

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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE HONORARY SECRETARY.

VOL. IX.



LONDON:

(Published for the Institute)

HARDWICKE & BOGUE, 192, PICCADILLY, W.

1876.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

ORDINARY MEETING, MARCH 16TH, 1874.

A. McARTHUR, Esq., M.P., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed, and the following Elections were announced :—

MEMBER :—C. Aldin, Esq., Queensbury, South-road, Clapham Park.

ASSOCIATES :—Rev. T. Aveling, Kingsland ; Rev. H. St. G. Reade, M.A., late Sch. Univ. Coll., Oxon, Head Master of the Godolphin School, Hammersmith.

Also the presentation of the following Works to the Library :—

- “Proceedings of the Royal Society.” Part 150. *From the Society.*
 “Proceedings of the Royal Institution.” Part 59. *From the Institution.*
 “On Ocean Currents.” By J. Croll, Esq. *From the Author.*
 “The Mersey Papers.” By Rev. R. Hitchman. *From the Author.*

It was further announced that, with regard to last month's discussion on the Brixham Cavern, the Geological Society had been communicated with, and had kindly arranged for inspection all the flint “implements” found in the cavern.

The following Paper was then read by the Author :—

ON THE HARMONY BETWEEN THE CHRONOLOGY OF EGYPT AND THE BIBLE. By the Rev. BOURCHIER WREY SAVILE, M.A., M.V.I.

WHEN the very learned Joseph Scaliger, animadverting on Eusebius, burst forth in a paroxysm of chronological enthusiasm, “Hail venerable Olympiads, ye guardians of time, ye vindicators of the truth of history, ye bridlers-in of the fanatical license of chronologists !” he bore witness to the

immense importance of every nation possessing an authoritative era for computing the records of the past, and as a guide to unborn generations in the future.

2. Probably at no period has there ever been such a variety of conjectures concerning the age of man on earth as those put forth by the learned in the present day. The late Baron Bunsen contended that "man existed on earth about 20,000 B.C., and that there is no valid reason for assuming a more remote beginning of our race."* Mr. Jukes, a distinguished English geologist, places the age of man at 100,000 years. Professor Fühlroth affirms in his work, "Der fossile Mensch aus dem Neanderthal," that "it reaches back to a period of from 200,000 to 300,000 years." Dr. Hunt, the late President of the Anthropological Society, not content with the comparatively modest chronology of the Brahmins, which allows the human race an antiquity of 4,300,000 years, according to Sir William Jones, affirms that man has really existed on earth for the prolonged period of 9,000,000 years! While Professor Huxley, though cautiously declining to commit himself by naming a definite number of years, having affirmed in his lecture "On the Fossil Remains of Man," that the human race was existing "when a tropical Fauna and Flora flourished in our Northern clime," *i.e.* during the Carboniferous era, we might fairly credit his theory concerning the antiquity of man with 9 or even 90,000,000 of years! Indeed, in his speech at the Norwich meeting of the British Association, he asked his audience if the distribution of the different types of skulls did not "point to a vastly remote time when the distant localities, between which there now rolls a vast ocean, were parts of one tropical continent? And if so, does it not throw back the appearance of man on the globe to an era *immeasurably more remote than has ever yet been assigned to it by the boldest speculators?*" †

3. I need scarcely point out not only the extreme variety of these conjectures, but also the extreme want of anything like reason to induce our acceptance of them. The learned of

* *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, iii. xxviii.

