

The questions here raised have been disputed ever since the time of Thrupp and Williams, and are of peculiar difficulty. The argument which I wish to bring forward as clearly as I am able is this:—

1. Solomon's palace was on Ophel. It was not in the City of David. Therefore the City of David was not on Ophel; or again
2. Manasseh built a wall on Ophel. This wall was not in the City of David. Therefore the City of David was not on Ophel; or again
3. Millo was in the City of David. Millo, according to the Jews was Akra. Therefore Millo was not Ophel.

Ingenuous as is Mr. Birch's theory, it is hard to believe that the names Sion, Moriah, Akra, Ophel and Millo, all applied to the one narrow ridge, and that the larger hills of the city are not mentioned in the Bible by any distinctive name.

C. R. C.

NEW IDENTIFICATIONS.

Chephar Haammonai (Joshua xviii, 24). I have hesitated to identify this site with the ruin of *Kefr 'Ana*, north of Bethel, but when the boundary of Benjamin is laid down on the map it appears that the situation of the ruin in question agrees well with the description of the border descending southwards to Bethel (verse 13), and we thus obtain another point on a part of the line which was before not well indicated.

Jezeel (of Judah). The situation of the ancient ruin called *Sirreh* would agree well with the probable position of this town. (Joshua xv, 56.) The name is not very close, though the loss of the final L, and the change of *Zain* to *Sad* are of occasional occurrence. The ruin lies west of *Juttah*, (*Yuttah*), the name preceding *Jezeel* on the list. We may also compare the form *Izar* which Josephus gives for *Jezeel* (Ant. VIII, 13-8) in speaking of the capital of Ahab.

The Negeb. Many of the towns of Simeon may be identified with cities north of Beersheba and west of the Debir hills. The following occur close together in this district, being newly identified from the Survey Sheets with exception of the first:—

- | | |
|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. En Rimmon | <i>Umm er Rumâmîn.</i> |
| 2. Ashan | <i>'Aseileh.</i> |
| 3. Hormah | <i>Horân.</i> |
| 4. Beth Birei | <i>Bireh.</i> |
| 5. Baalah | <i>Umm Baghleh.</i> |
| 6. Etam | <i>'Aitân.</i> |
| 7. Madmannah | <i>Umm Deimneh.</i> |
| 8. Sharuhen | <i>Tell Sheria'h.</i> |
| 9. Bethul | <i>Beit Leyi.</i> |

Some of these I have already proposed in former numbers of the

Quarterly, but a comparison of the above list with the map will serve to show that they all belong to one district—the rolling chalk downs of the Negeb north of Beersheba.

C. R. C.

TOPOGRAPHY OF THE EXODUS.

THE valuable and interesting paper contributed to the last number of the *Quarterly Statement* has, we may perhaps feel justified in saying, entirely destroyed the basis on which Brugsch's theory of the topography of the Exodus is founded. The following notes may, it is hoped, prove of use in connection with this important question.

I.

An important element in the consideration of the subject to which Mr. Greville Chester does not seem to allude, is the rapid formation of land, and advance of the shore line, due to the annual deposit of the Nile mud on the Mediterranean coast. The shore in the Pelusiatic Bay has been proved by actual observation to be advancing seawards at the rate of 52 yards per annum, and according to the observations of Mr. Fowler, C.E., the Nile deposits no less than three millions of cubic yards of mud annually, or an area of 4 square miles added to the Delta of the river, and to the Levantine shore line. A strong current sets from the Nile mouths eastwards, and as the prevailing winds are from the north, a series of bars are formed, behind which the mud gradually consolidates into an alluvial tract, and this especially in the Pelusiatic Bay, and in the vicinity of Port S'aid, where the shoaling is a constant source of danger and expense.

Herodotus tells us that in his opinion (II, 5), all Egypt except the Theban Nome was at the time of the founding of Memphis (or some 30 centuries before the Exodus), a marshy tract, and that none of those districts which afterwards existed south of Lake Moeris (which was near Memphis) were then above water. He considers that the Nile Delta was originally a bay of the Mediterranean (II, 11), and he remarks that if the Nile had flowed into the Red Sea nothing could have prevented its being entirely filled up by the mud brought down by the river. Herodotus was apparently unaware that the Pelusiatic branch of the Nile, which in his time was silted up, had in all probability actually done what he suggests, and had formed an isthmus of marshy ground with lakes dividing the Red Sea from the Mediterranean.

In the Geography of Ptolemy (about 147 A.D.), degrees of latitude are marked, and no part of the Delta is shown as being north of 31° N. Lat. whereas the land now extends 40 minutes further north. The central part of the Delta is that which appears to have formed latest, and thus while the sites of Zoan and Bubastis are found on the east, no ancient cities (so far as the map informs us) existed in the lower part of the Delta between the branches of the river.