

is not a friend, but a foe, to the only bond which can comprehend and bind us all together; is not a foe, but a friend, to discord and the essential spirit of intolerance.

STANLEY LEATHES.

ART. II.—PROFESSOR RAWLINSON'S EGYPT.

History of Ancient Egypt. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. Two volumes. London: Longmans & Co. 1881.

PROFESSOR RAWLINSON tells us that his present work was "conceived and commenced in the year 1876, and designed to supply what seemed a crying need of English literature—viz., an account of Ancient Egypt, combining its antiquities with its history, addressed partly to the eye, and presenting to the reader, within a reasonable compass, the chief points of Egyptian life—manners, customs, art, science, literature, religion—together with a tolerably full statement of the general course of historical events, whereof Egypt was the scene, from the foundation of the monarchy to the loss of independence"—*i.e.*, from Menes, the proto-monarch of Egypt—the "Mizraim" of Scripture, as George Syncellus¹ calls him—to the Persian Conquest, B.C. 527. After alluding to the enormous stores of antiquarian and historical material accumulated during the present century, since the discovery of the famous Rosetta Stone by M. Boussard, in 1799—the key which has unlocked all the archaic treasures of Egypt—the Professor enumerates some of these treasures in chronological order. Thus, he mentions Denon's "Description de l'Égypte," Rosellini's "Monumenti dell' Egitto," Lepsius's "Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Aethiopien" and his "Königsbuch der Alten Ägypter," Mariette's "Monuments divers recueillis en Égypte et en Nubie," De Rouge's "Recherches sur les Monuments," Chabas's "Mélanges Egyptologiques," Col. Howard Vyse's great work on "The Pyramids," Sir Gardner Wilkinson's five volumes on "The Entire Subject of Egyptian Customs and Manners," the "Revue Archéologique," the "Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology," together with "the finished histories of Egypt by Bunsen, Kenrick, Lenormant, Birch, and Brugsch, without whose works his (Rawlinson's) could certainly not have been written." As all of these are either possessed by, or known to, the present writer, we are

¹ "Mizraim, who is Menes."—SYNCELLUS, *Canon of the Kings of Egypt.*

surprised at the omission of several names from this list, such, *e.g.*, as Osburn's "Monumental History of Egypt," and the most valuable, perhaps, of all the works which have appeared on the subject of Egyptian history—*viz.*, "Records of the Past." Of Mr. Osburn's work, we regret to think that Professor Rawlinson, like other writers on Egypt, has ignored it altogether. We are quite aware that Osburn committed mistakes, such as mistaking Apophis, the undoubted patron of Joseph, the most famous of the Shepherd Kings, for Pharaoh Pepi, of the Sixth Dynasty; but, considering that Osburn was a skilled Egyptologist, and that his work was published nearly thirty years ago, we may express our surprise that Canon Rawlinson has apparently overlooked his merits, especially as several of the interesting plates which appear in the history of the latter are found in that of the former; though it is possible that both may have gone to the same source—*viz.*, Lepsius's magnificent work, the "Denkmäler," a copy of which is to be found in the British Museum.

On the subject of plates, we may congratulate the author on the exquisite way in which these have been executed in the work before us. Whether it be the drawing of animals, such, *e.g.*, as the Egyptian hare, at p. 69 of vol. i.; or the *Ibis Religiosa* at p. 80; or the oxyrhynchus fish, at p. 83; or the portraits of individual Pharaohs, such, *e.g.*, as Thothmes III., as he appears at p. 253 of vol. ii.; or that of Rameses II., commonly called "the Great," we are charmed with the beauty of their execution; but, alas! in these last two instances we cannot speak favourably of the fidelity of the likenesses.¹ Thus, Thothmes III., whose features are well known from his gigantic bust—an original—now in the British Museum, where his coarse, hideous, negro-lipped face, displays a very different race from that of the refined English face which our author has presented to the public as a likeness of Pharaoh Thothmes III. So again, the picture of the great Rameses, given at p. 323, vol. ii., beautiful though the face appears, is by no means a likeness of the original, as it appears in a photograph now lying before us, of his grand statue at Abu-Simbel, as perfect, with the exception of a

¹ So also, at p. 218 of the same volume, we have a well-executed portrait of Thothmes II.; but on turning to Mr. Stuart's "Nile Gleanings," at p. 153, we have an equally well-executed portrait of the same Pharaoh, taken by the author from the walls of the Temple, at Amada, about 200 miles south of Thebes; and the two portraits are as unlike each other as is possible for representations of the same person to be, not merely in the expression of the features, but in the nationality. They appear as different as the ordinary face of an Englishman would from that of the average specimen of a Chinaman. There is no dependence upon the likenesses represented in the many works now published on Egypt, unless from photographs taken on the spot.

slight injury to the tips of the fingers of his left hand, as it was when executed between thirty and forty centuries ago.

Passing over the first volume of the history before us, which contains a useful account of the ethnology—proving that the origin of the ancient Egyptians is to be traced from Asia, in accordance with the 10th chapter of Genesis, and not from the south, as some Egyptologers, who ignore Scripture, are in the habit of doing—of the language, mythology, customs, and manners of the ancient Egyptians—in which the author, as is natural, draws largely upon the various works of Sir Gardner Wilkinson—we come to the historical portion of the work under review, which is placed before the reader in an interesting way. There is a striking deficiency in this portion of the history—viz., the story of the children of Israel in Egypt, which is but rarely mentioned in the otherwise valuable work before us. With the exception of a slight allusion to “the synchronism of Joseph with Apepi, the last king of the only known Hyksos dynasty”—as he admits that it is “in the highest degree probable that it was Apepi (Apophis), who made the gifted Hebrew his Prime Minister,” (ii. pp. 202, 203)—and a denial of the well-known brickmakers’ picture from the tomb of *Rekhmara*, at Thebes, being that of the Jews working under their appointed taskmasters, the story of “Israel in Egypt” is ignored by the learned Professor almost as much as if it had never been known. The way in which he has treated this matter betrays, as we think, a mistaken idea of the evidence, which is daily enlarging, in illustration of the narrative of the Exodus. But on this point the Professor shall speak for himself. In describing the beautiful tomb of *Rekhmara*, a nobleman of the Court of Thothmes III., which our readers will regret to hear is now fast crumbling to pieces, he writes:—

The scene is so graphic, the words are so forcible and suitable, that many¹ have recognized in this remarkable picture an actual representation of the oppressed Hebrews working under the tyrants, who “made their lives bitter with hard bondage in mortar and in brick,” beating them and ill-using them, so that “all the service, wherein they made them serve, was with rigour;” but the best critics of the present day are of opinion that it depicts, not the sufferings of the Israelites, but those of quite a different people (ii. 244).