† A French speculator boldly declares that "The horse was killed and eaten in Europe before having been made a domestic animal for the use of man, from the commencement of the quaternary (*i.e.* the post tertiary) up to the period termed the age of bronze; that is to say, during a period which cannot be estimated less than 300,000 years."—*Les Origines du Cheval domestique*, par C. A. Piétrement, quoted by M. Chabas in his *Etudes sur l'Antiquité Historique, d'après les Sources Egyptiennes*, pp. 1, 2,

ancient times held very different views respecting man's antiquity. Bishop Newton, in his 14th "Dissertation on the Prophecies," mentions "an old tradition both amongst Jews and Christians, that at the end of 6,000 years the Messiah should come and the world be renewed," apparently assigning that period to man's age on earth. This view appears to be confirmed by the epistle ascribed to Barnabas, who writes: "Consider, my children, what that signifies—God finished them in six days, which means that in 6,000 years the Lord God will bring all things to an end."

4. Hence the natural anxiety which has been manifested by so many to ascertain the age of the human race since the creation of our first parents in Paradise; for I dismiss, as totally beside the mark, the question of the age of the world, which so many confound with the antiquity of man. How wide the variations of different chronologers are in respect to this may be seen in Hale's "New Analysis of Chronology"; where upwards of 120 different opinions are given, and which the writer says "might be swelled to 300," while in his own list the difference is so great that the first exceeds the last no less than 3,268 years.

5. Although the chronology of Scripture points distinctly to a period of about 6,000 years since the creation of man I purposely avoid entering upon the difference between the Hebrew and the LXX. chronology, though I unhesitatingly give my preference to the former), it is to the age of man since the Noachian flood that we have now to consider. And the arguments in favour of the Hebrew chronology, confirmed, as I shall endeavour to show, by that of Egypt, may be summed up under the following heads:—

(a.) The actual number of the present population of the world would, according to the calculated rate of increase from the three sons of Noah on their exit from the ark be reached in between 4,000 and 5,000 years.

(b.) The comparatively modern date of arts, sciences, and inventions.

(c.) The low date of all *authentic* history, whether Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Indian, or Chinese, none of which can be traced earlier than B.C. 2400. Champollion considered that "no Egyptian monument was really older than B.C. 2200;" and certainly Egypt affords the earliest positive evidence of man's existence on earth. *

* It is a curious fact that in the celebrated letter, which Alexander the

(d.) The moral reasoning which forbids the supposition of so vast a period of gloom and barbarism as the theory of the opponents of Scripture chronology demands.

6. It may be well, therefore, to mention that of the two most distinguished chronologers of modern times, Archbishop Usher and Clinton, the author of "Fasti Hellenici," while both alike reckon a period of 1,656 years, from Adam to Noah, the former dates the fall of man at B.C. 4004, while the latter places it as B.C. 4138, the difference between the two computations resting upon the exact interval between the Exodus of Israel and the building of Solomon's Temple; and I shall presently ask your attention to some Egyptian evidence on this much controverted portion of Scripture chronology.

7. I conclude we are all agreed in considering that the absence of any definite eras in very early times is the cause of the endless disputes on the subject of ancient chronology. With the exception of one instance, mentioned in 1 Kings vi., respecting *the era of the Exodus*, as it might be termed, but which I shall have occasion to show is certainly not Scripture, and the recently discovered *era of Noubti* amongst the monuments of Egypt, referring to a period somewhat earlier in the world's history, we have no evidence before the eighth century B.C. of the ancients having adopted any plan so simple for correcting chronology as that of the system of *eras*.

8. Of the eras with which we are most familiar, and which have necessarily tended to confine the variations of chronologers within a small compass, they may all be comprised within the limit of a few centuries, and three of them appear to have come into existence within the space of less than twenty-six years.

Great wrote to his mother Olympias, with the narrative he had received from the Egyptian High Priest Leo, who had extracted the same from the national archives, a term of 5,000 years is assigned to the Assyrian kingdom, while in the more authentic Greek history only 1,300 years are reckoned for the same period. So the Egyptian chronology gives 8,000 years to the duration of the Persian empire, counting to the time of Alexander, while among the Greeks only seven centuries are allowed for the same. St. Augustine, who records this, suggests a possible explanation that "the Egyptians are said to have formerly reckoned *only four months to their year*," though even this reckoning would make the Egyptian chronology longer than the Grecian. From which Augustine wisely concludes that if this "differs widely in this matter of chronology from the credible account, how much less can we believe these documents, which, though full of fabulous and fictitious antiquities, sceptics would fain oppose to the authority of our well-known and divine Books of Scripture."—Augustine's *City of God*, lib. xii. c. 10.

