that they had passed by the Muraille² to the north of the Migdol of king Seti Menepthah." Upon this letter Dr. Brugsch remarks: "the correspondence between these Egyptian stations Ramsès, Soucoth, Khatom (which certainly is identical with the Etham of the scriptures), and Migdol, and between the same places enumerated in the Book of Exodus, is too evident and too striking for us to waste one word upon their identity."³

Pihakhiroth Dr. Brugsch does not profess to have identified from Egyptian sources, so he falls back upon the statement of the Hebrew narrative, that it was "over against Baal-zephon, between Migdol and the sea";⁴ and he concentrates his attention upon the two inquiries, Where was Migdol? and, What was the sea? As to Migdol, classic authors recognized the name of this fort, which they transcribed as Magdolos or Magdolon, and which they fixed midway between Pelusium and Sile, which latter place corresponded nearly to the El-Kantara of to-day, at the point where the Suez canal pierces the neck between Lake Ballah and Lake Menzaleh. But Dr. Brugsch overlooks the evidence that the Egyptian Pharaohs had fortified at several points their eastern boundary, and that, Migdol being the common name for a fortified station,

¹ p. 20.

² This *Muraille* (in Egyptian *ta-Aub*) appears to have been a walled district east of the delta, on the confines of the desert.

³ p. 31. In a note, however, Dr. Brugsch argues that the roots *Khatom*, *Asham*, *Tam*, signify to seal up, to enclose. *Khatom*, in Egyptian, like *Atham*, *Etham*, in Hebrew, signifies an enclosed place, a fortress. But Jablonski, and others, make *Etham* signify "border of the sea."

⁴ Ex. xiv. 2.

there was probably more than one Migdol¹ in that quarter; and hence, his identification of Etham being problematical, we are not shut up to the Magdolon of Herodotus and Diodorus (which stood about twelve miles south of Pelusium, on the coast road between Egypt and Syro-Phœnicia) as the Migdol of the exodus.

"As to the sea," continues Dr. Brugsch, "no one could think of the Red Sea. The Elohim texts of the sacred books never use the name of the Red Sea; while speaking habitually and simply of the sea, or of the Egyptian sea, which is none other, and could not be other, than the Mediterranean Sea."² We have searched the Hebrew scriptures in vain for an instance in which יַם־מִצְרַיִם (the sea of Egypt) is used for the Mediterranean. Where this name occurs, "the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea," it is impossible to understand it of the Mediterranean; it must either mean the Red Sea, or stand in parallelism with "the river," for the Nile is called "a sea"³ in the Old Testament, and at this day a common name for the Nile in Egypt is el-Bahr, "the sea." The Mediterranean is called "the sea," "the great sea," "the hinder or western sea," and once also "the sea of the Philistines," because it washed their whole coast; but it is not called the Egyptian sea. Dr. Brugsch, however, would shut up the Hebrews between Migdol and the Mediterranean. From this point, to carry out his theory, he requires both Moses and Pharaoh to commit a strategic blunder, of which we cannot believe either of them to have been capable. The Hebrew narrative informs us that "God led them not by the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near; for God said, "Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt." Dr. Brugsch quotes this as authority, and adds, that Moses had also a fear of the treaty for the rendition of fugitive slaves, which existed between Egypt and the Khétans of Syria.⁴ But how does Dr. Brugsch provide against this danger of falling into the hands of the Philistines? By leading the Israelites northward along the Mediterranean shore, where a march of two or three days would bring them directly upon the border of the Philistines, who by reason of this detour would have gained time to gather and dispute their march! His own map of the route causes this difficulty to stare us in the face. The reason for going by "the way of the wilderness," to avoid war with the Philistines, was given before the Hebrews had reached Migdol; and it was

¹ So small a country as Palestine had several fortified places called Migdol, Migdol-Eder (Gen. xxxv. 21), Migdol-el in Naphtali (Josh. xix. 38), Migdol-Gad (Josh. xv. 37).

² Isa. xi. 15.

³ Isa. xix. 5; Nah. iii. 8. Also, the Euphrates is called a sea (Isa. xxvii. 1).

⁴ Ex. xxiii. 31.

⁵ See this treaty in *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1869, p. 186.

because of this that they "encamped in Etham, in the edge of the wilderness." ¹ If Etham was identical with Khatom, and Migdol with Magdolon, as Dr. Brugsch believes, then the highway from Egypt to Syria lay in a direct line a little to the north of east from Etham through Migdol to el-Arisch, at which point it would first touch the Mediterranean. This route ran south of the ancient marsh known as the Serbonian lake. If the Hebrews quitted this route to avoid a collision with the Philistines, they must have turned to the south; but Dr. Brugsch sends them northward to the narrow and treacherous passage between the Mediterranean and Lake Serbonis, upon emerging from which, after a three days march from Etham, they must come again upon the direct "way of the land of the Philistines," and almost at their very door! We cannot be persuaded that Moses was so stupid a strategist, nor that the higher guidance to which he trusted was so blind to the obvious features of the country he was to traverse.