The critics to whom our author refers for the denial of these brickmakers being the captive Israelites, are undoubtedly two of the best Egyptologers in the world—viz., Birch, “Egypt,” p. 98,

¹ *E.g.*, Rosellini, “Mon. Civ.” ii. 249; Hengstenberg, “Egypt and the Books of Moses,” p. 80; Osburn’s “Mon. Hist. of Egypt,” ii. 297; Kurtz, “Hist. of the Old Covenant,” ii. 152; Kalisch, “Com. on Exodus,” p. 9; Palmer’s “Egypt. Chron.,” p. xix.

and Brugsch, "Hist. of Egypt," i. 375, 376. On referring to these two passages in their respective works it is very doubtful whether Rawlinson has not misrepresented the meaning of both. What Birch says, in the passage named, is just this: "The captives are represented on the walls of a tomb at Thebes in such a manner that it depicts vividly to the eye the anguish and cruel slavery to which the people of Israel had been reduced by the Pharaoh who knew not Joseph. There are the brickmakers, the drawers of water, the bearers of the heavy burdens, and the severe taskmasters of the land of bondage; while their Asiatic countenances resemble those of the Semitic, and especially the Hebrew race." All that Brugsch says, in the passage referred to, is this—"The picture presents an important illustration of the accounts in the Bible concerning the hard bondage of the Jews in Egypt."

Other mistakes of a similar nature will require correction in any future edition of this valuable "History of Egypt." We will mention one or two, to show our meaning. Speaking of the reign of Rameses II., Canon Rawlinson says:—

Of subject races, there seem to have been several in Egypt under Rameses, the principal being the Sharuten or Shardana, the Apuriu or *Aperu*, and the Hebrews. Of these, the Shardana were employed principally as auxiliary troops, while the other two—if they were really distinct—formed the main sources from which forced labour was drawn by the monarchs (ii. 314).

We beg our readers to notice the expression—"if they (the *Aperu* and the Hebrews) were really distinct," as thereby hangs an important tale. Nearly twenty years ago, M. Chabas, a distinguished French Egyptologist, to whom Professor Rawlinson refers in a note in support of this view, broached his theory that the *Aperu* and the Hebrews were the same people. He had discovered in a papyrus of the Leyden Museum the name of a tribe called "*Aperu*," who were represented as being employed in drawing stone for the Temple of the Sun, built by Rameses II. near Memphis. Hence, he contended that these *Aperu*, or "*Aperiu*," as he writes the name, were none other than the captive Hebrews, then at the height of their bondage in Egypt. And so convinced was M. Chabas of the truth of his theory, that he boldly wrote: "Cette identification, qui repose sur une juste application de principes philologiques incontestables, et sur un ensemble de circonstances caractéristiques, n'a été contesté par aucun égyptologue."¹ Nevertheless, we ventured at the time to

¹ See "Mélanges Egyptologiques," deuxième série, par F. Chabas, de Chalon-sur-Saône, 1864, p. 144. For a full examination of the philological difficulties connected with M. Chabas's theory, see the valuable remarks of Canon Cook, in his *Excursus* "On the Bearings of Egyptian History upon the Pentateuch," as printed in the "Speaker's Commentary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 466.

contest M. Chabas's conclusions, both on chronological as well as philological grounds, that the *Aperiu*, or, rather, as the hieroglyphic characters read literally, as M. Chabas has printed them from the Papyrus, *Apu-ri-aa-u*, could not be the same people as the *Haberim*, or Hebrews of the English Bible. And truly glad were we to find, on the appearance of Brugsch-Bey's great work, "A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs," in 1879, that that eminent Egyptologist thoroughly confirmed our view of the question, observing these *Aperiu* were spoken of as a "settled people," dwelling in Egypt during the reigns of Rameses III. and IV., "long after the Exodus of the Jews from Egypt." Hence, he adds, "These and similar data completely exclude all thought of the Hebrews, unless one is disposed to have recourse to suppositions and conjectures against the most explicit statements of the biblical records" (ii. 129).

The grand error, however, of Rawlinson's work, is his tacit acceptance of the theory of those Egyptologists who declare that Rameses was the king who "knew not Joseph;" and his fourteenth and eldest surviving son, Manephthah, the Pharaoh of the Exode. "Hence," says our author, in speaking of the reign of the latter, "Moses, a Hebrew brought up in the Court of his predecessor, but for many years self-exiled from Egypt, appeared before him, and requested permission to conduct his people out into the desert which bounded Egypt on the East, the distance of three days' journey, in order that they might hold a feast and offer sacrifice to their God, Jehovah" (ii. 333). But our author goes even a step further than some who adopt the theory of the son of the great Rameses being the Pharaoh of the Exode, for he is confident that this Pharaoh escaped from being overthrown in the Red Sea, declaring that "Manephthah, *with the remnant of his host, returned to Egypt*, and resumed the peaceful occupations which, first the invasion of Marmain, and then the Hebrew troubles, had interrupted" (ii. 336). Now, this appears to be in direct contradiction to the words of Scripture.