The well-known Greek era of the Olympiads is reckoned from B.C. 776; the still better-known Latin era A.U.C.—*i.e.* the building of the city of Rome—is computed, according to Varro, as B.C. 753; or, according to Fabius Pictor, as B.C. 747,—the very year on which the Babylonian era of Nabonassar, according to the canon of Ptolemy, commenced. The era of the Seleucidæ is dated from B.C. 312; and our own era, which was invented by the Roman abbot Dionysius Exiguus, who flourished towards the close of the sixth century, is computed, as is well known, from January 1, A.D. 1, though, probably, a few years after the true date of the birth of Christ.

9. Notwithstanding the existence of the eras already mentioned, and that the ancient dates (from the time of the Olympiads, *i.e.* 776 *before* to the year 238 *after* the received Christian era) have been accurately adjusted, according to the computation of Censorinus, who wrote during the last-named year, there are still differences amongst chronologers, not merely on such minor points as the true date of the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus, possibly owing to the idea of a suppressed consulship during the time of the Antonines, which necessarily affects all the intervening dates for about a century; but such important and well-established events as the birth and death of Christ have been the subject of endless differences and controversies amongst chronologers in the present day.

10. As the true date of the crucifixion is one of those points on which recent discoveries in Egypt have thrown considerable light, I shall take the opportunity of examining this matter in detail. Let me introduce this subject by expressing my full concurrence in the opinion expressed by Dr. Farmer in his valuable "Chronological Introduction to the History of the Church," in which the learned American writer seeks to prove "That our Lord's ministry began in the fifteenth year of the associate government of Tiberius, and the twelfth year of his sole reign, and was ended by His crucifixion in the nineteenth year of that associate government. That the year of our Lord's birth preceded the common Christian era six years, having taken place in the 747th of Rome, the year silently adopted by the French Benedictines in their learned work on the 'Art of Verifying Dates.'" (Preface, vii.)

11. The date of the birth of Christ was very fully considered by Nicholas Mann about 140 years ago, in his "Treatise" on that subject; and the conclusion at which he then arrived has been confirmed in a still more learned treatise published at Leipzig in 1869, by A. W. Zumpt, entitled "Das Geburtsjahr

Christi ; geschichtlich-chronologische Untersuchungen." Both works agree at fixing the birth towards the close of B.C. 7, *i. e.* six years before our Christian era ; and which accords with the overwhelming amount of evidence in fixing the date of the Passion at A.D. 29.

12. The historical testimony that the crucifixion took place during the consulship of the Gemini, a date as well ascertained as that of the Council of Nice, is, with the exception of Epiphanius, a Greek father who flourished in the fourth century, perfectly uniform. Whether we regard the earliest authorities, such as the apocryphal Greek Gospel of Nicodemus, written in the middle of the second century, or the words of Tertullian at the close of the same, who writes : " In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Christ suffered, whose sufferings were completed *within* the time of the 70 hebdomads under Tiberius Cæsar, Rubellius *Geminus* and Rufus *Geminus* being consuls, in the deviating of March at the time of the Passover ; " * the undeviating testimony of history shows that the Passion took place in the year which answers in our era to A.D. 29.

13. The testimony of Tertullian is peculiarly valuable on this point ; not only because he wrote of an event so comparatively near to his own time (which might be compared to an historian of the present day mentioning the time when the Hanoverian dynasty ascended the British throne), and he tells us that the " *Acta Pilati* " † was his authority for the statement, but also because he enters into such minute details, which agree to the year A.D. 29, and to that year alone. Thus, the singular fact that both the consuls on that memorable year bore the same name must have been well known to the primitive Christians, and handed down by tradition unto the time of Tertullian—the truth of the crucifixion having taken place during the month

* Tertullian *Advers. Jud.*, § 8.