Again Dr. Brugsch makes that region of morass and quicksands, lying south of the Bay of Pelusium, which Herodotus, Diodorus, Strabo, and others name τὰ βάραθρα and Lacus Sirbonis, the seat of the disaster to Pharaoh and his host :

"That Serbonian bog
Betwixt Damatia and Mount Casius old
Where armies whole have sunk." ²

Diodorus states that in this bog the Persian king, Artaxerxes, when invading Egypt, lost a great part of his army, through ignorance of the character of the region. ³ That a foreign invader should have become entangled in this treacherous marsh is quite supposable; but that Egyptian generals accustomed to lead armies to the east, and who had built a military road to the south of this bog, should have been ignorant or unmindful of its dangers, and should have led an army around its borders to the very bars of quicksand that joined it to the Mediterranean, and were subject to overflow by stress of northerly winds, is as incredible a bit of strategy as that Moses should have led the Hebrews there to get out of the way of the Philistines. All these difficulties are avoided by fixing the point of departure farther to the south, and Etham upon the edge of the wilderness of the Red Sea, where the Hebrew narrative locates it. Dr. Brugsch seems to undervalue the testimony of the Hebrew scriptures concerning the Yom Suph as the scene of the disaster to Pharaoh, because the Elohist texts speak simply of "the sea," without employing this designation. "Aussi les textes Elohim des livres saints ne se servent jamais du nom de la Mer Rouge; en parlant toujours et simplement de la mer ou de la mer Égyptienne." ⁴ It is true that nearly all the texts of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua in which the

¹ Ex. xiii. 17-20.

² Paradise Lost, ii. 293.

³ Dio. xvi. 46.

⁴ p. 35.

“Red Sea” occurs are Jehovistic; e.g. Ex. x. 19; xv. 4, 22; xxiii. 31; Num. xiv. 25; xxi. 14; Deut. i. 40; xi. 4; Josh. ii. 10; xxiv. 6; in Josh. iv. 23 Jehovah-Elohim occur in combination. We do not enter here into the relative antiquity and authority of the Elohistie and Jehovistic texts; but admitting for the moment that the Jehovistic documents were later and supplementary, how shall we account for the fact that in all the traditions and the poetry of the Hebrews it is always the Red Sea that is named as that in which Pharaoh was overthrown?¹

But Dr. Brugsch has overlooked the significance of one text which should set the question at rest: “And it came to pass when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God [Elohim] led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near; for God [Elohim] said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt; but God [Elohim] led the people about through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea [Yom Suph].” Ex. xiii. 17, 18; and Elohim occurs again in vs. 19, where the dying words of Joseph are cited. Here, then, is an Elohim document in which the Red Sea is expressly mentioned. In quoting this passage Dr. Brugsch omits the mention of the Red Sea — “Mais Dieu fit faire un circuit au peuple, par le chemin du désert”² — and overlooks the name Elohim; for it is on the very next page that he says “the Elohim texts never employ the name of the Red Sea.” But here is an Elohistie text which does give that name; and this stands in such a connection that it must be taken as the key to the whole narrative.

Perhaps Dr. Brugsch would adopt the view of some Hebraists, that this passage, though in form Elohistie, was an interpolation from a later source; but he is debarred from this resort, inasmuch as he quotes vs. 18 as an authentic portion of the narrative, though he suppresses the mention of the Red Sea. Even if it were an interpolation, there would remain the difficulty, already mentioned, of explaining how the tradition of the Red Sea as the scene of Pharaoh’s disaster, crept into all Hebrew song and story. Besides, how natural it was for Moses to lead the people in *that* “wilderness,” from which he had just come, and with which he was so familiar — the desert of Sinai, which borders upon the Red Sea. Neither Knobel nor DeWette rejects the testimony of Ex. xiii. 18. DeWette translates it: “Und Gott liess das Volk sich wenden auf den Weg nach der Wüste am Schilfmeere”; and Knobel’s comment is: “Gott führte es so, dass es um die Wüste, um die sinaitische Halbinsel und somit an dem Meere herumzog. Die Hebräer zogen nämlich in der Nähe des heroopolitanischen Meerbusens südwärts zum Sinai.” Rabbi Hirsch has a remark upon the transition from Elohim to Jehovah in Ex. xiii. that is worth quoting: “Es wird diese Erzählung (vs. 17, 18) von dem gewöhnlichen Gottesnamen *Elohim* getragen und erst vs. 21, wo die

¹ See Miriam’s song, Ps. cvi. and cxxxvi.; Acts vii. 36; Heb. xi. 29. ² p. 34.

ausserordentliche Führerschaft Gottes in den voranschreitenden Wolken- und-Feuersäulen ihren sichtbaren Ausdruck erhält, kehrt der Name dieser ausserordentlichen Führungen, *Jah*, wie bei den ausserordentlichen Wunderthaten in Egypten wieder."¹