We may adduce, therefore, the testimony of two Egyptologists, who, though differing as to the name and dynasty of the Pharaoh of the Exode, are agreed that, according to the words of Divine truth, he certainly was overthrown in the Red Sea. Manephthah, says Dr. Birch, "was the Pharaoh addressed by Moses and Aaron, visited by God with plagues on account of the hardness of his heart, and finally drowned in the Red Sea, in pursuing the Hebrews after their departure from the land of bondage."¹ Canon Cook observes, on the same subject:—

The statement is explicit. All the chariots and horsemen, and that portion of the infantry which followed them into the bed of the sea.

¹ Birch, "History of Egypt," p. 133.

In fact, as has been shown, escape would be impossible. A doubt has been raised whether Pharaoh himself perished; but independent of the distinct statement of the Psalmist, Ps. cxxxvi. 15, his destruction is manifestly assumed, and was, in fact, inevitable. The station of the king was in the vanguard: on every monument the Pharaoh is represented as the leader of the army; and allowing for Egyptian flattery on other occasions, that was his natural place in the pursuit of fugitives whom he hated so intensely. The death of the Pharaoh, and the entire loss of the chariotry and cavalry accounts for the undisturbed retreat of the Israelites through a district then subject to Egypt, and easily accessible to their forces.¹

On another point, the differences between those who ignore Scripture authority is still more marked—viz., in reference to the duration of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt. Professor Rawlinson does not attempt to solve this problem, though he alludes to “the chronological difficulties” concerning the identification of the “new king over Egypt which knew not Joseph;” but others have gone so very wide of the mark that it is impossible to place any reliance on their fanciful speculations. It is certain from Exodus xii. 40, 41, that “the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years. And at the end of the 430 years, even the selfsame day, all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt.” And St. Paul tells us, in Galatians iii. 17, that these “430 years” were counted from the time when the promises were made to Abraham until the Exode. And this is confirmed by the reading both of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX., all of which MSS., as Kennicott observes, are uniform on the matter, and read the text as follows: “Now the *sojourning* of the children of Israel, and of their fathers, when they sojourned in the land of Canaan, and in the land of Egypt, was 430 years.”² The Jews of all ages so understood the text. Demetrius, who flourished in the third century B.C.; Josephus, who lived four centuries later; both the Talmuds of Jerusalem and Babylon; and Joseph Ben Gorion, a Rabbinical writer of the tenth century, have explained the passage in the same way. The last-named writes as follows:—

The sojourning of the children of Israel in Egypt, and *in other lands*, was 430 years. Notwithstanding, they abode in Egypt only 210 years, according to what their father Jacob told them, to “descend,” or *go down*, into Egypt, which in Hebrew signifies 210. Furthermore, the computation of 430 years is from the year that Isaac was born, which was the holy seed unto Abraham.³

¹ Canon Cook, on Exodus xiv. 28, in “Speaker’s Commentary,” vol. i. p. 309.

² Kennicott, “Dissert.” ii. pp. 164, 165.

³ Demet. “Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang.” ix. § 21. Josephus, “Antiq.” ii. xv. § 2. “T. Hierosol, Megillah,” fol. 71, 4. “T. Babylon Megil.”

The testimony of the early Christian writers who took up this subject, such as Eusebius, St. Augustine, and the historian Sulpicius Severus, is to the same effect.¹ Baron Bunsen, however, in his great work on Egypt, the only valuable portion of which belongs, in reality, to Dr. Birch, of the British Museum, the prince of English Egyptologists, computes the duration of the Israelites in Egypt alone, in one place at 1434 years, and in another part of the same work at 862 years. Professor Lepsius, again, a distinguished Egyptologist, reduces it to only 90 years.²

These chronological discrepancies are mainly caused by what Rawlinson justly terms—

The one patent fact that is beginning to obtain general recognition, that the chronological element in the early Egyptian history is in a state of almost (? perfectly) hopeless obscurity. Modern critics of the best judgment and the widest knowledge, basing their conclusions on identically the same data, have published to the world views upon the subject, which are not only divergent and conflicting, but which differ, in the estimates that are the most extreme, to the extent of *above* 3,000 years! Böckh gives, for the year of the accession of Menes, the supposed first Egyptian king, the year B.C. 5702; Unger, B.C. 5613; Mariette-Bey, B.C. 5004; Brugsch-Bey, B.C. 4455; Lepsius, B.C. 3852; Bunsen, B.C. 3623 or 3059; Stuart Poole, B.C. 2717; and Sir Gardner Wilkinson, B.C. 2691. It is as if the best authorities upon Roman history were to tell us, some of them, that the Republic was founded in B.C. 508, and others in B.C. 3508 (ii. p. 2).

We are glad, however, to see that Rawlinson calls attention to the Turin papyrus, the Noubti era of 400 years, the Apis cycle, and the testimony of Eratosthenes as an historian, as of far greater value than that of the overpraised Manetho;³ and we

fol. 9, 1. "Historie of the Latter Tymes of the Jewes' Common Weal," by Joseph Ben Gorion. Translated by Peter Morwing, pp. 2, 3. Oxford, A.D. 1567.

¹ Euseb. "Chron. Canon," liber prior, § 19. August. "De Civit. Dei," lib. xvi. § 24. Sulpic. Sev. "Hist. Eccles." i.—xxvi. § 4.

² Bunsen's "Egypt's Place in Universal History," vol. iii. 357, and vol. v. p. 77. Lepsius's "Letters from Egypt," p. 475. Bunsen's chronology respecting the Israelites in Egypt is, however, such a complete muddle that in a third place he says: "According to the joint evidence of the Bible and the Egyptian records, Joseph was Grand Vizier of Sesotôsis, second King of the Twelfth Dynasty—that the 215 years of bondage in Egypt (of the Israelites) form an historical data—and that the date of about 860 years between Joseph and Moses tally with the Biblical account better than any other"!!! ("Egypt's Place," vol. v. p. 14). Brugsch-Bey, "Histoire d'Egypte," p. 80, reckons it at 430 years.