† The Romans possessed something like our *Annual Register* in their *Acta Senatus* and *Acta Divina Populi* ; as it was customary for the provincial governors to send the acts of their governments to Rome for the Emperor's use. Hence Pontius Pilate sent to Tiberius an account of the crucifixion, to which Justin Martyr alludes in his *First Apology*, written about the middle of the second century, saying, " And that these things were so done you may know from the *acts* made in the time of Pontius Pilate." So Tertullian in his *Apology*, written a few years later, when speaking of the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension, says, " Of all these things relating to Christ, Pilate himself, in his conscience already a Christian, sent an account to Tiberius, then Emperor." (*Apol.*, c. 21.)

of March not only agrees with the testimony of St. John (xviii.) that "it was cold" during that period, but also with the fact that those Christians, who commemorated the crucifixion as an anniversary, observed it as late as the fourth century, on the 17th of March*—and I shall endeavour to show presently, by the aid of an Egyptian monument, how exactly the further test of Tertullian "within the time of the 70 hebdomad^s" is fully confirmed.

14. One more testimony, much earlier than that of Tertullian, as to the true date of the crucifixion, is to be found in the records of a nation detailing contemporary events. Eusebius, the great ecclesiastical historian of the fourth century, states that he had discovered certain letters from the King of Edessa addressed to Jesus Christ, which, he says, "were taken by himself from the archives of that city and translated, word for word, from the Syriac language." After quoting these letters in full, Eusebius goes on to say that "the following things are subjoined in the Syrian tongue," viz., that after the ascension the Apostle Thaddeus was sent to Edessa, where he performed many miracles, &c.; adding these words, "this was done in the 340th year," i.e. of the era of the Seleucidæ, which synchronizes with the year of our era A.D. 29.†

15. The allusion of Tertullian to the crucifixion having occurred "within the time of the 70 hebdomad^s" refers to the famous prediction of the prophet Daniel, that "the Messiah was to be cut off" at a certain period in the history of Israel, and which caused pious Jews, like Simeon and Anna, to be "waiting for the consolation of Israel" at the time of our Saviour's birth. Thus we read in Daniel ix. 26, how it was foretold that, counting from the time of the issue of a certain decree for rebuilding the broken-down walls of Jerusalem, there should be 7+62, i.e. sixty-nine weeks of years, or what Tertullian calls "hebdomad^s," which equal 483 years, at the expiration of which the Messiah would be cut off, i.e. put to death by crucifixion at Calvary. That such is the meaning of this famous prophecy, on which, as Sir Isaac Newton is reported to have

* Epiphanius says that the Christians, nicknamed *Quartadecimans*, who observed Easter as the Apostles and the primitive Christians did, "kept their Pasch on the 15th of the Kalends of April (i.e. March 17), grounding their reasons for so doing upon certain information contained in the *Acta Pilati*, respecting the day of our Lord's crucifixion." (Epiphanius, *Hæc.* 50, *Quart.* n. 11.)

† Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, i. ch. xiii.

said, "the Christian religion rests," we may gather from comparing the expression in Daniel, "after the sixty-two weeks shall Messiah be cut off," with the words of our Lord when speaking of His own resurrection—"after three days and three nights," at the expiration of which period He would, as He had foretold, rise again. Even so at the expiration of the sixty-nine weeks or hebdomads* the Messiah would be cut off.