It is the moment of the exodus which is the point of departure of the text; the reason is given why the Hebrews did not take the direct course to Palestine, — the northeastern route skirting the southern edge of Lake Sirbonis — but, to avoid a collision with the Philistines, went as far as possible from their borders by marching in a southeasterly direction to "the wilderness of the Red Sea." Hence Etham must have been in the edge of *that* wilderness, and the sea beside which they encamped could have been none other than the Red Sea. There is both geological and historical evidence that the neck of the Red Sea once extended farther north into the isthmus which is now pierced by the Suez canal; but is there any evidence that the name Yom Suph was ever applied to Lake Sirbonis? So sanguine is Dr. Brugsch over his theory, that he says in conclusion, "one could no more deny the facts established in this lecture, than he could dispute that A is A and B is B." We would not disparage his discoveries, nor wholly reject his identifications; but, as yet, we do not see how it is possible to reconcile his view with the Hebrew text, nor with the conditions under which the exodus began; and we shall be grateful if he will attempt a solution of the difficulties we have raised in his promised *Bibel und Denkmäler*.

This theory of the route of the Israelites, which Dr. Brugsch propounds with so much confidence, is by no means new, and we are surprised that he makes no mention of the work of Dr. Schleiden, whom he follows, almost word for word, in his description of the route from Etham onward, in his references to the Mediterranean as the Egyptian sea, and to Sirbonis as the scene of Pharaoh's disaster, and also in his comparative estimate of Elohist and Jehovist documents.² The only difference between Dr. Brugsch and Dr. Schleiden is in the location of Ramsès and Pithom, the starting-point of the Israelites for their march into the wilderness. In fixing the site of these cities Dr. Schleiden followed the authority of Dr. Brugsch himself, who, in 1857, placed them somewhere on the line of the Wadi Tumulât. In the first volume of his *Geographie des alten Aegyptens*,³ Brugsch identified Pithom with Hieroöpolis, and added this remarkable passage: "Die Stadt Ramsès, welche die Israeliten nach 2 Buch Mos. 1, 11 nebst Pithom das wir für Heroonpolis halten, erbauen, oder vielmehr befestigen mussten, un³ von wo aus sie später ihren Auszug antraten (2 Buch Mos. 12, 37) findet sich in dem hierati-

¹ Der Pentateuch, von Samson Raphael Hirsch. Frankfurt am Main. 1869.

² Die Landenge von Sués, zur Beurtheilung des Canalprojects und des Auszugs der Israeliten aus Aegypten. von Dr. M. I. Schleiden. Leipzig. 1858.

³ p. 265.

schen Papyrus Anast. No. 5 p. 24 dicht hinter dem *pa-chtum n Ràmessu* (No. 1273) genannt als *ta-a-Ra.ms-su Mr-n-amu* (1278) 'das Haus Ramses Miamuns,' woraus in der Volkssprache der abgekürztere Name *taaramessu* oder bloss *ramessu* entstehen konnte. So merkwürdig hat das Schicksal gewaltet, welches uns in einem zerbrechlichen, dünnen äg. Papyrus ein *gleichzeitiges* Denkmal des Auszuges aufbewahrt hat, in welchem sich jene Städte Pchtum und Ràmessu zusammen genannt finden, die in den heiligen Urkunden der Bibel eine so wichtige Rolle spielen!" The significance of this Papyrus Dr. Brugsch does not now qualify; though upon the ground of recent discoveries of Mariette-Bey, as before stated, he shifts the site of Ramsès from the Wadi Tumulât to Sîn. He has not yet published the hieroglyphic texts upon which he rests his new identification; but there is reason to suspect that these are not satisfactory to Lepsius and other Egyptologists. Meantime the Anast. Papyrus, which was such a wonderful godsend in 1857, remains in all its force, and admonishes us to be cautious in accepting the results of an interpreter who was then so confident over the discovery of Ramsès, and is now equally confident of finding it some forty miles away.

ARTICLE XII.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE PENTATEUCH IN ITS PROGRESSIVE REVELATIONS OF GOD TO MEN. Designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev. Henry Cowles, D.D. pp. 414. New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1874.

This work is not a continuous commentary upon the text, but a practical, popular, and to a considerable extent critical, discussion of the great themes of the five books of Moses. It is marked by the author's usual perspicuity and spirituality, and is, on the whole, to be highly commended. We have space but to notice what is, to us, the least satisfactory part of the work; viz. the author's treatment of the passages bearing on the method of creation, and chronology. Without going into the discussion too deeply it is sufficient to remark that, after our author has led his readers by legitimate steps to the conclusion that "it suffices if we make God's days of creative energy and of creative rest each and all *divine days*—all alike periods of indefinite length and, on the other hand, man's days of labor and his day of rest all *human days*, of the same sort with each other, from sun to sun,"¹ it is hardly in keeping to attempt a refutation of Darwinism by forcing upon the word יָמֵי the restricted, technical sense of invariable kind.² Is it not enough if the

¹ p. 22.

² See p. 37 seq.