³ Bunsen's admiration of the Egyptian scribe, Manetho, is so great that he dedicates the third book of his "Egypt's Place in Universal History" to his memory, exclaiming, in his ludicrously incorrect rhapsody—

"Manetho gave us our name!

Grateful, I offer to thee whatever through thee I have learned.

Truth have I sought at thy hand; *Truth have I found by thy aid.*"

Vol. ii. p. 393.

add to these the two invaluable genealogies which still exist in the wonderful Land of Ham, recording the names of forty generations, which, with a lacuna of a little over two centuries—and which can easily be supplied from other sources—will carry us down the stream of time from *circa* B.C. 2000 to B.C. 500, and prove the real harmony between the records of Scripture and the chronology deducible from the monuments of Egypt, from the time of Abraham's visit to Egypt down to the time of the end of the captivity in Babylon, and the conquest of Egypt by the Persians under Cambyses—the former event being dated B.C. 538, and the latter, B.C. 527.

According to Hebrew chronology, Abraham's visit to Egypt took place about the year B.C. 2010. Josephus relates that he found the Egyptians quarrelling concerning their sacred rites; and by his superior knowledge he succeeded in composing their differences; and, moreover, he is said to have taught them the science of arithmetic and astronomy, as Josephus relates before Abraham's time the Egyptians were "unacquainted with that sort of learning"—which statement is confirmed by the testimony of Berosus the Chaldean, and Eupolemus, a Grecian historian, both of whom lived between three and four centuries before Josephus.¹ Hence, Osburn, while adducing evidence in proof that the Pharaoh who treated Abraham kindly on his visit to Egypt was Acthoes, of the Eleventh Dynasty, confidently declares:—

Of Acthoes and his times, and of those of all his predecessors, there exists no single record of king or subject having a date; whereas tablets and papyri, inscribed with dates of the reign of Amenemes, the son and immediate successor of Acthoes, are not uncommon. The same practice continued with all the successors of Amenemes to the end of the monarchy.²

This discovery by Osburn of the time when Abraham visited Egypt, is of the greatest importance, as it enables us to see the harmony which really exists between the Biblical and the true Egyptian chronology, as gathered from the monuments and papyri, which have recently been discovered and deciphered in the land of Ham.

We have already referred to the fact, recorded in Scripture, that from the call of Abraham, which synchronized with his visit to Egypt until the Exodus under Moses, were exactly 430 years. Now, let us see how this accords with Egyptian history. Rawlinson has justly remarked, that "the Egyptians had no era," such as we have had in this country since the Dionysian era was

¹ Josephus, "Antiq." lib. i. c. viii., § § 1, 2; Eusebius, "Præp. Evang." § 9.

² Osburn, "Mon. Hist. of Egypt," vol. i. p. 378.

introduced, about eleven centuries ago. A series of Pharaohs discovered by Mariette-Bey, on a tomb near Memphis, shows that in the order of succession of dynasties, the Sixth is immediately followed by the Twelfth. In the sepulchral grottoes of *Beni Hassan*, on the banks of the Nile, are some inscriptions belonging to the early kings of the Twelfth Dynasty, in which special mention is made of the *tropical cycle*—*i.e.*, a perfectly exact cycle of sun, moon, and vague year, which the late Astronomer Royal has fixed as having happened B.C. 2005.¹

As this accords with the date of Abraham's visit to Egypt not many years before, according to the Hebrew chronology, we may accept it as approximately correct. On a tomb at *El-Kab*, in Upper Egypt, which was founded by Acthoes, the father of the first king of the Twelfth Dynasty, there exists an engraved pedigree of Prince Aah-mes, who bore the rank of Admiral of the Nile, under the first king of the Eighteenth Dynasty, of the same name, who, according to the high authority of Brugsch-Bey, ascended the throne B.C. 1706. The pedigree is traced from the founder of the family, who bore the name of *Ahi-snau*, signifying "two souls," through *eleven* descents, specifying the names of all the intermediate heads of the family, together with their wives, which are recorded on the tomb. These, on the well-established principle of three descents to a century, would give the required number of about 300 years between the reigns of Acthoes and Aah-mes—*i.e.*, between B.C. 2000–1700, when the latter was seated on the throne of the Pharaohs, and his namesake, who has left his pedigree engraven on his tomb at Elkab,² was appointed admiral of his fleet.

As this brings us to the great point of difference between those who accept the testimony of Scripture as infallibly correct, and those who either reject or ignore it, we are compelled to take our leave of Professor Rawlinson's mode of interpreting the presence of the Israelites in Egypt, as detailed by Moses in the story of the Exodus, recorded in the first two books of the Bible. At the same time, we must not omit to do justice to the learned Professor, for however much we are compelled to dissent from him on some points, we gladly bear testimony to the very high value of the work before us. None of the works which have yet appeared on the subject of Egypt give anything like the amount of references to other authors on this increasingly interesting subject; so that the reader of Rawlinson's "History" has an invaluable *repertoire* of authorities before him, by which he can form an opinion of his own on the subjects which are in

¹ Poole's "Horæ Ægyptiacæ," part i. § 11.

² Osburn's "Monumental History of Egypt," ii. p. 161; Brugsch-Bey's "History of Egypt," i. pp. 247, 272.

dispute among Egyptologists of the present day. Besides which, the first volume contains a better and more complete account of the religion of the ancient Egyptians than any which has yet appeared.

Now, the question which we must briefly consider is—Who was “the new king that knew not Joseph?” Canon Cook, and others, regard it as certain that it can be none other than Aah-mes—or Amosis, as the Greeks termed him—who expelled the Shepherds from Egypt, and founded the Eighteenth—the most distinguished of all the Egyptian dynasties.

Many Egyptologists, however, credit Rameses II. with that office. But, putting aside the chronological difficulties, or, rather, impossibilities, connected with that view, we venture to declare with unhesitating confidence that while, on the one hand, there is not one substantial reason for accepting Rameses II. as “the new king,” there are a multitude of reasons for believing the head of the Eighteenth Dynasty to be the Pharaoh specified by Moses. We say, “not one substantial reason;” for the advocates of this opinion are very chary of attempting to *prove* what they assert, but rest content with the assumption that as the name of *Raamses*, or *Rameses*, is mentioned by Moses in connection with the “new king,” as the name of one of the “treasure cities” which the enslaved Israelites were compelled to build for Pharaoh, therefore, it must refer to Rameses I., who founded the Nineteenth Dynasty, or to his grandson, Rameses II., whose long reign of sixty-six years is found engraven on a stone now in the British Museum. But they forget that this reasoning goes back further still; for, in the account which Moses gives of the establishment of Joseph’s father and brethren in Egypt, which happened about four centuries before Rameses II. ascended the throne, it is said, “Joseph gave his father and his brethren a possession in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, *in the land of Rameses*, as Pharaoh had commanded.”¹

Now, it is one of the important discoveries recently brought to light by the science of Egyptology, that the name of *Rameses* was certainly known to the Egyptians some centuries before the king of that name, who came to be known as the founder of the Nineteenth Dynasty, *circa* B.C. 1400. Lepsius considers that *Aah-mes*, or Amosis, the founder of the Eighteenth Dynasty, B.C. 1706, had a son, whose name in hieroglyphic characters reads, RA-MSS.² The “*Raamses*” of Exodus i. 11 was written in Hebrew, RHMSS, and sufficiently near in sound to the son of Aah-mes (the new king that knew not Joseph, when the bondage

¹ Genesis xlvii. 11.

² “Königsbuch der Alten Aegypter,” von C. R. Lepsius. Taf. xxiii. K. Sohn Ramas. No. 320.

of the Israelites commenced) to warrant the conclusion that they refer to one and the same individual.

The other "treasure city" mentioned in Exodus, which the enslaved Israelites were compelled to build for the King of Egypt, is called "Pithom," which has been identified by Brugsch with the *Pa-ctum-en-Zaru*—i.e., "the treasure city of Thom, built by foreign captives;"¹ and which occurs in the annals of Pharaoh Thothmes III., grandson of Aah-mes, the founder of the Eighteenth Dynasty; and there can be little doubt that it was one of the two "treasure cities" built by the enslaved children of Israel some three centuries before the dynasty of the Ramesides ascended the throne.

It has been sometimes said that no names resembling those of the "Hebrews," or Israelites, have yet been discovered on any Egyptian monument. But this is probably incorrect. In the statistical tablet of Karnac, erected by Pharaoh Thothmes III., there will be found, among the various captives enslaved during his reign, the name of *Hebu*, or *Hibu*, as the seventy-ninth on the list,² which is sufficiently like the word *Hebrew* to warrant the conclusion that they refer to one and the same people. Moreover, from an inscription deciphered by Brugsch, we learn that certain captives called *the Fenchu*, of the time of Aah-mes of the Eighteenth Dynasty, were employed in transporting blocks of limestone from the quarries, to Memphis and other Egyptian cities. As the name "*Fenchu*" means "bearers of the shepherd's staff," and the occupation of these captives corresponds with the forced labour of the Children of Israel, it is probable that they represented that race who are described in Scripture, on the arrival of Jacob's family in Egypt, as shepherds—"The men are shepherds, for their trade hath been to feed cattle."³ "Hence," says Brugsch, when describing the conquests of Pharaoh Shishak, seven centuries later, as they are recorded on the great Temple of Karnac, "the smitten peoples, Jews and Edomites, are named 'the *Am* of a distant land' and the '*Fenekh*' Phœnicians. The '*Am* would, in this case, answer exactly to the equivalent Hebrew '*Am*, which signifies 'people,' but especially the people of Israel and their tribes. As to the mention of the *Fenekh*, I

¹ Compare Brugsch, "Histoire d'Égypte," p. 129, with his work "Géograph. Inscript.," iii. 21.

² See Dr. Birch on "The Statistical Tablet of Karnac, or, a Catalogue of the Captives from the North and South Countries," in the "Proceedings of the Royal Society of Literature," 1861, p. 69. Also Brugsch-Bey's "History of Egypt under the Pharaohs" (this is a much more recent work than his "Histoire d'Égypte," quoted above) vol. i. p. 364, where the name is written "Hibu," in Abusimbel, called "Hibuu." Brugsch writes it as the seventy-seventh on the list, instead of the seventy-ninth.

³ Genesis xlv. 32.

have a presentiment that we shall one day discover the evidence of their most intimate relationship with the Jews."¹

All the details mentioned in Scripture, passing by the chronological requirements, both before and after the time of Aah-mes, bearing on the story of the Exodus and the presence of the Israelites in Egypt, are in complete accord with the recent discoveries of the monuments in the land of Ham, but they are entirely wanting in the history of Rameses the Great and his son Seti-Manephthah, the alleged Pharaoh of the Exode. Time will not permit us to enter upon the numerous proofs which we have in support of our strong conviction and our earnest contention. We can only notice one; but it is one that seems more conclusive than any other, in correcting the mistake of those who make Rameses the Great the "new king which knew not Joseph."

The few details mentioned in Scripture respecting "Pharaoh's daughter," and her adopted child, MOSES, to whom she gave that name, "because she drew him out of the water," appear to show that she had both the will and the power in after years to offer the succession of the throne to her adopted son, who by grace and faith—

When he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward.²

Now, the only female sovereign in the long line of the Pharaohs, whose duration extended for about a period of 2000 years, with the exception of the insignificant Nitocris, of whom we know next to nothing, is the illustrious Queen HAT-ASU. Queen Hat-asu was the daughter of Thothmes I., and granddaughter of Aah-mes, the founder of the dynasty, and "the new king which knew not Joseph." At the time when the reigning Pharaoh had

¹ Brugsch-Bey, "Hist. of Egypt," vol. ii. p. 210. I presume these *Fenekh* are the same as the *Fenchu*, as the same learned Egyptologist writes the name in the *Zeitschrift* for November, 1867, when giving an account of the "*Fenchu*," from an inscription dated in the twenty-second year of Aah-mes, "the new king which knew not Joseph."

² Exodus ii. 10. Canon Cook, in his very valuable Essay II., attached to his "Commentary on the Book of Exodus," observes that the word for *Moses* is written in hieroglyphics, *m s u*, and "corresponds in form to the Hebrew, letter for letter. The syllable *m e s* occurs in many names of the Eighteenth Dynasty" (e.g., Aah-mes, the founder of the dynasty, and four kings of that dynasty bearing the name of Thoth-mes). Hence, adds Canon Cook, "in his 'Hieroglyphic Dictionary,' M. Brugsch shows that the sense 'drawing out,' is the original one. It is taken from the Work of the Potter, p. 705."

³ Hebrews xi. 24-26.

decided on the destruction of all the *male* children of Israel, "Pharaoh's daughter" was the honoured instrument of preserving alive him, who, eighty years later, was the leader and deliverer of the Israelites from the cruel bondage under which they had suffered since the death of Joseph in the land of Egypt. And Scripture says, that, as the infant Moses grew, "the nurse brought him unto Pharaoh's daughter, and he became her son."¹

The reign of Pharaoh's daughter remains to be written, as unhappily, of all the Egyptologers who have written on the subject of the Eighteenth Dynasty, the only one who appears inclined to do her justice is the late Mariette-Bey, the first, and the very able curator of the Boulaque Museum. It will be sufficient now if we mention that her reign must have been a long and distinguished one, as she was taken into partnership with her great father, Thothmes I., and succeeded him on the throne of the Pharaohs, and is the only queen regnant of Egypt of whom we have any knowledge that she was so honoured. She shared the throne for a brief period with an unworthy husband, who calls himself the son of Thothmes I., and is called by Egyptologers Thothmes II. He died apparently at an early age, and for many years Queen Hat-asu reigned gloriously alone, until compelled, for some unknown cause, to admit her negro-lipped half-brother (if so nearly related as that), to share her throne. After her decease, this young Pharaoh disgraced himself by defacing her name from every monument within his reach; and as he is said to have had a reign of fifty-five years, counting from the death of his imputed father, Thothmes I.—half of which may be credited to the reign of our illustrious queen—he had plenty of time to do his unfraternal deed, besides erecting several obelisks, three of which are now respectively located at Rome, London and New York.

There are many monumental proofs of Queen Hat-asu's glorious reign still remaining, notwithstanding the endeavour of her unworthy brother and successor to erase every memorial of it; which can only be explained on reasonable grounds by the supposition that Thothmes III. was actuated by feelings of revenge, on account of his great sister having offered the reversion of the throne to her adopted child, whom she had "drawn from the water," and preserved from her grandfather's cruel edict to destroy all the male-born children of Israel. Queen Hat-asu erected two splendid obelisks at Thebes in memory of her father, to whom she was fondly attached; one of which is still standing, and fragments of the other are scattered all around. The standing one, thirty feet higher than the obelisk of her suc-

¹ Exodus ii. 10.

cessor, which now stands on the Thames Embankment, is certainly the most beautiful monolith in the world. It is formed of a single block of red granite from "the far Syene," ninety-eight feet in height, highly polished, with reliefs and hieroglyphs of matchless beauty. The inscription on the plinth states that the work was commenced in the sixteenth year of her majesty's reign, on the first day of the month Mechir, and finished on the last day of the month Mesore; altogether, seven months from its commencement in the mountain quarry. "Her Majesty," it adds, "gave two obelisks, capped with gold, and so high that each pyramidal cap should reach to the heavens, and placed them before the pylon of her father, Thothmes I., in order that her name should remain always and for ever in this temple." Amongst other titles which the obelisk bears, such as those of "Royal Wife," "Queen of Upper and Lower Egypt," &c., is found the significant Biblical name of "PHARAOH'S DAUGHTER."

The splendid temple of *Deir-el-Bahari*,¹ a few miles from Thebes, is another monument due to the munificence of "Pharaoh's daughter," built under the superintendence of one Semnut, the son of Rames, the chief architect of Egypt during her reign.²

The walls of this temple, besides recording the expedition of her fleet to the shores of Arabia Felix, in order to establish friendly relations with the sovereign of that country, as well as to collect its marvellous productions (which recalls to mind the voyages of King Solomon's fleet to the same country, seven centuries later, mentioned in the books of Kings and Chronicles), and which are described as gums, scents, incense, trees, ebony, ivory, gold, emeralds, asses, &c. &c.,³ record the warlike exploits of the Egyptian army during the reign of this great queen. (Just as if, in after ages, paintings were to be discovered of the sailing of the annual tea-fleet from China, and the Siege of Sebastopol, on the walls of Westminster Hall.) The late

¹ So called from the "Northern Convent" of the Copts, which stands at the south-western corner of the Theban Valley, near the site of the modern *Medinet Abu*.

² Brugsch-Bey seems somewhat prejudiced against Queen Hat-asu, but he admits that "her buildings are some of the most tasteful, most complete and brilliant creations which ever left the hands of the Egyptian artists. They are specimens of the matchless splendour of Egyptian art history, whether we consider the stone as to form and proportion, or the rich coloured decoration. Even in their ruin, these remains, though heaped together in confusion, exercise a wonderful charm, even on those who are experienced in the rich monuments of Ancient Egypt."—BRUGSCH-Bey's *History of Egypt under the Pharaohs*, i. p. 303.

³ For a full account of this naval expedition, see Dümichen's "Flotte einer Ägyptischen Königin," p. 17, *et seq.* A brief *résumé* of Herr Dümichen's work is given in vol. x. of "Records of the Past," pp. 13-20.

curator of the Boulaque Museum, in his description of the Temple at *Deir-el-Bâhiri*, says:—

The grand bas-reliefs, sculptured by the chisel, with great skill, and of astonishing size, enable us to understand the incidents of a campaign undertaken by Queen Hat-asu against the country of the Punt, the southern part of the Arabian peninsula. The mutilations of the monuments unhappily prevent us from discovering in what battles the Egyptian valour was most conspicuous. We know, however, from the representations engraven on the walls of the two chambers recently discovered, that victory crowned the queen's efforts. The pictures show the Egyptian general receiving the enemy's commander-in-chief, who presents himself as a suppliant without arms; behind him walk his wife and daughter, both presenting the most repulsive traits, which the Egyptian artist has rendered with the greatest skill. . . . Queen Hat-asu was the worthy daughter of Thothmes, and fills one of the most distinguished places in the series of illustrious sovereigns who, under the Eighteenth Dynasty, have left their mark upon the Egyptian soil.

Who was Queen Hat-asu's successful general, whose portrait² is thus given on the walls of the Temple at *Deir-el-Bâhiri*? We do not say it is for certain a picture of Moses himself, her adopted son, who had attained the age of forty, according to Scripture, before he quitted Egypt, which was doubtless at the death of his august patroness, and the accession of her unworthy half-brother, Thothmes III.; but Egyptian chronology perfectly agrees with this theory, as we may suppose the preservation of Moses to have taken place early in her father, Thothmes I.'s reign, which with her own, as far we can speak from Manetho and the monuments, make up the required number of about forty years. It is, therefore, not impossible, but that the picture on the walls of the Temple at *Deir-el-Bâhiri* of the Egyptian general may be a portrait of the real Moses, who, as Scripture tells us, "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and mighty in words and deeds."³ Josephus, in the first century of the Christian era, and Irenæus⁴ in the second, alike relate "the fame which Moses gained, as general of the Egyptian army, in a war with Ethiopia," which, though somewhat encumbered with romance, still helps to explain a statement in the book of Numbers that Moses married a woman of that country.

¹ Birch's "History of Egypt," p. 84, gives a portrait from these walls of an "Arabian Queen in the reign of Hat-asu;" and although this country was said to be "under the jurisdiction of Athor, the goddess of beauty," the face and figure of this Queen of Punt quite confirm Mariette's remark as to their presenting "the most repulsive traits."

² "Aperçu de l'Histoire Ancient d'Egypte," par Auguste Mariette-Bey. Paris: Dentu, 1867, p. 32.

³ Acts, vii. 22.

⁴ Josephus, "Antiq." ii. x. § 2; Irenæus, "Frag. de Perdid. Iren. Tract.," p. 347.

The mention of Queen Hat-asu's Temple at *Deir-el-Bâhari* will naturally lead us to notice the important discovery of mummies and other relics, which have been recently made in that neighbourhood, some account of which appeared in the *Times* of August 4th and 19th. Last June, the governor of the province of Keneh, which includes the ruins of ancient Thebes, noticed that the Bedouin Arabs were offering for sale an unusual quantity of antiquities at very low prices. The Pasha soon discovered that the source of their hidden treasure was situated in a gorge of the mountain range which separates *Deir-el-Bâhari* from the *Bab-el-Molook*, an Arabic word signifying "the gates of kings," containing the mausoleums of the Rameside kings of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties. Herr Emile Brugsch, a younger brother of the famous historian of Egypt, was sent for, and he discovered in the cliffs of the Lybian Mountains, on the left bank of the Nile, and near the Temple of *Deir-el-Bâhari*, a pit about thirty-five feet deep, cut in the solid rock; a secret opening from this pit led to a gallery 200 feet long,¹ which was also hewn out of the solid rock. This gallery was filled with relics and mummies, thirty-nine in number, of royal and priestly personages, almost exclusively belonging to Manetho's Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Dynasties, and which are of surpassing interest to the Biblical student, as the first two include the whole period of Israel's sojourn in Egypt, from Joseph to Moses; and when the four papyri found in the gallery have been unrolled and deciphered, we may hope to gather in a rich harvest of historical information of those most important times. One of these papyri, nearly 140 feet in length, is said to have been found in the coffin of Queen Hat-asu, most beautifully written, and illustrated with richly coloured illuminations. These papyri may prove the most valuable portion of the discovery; and, if so, they will confirm the saying of the late Mariette-Bey, that, "if ever one of those discoveries that bring about a revolution in science should be made in Egyptology, the world will be indebted for it to a papyrus."

The cause of these mummies and relics having been removed from their original tombs at *Deir-el-Bâhari* and *Bab-el-Molook* to this concealed gallery, is supposed to have been occasioned by fears of some foreign invasion; but whether that of the Assyrians, the Ethiopians, or the Persians, it is impossible to say. It is said that twenty-six out of the thirty-nine mummies discovered have already been deciphered, and their actual ownership made

¹ A good notion of the size of this gallery, excavated in the solid rock, may be obtained from knowing the extreme length from the north to south of the transepts and choir of Westminster Abbey, which, according to Stanley, p. lv., measures exactly 203 feet 2 inches.

known. The most interesting ones are those of King Ra-skenen, who was feebly reigning in the south, when Apophis, the patron of Joseph, was dominant over the whole land of Egypt; Aahmes, the conqueror of the Shepherds and founder of the famous Eighteenth Dynasty; the mummy case, but not the mummy of his son, Thothmes I.; his daughter, the illustrious Queen Hat-asu, the preserver of Moses; her younger half-brother, Thothmes III., the original maker of the London obelisk, and its completer, Rameses II., commonly called "the Great," after an interval of two centuries—all of whose corpses, with many others besides, after having been reposing for many ages in their respective tombs, and in this secret subterranean rock gallery near Thebes, are now lying quietly in the Boulaque Museum, near Cairo; all of them having thus given a practical contradiction to their theory, which caused the ancient Egyptians to make such continued efforts to preserve the body for the space of 3,000 years.

The learned Gibbon has made a strange mistake on this point. He says that "the doctrine of the resurrection was first entertained by the Egyptians; and their mummies were embalmed, their pyramids were constructed, to preserve the ancient mansion of the soul, during a period of 3,000 years;" and he gives Herodotus as his authority for his conclusion.¹ But what Herodotus really says is this:—"The Egyptians were the first to broach the opinion that the soul of the man is immortal, and that, when the body dies, it enters into the form of an animal which is born at the moment; thence passing on from one animal into another, until it has circled through the forms of all the creatures which tenant the earth, the water and the air, after which it enters again into a human frame and is born anew. The whole period of the transmigration is 3,000 years."² Such is the doctrine of *Metempsychosis*, which was entertained by the ancient Egyptians, borrowed from them by Pythagoras; an early belief in India; held by the Chinese Buddhists; and, according to Josephus,³ by the Jewish sect of the Pharisees. Plato gives a detailed account of it in his "Phædrus," as held by the Greeks. Cæsar found it amongst the Druids;⁴ and it was entertained by many other nations besides. The Egyptian idea went a great way towards the true doctrine of the resurrection, and was a wonderful discovery for man untaught by a revelation from on high; for it supposed that the good, after having passed through a purgatorial fire, and then made the companion of Osiris for 3,000 years, returned from Amenti, the place of the

¹ Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," ch. I.

² Herodotus' "History," ii. § 123.

³ Josephus, "Bell. Jud." ii. viii. § 14.

⁴ Cæsar, "Com. B. Gall." vi. 14.

departed, *re-entered its former body*, rose from the dead, and lived once more a human life on earth. This process was repeated over and over again, until a certain cycle of years became complete; when, finally, the good were united with Deity, being absorbed into the Divine Essence, and thus attaining the true and full perfection of their being.¹ Although, on this principle, as Queen Hat-asu lived 3,500 years ago, her soul would have again re-entered her body, and she would have emerged from the secret cave in the Libyan mountains about five centuries ago, the Christian visitor to the Boulaque Museum at Cairo, may look upon the mummy of this illustrious queen with the feeling that he has before his eyes the embalmed corpse of that "PHARAOH'S DAUGHTER," who was the honoured instrument of preserving the life of the great law-giver of the Jews, when she spied "the ark among the flags" of the Nile, and the infant within, and called his name Moses, because she had "drawn him out of the water."

Before concluding we may call attention to the recent discovery of two archaic inscriptions, which confirm in a remarkable manner the prophecies of Jeremiah (xliii. 10-13; xlvi. 25, 26) and Ezekiel (xxx. 10, 11; xxxii. 11, 12), respecting the judgment on Egypt by the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon. Hitherto the absence of confirmation of these particular predictions has allowed the Rationalistic school to boast that here is so evident a failure of Scripture prophecy, that "men even on the theological side have ceased to defend them" (Wiedemann's "Geschichte Aegyptens," p. 168). The discovery, however, of two documents, one Egyptian and the other Babylonian, shows that Nebuchadnezzar, as Josephus ("Antiq." x. ix. § 7) asserts, in the thirty-seventh year of his reign (B.C. 569), made an expedition against Egypt; and after overrunning and plundering the greater part of the land of Ham, penetrated as far south as Syene, and there engaged the Egyptian army commanded by one of Pharaoh Hophra's generals named Hor. The Egyptian commander claims the merit of having inflicted a check upon the Babylonian arms; but he does not dispute the fact that all Egypt had been conquered, and for a time was at the mercy of the King of Babylon, exactly as the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel had foretold. This is one of the many evidences which are daily accumulating in proof of the prophetic and historical veracity of Holy Scripture. Rawlinson, in his "History of Egypt" (ii. pp. 487, 488), has alluded to the value of this discovery; and a full account of these Babylonian and Egyptian inscriptions will be found, of the former, in the "Transactions of the

¹ Rawlinson's "Egypt," i. 319.

Society of Biblical Archæology" (vol. vii. pp. 210-225), and of the latter, in the "Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache" (for 1878, pp. 2-6).

BOURCHIER WREY SAVILE.

ART. III.—THE SUNDAY SCHOOLS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Church of England Sunday School Institute, 1880-81.

IF the subject of Sunday Schools was threshed out last year at the Centenary, there is now grain to be gathered, eaten, and digested. Most of us, perhaps, are conscious of having acquired of late a larger and more correct view of what has been done, is being done, and has yet to be done, in the way of Sunday School organization and improvement in teaching power. Yet to no subject more than to Sunday Schools may the adage apply "Live and Learn." Any one who peruses carefully month by month the pages of the *Church Sunday School Magazine* will have felt the breadth of its grasp: and to analyse the last Report of the Church of England Sunday School Institute is to gain a bird's-eye view of much of England's Church life. Archbishops and bishops, clergy and laity, north and south, townfolk and countrymen, infants and adults, teachers and taught, there come before us acting and speaking, caring or being cared for in the fellowship of the Sunday School.

A peep has been lately given through a sketch by one of its founders, Mr. J. R. Frewer, into the origin of the Society which now makes its influence felt in much more than half the parishes of England, and is extending itself daily in India and the Colonies. Few studies are more interesting than the tracing of great movements to their first impulse—to "watch the new-born rill just trickling down its mossy bed," destined to swell and expand itself into the "bulwark of some mighty realm"—to go in spirit into the upper room in Jerusalem, where abide in prayer and supplication the first little group, whose names a child might write, of "the Holy Catholick Church." Here then is the simple story:—

In the summer of 1843, five Sunday School teachers met in the Boys' Parochial School connected with St. Saviour's, Southwark, to consider by what means they could best provide for their own and their fellow-teachers' improvement in the art of teaching. They