16. The difficulty which commentators have had to contend with in the interpretation of this prophecy, so far as it relates to "the cutting off of the Messiah" at the expiration of the sixty-nine hebdomads or 483 years from the time of the decree for building the walls of Jerusalem, has been the impossibility of reconciling the usual dates for the accession of King Artaxerxes, who granted the decree, with the requirements of the prophecy. Scripture shows that there were four edicts granted to the Jews after the Babylonish captivity by certain Persian kings, viz. by Cyrus, Darius Hystaspes, and two by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the seventh and twentieth years of his reign. Of these four edicts the first three relate exclusively to the building of the Temple, and the order of public worship therein.† The fourth edict, viz., that granted in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, and so fully detailed in chapters i. and ii. of Nehemiah, alone relates to the building of the city and the broken-down walls of Jerusalem, and consequently it must be this decree with which the prophecy of Daniel is at all concerned.

17. It is most important, therefore, that we should find the true date for the accession of Artaxerxes, from which the Scripture writers, like Ezra and Nehemiah, evidently date the beginning of his reign, and this we are enabled to do by the modern discovery of an Egyptian monument, which throws light upon an important point of history in a very singular way. Archbishop Usher, and Whiston, a learned divine who wrote much on prophecy at the commencement of the last century,

* It is important to notice an unfortunate omission in our English Bible of the definite article in this passage of Daniel, which reads "after 62 weeks" in place of the undoubted Hebrew reading "after *the* 62 weeks," showing a reference to the 7 weeks mentioned immediately before, and proving that it included the whole period of the 69 weeks or hebdomads. It is, therefore, worthy of note that the LXX., Aguila's version, and the Arabic, all repeat the word "seven" in this verse, and read it thus:—"After the 7 and the 62 weeks."

† Cf. Ezra i. vi. vii.

alike held the opinion that Artaxerxes ascended the throne some nine years earlier than the date (B.C. 465) commonly assigned to that event, according to Ptolemy's canon, for which they had the following evidence. Thucydides, who was born B.C. 471, and who may therefore be regarded as a contemporary writer, states that when Themistocles fled from Greece to Asia "in the company of a certain Persian, he sent letters to Artaxerxes, newly come to the kingdom," in which he referred to his own duty as ruler of the Athenians "in resisting thy father, Xerxes, who invaded me," &c.* Plutarch, in his "Life of Themistocles," relates that Charon, of Lampsacus, affirms the same thing, and that "the opinion of Thucydides seems most agreeable to chronology." Now, it would require a very prolonged investigation of the internal evidence of the history of Thucydides, who gives no dates, to discover the exact year for the flight of Themistocles; we must, therefore, be content with the statement of Eusebius, who states in his "Chronicon"† that it took place in the fourth year of the 76th Olympiad = B.C. 473, *i.e.* eight or nine years earlier than the date of Artaxerxes' accession according to Ptolemy's canon.

18. Now, this conclusion has been confirmed in a remarkable manner by some Egyptian monuments, which are very clearly represented in Burton's "Excerpta Hieroglyphica." I believe the late Dr. Hincks, so distinguished for his skill in deciphering the cuneiform inscriptions, was the first to call attention to the importance of the monuments at Hammamat, on the Cosseir road, or highway from Persia to Egypt, near the Red Sea. They were erected by a Persian official named *Artemis*, who records that he "held office in Egypt during five years of Cambyses, thirty-six years of Darius, and *twelve years of Xerxes*." Although this is no proof that twelve years, in place of the twenty years assigned to him in Ptolemy's canon, was the full extent of Xerxes' reign, it appears to support the view that according to some *twelve years* was the extent of his sole reign, as is fully confirmed by another monument at the same place, which speaks of the sixteenth year of Xerxes and the fifth year of his son Artaxerxes as connumerary years. I think this certainly proves the truth of Whiston's theory, who says, "about the twelfth year of Xerxes he made his youngest son Artaxerxes king-regent, under the direction of his prime minister

* Thucydides, *Hist. of Grec. War*, i. § 137.

† Olymp. LXXVI. iv. Themistocles in Persas fugit (*Euseb. Pamphili Cæsariensis Chronicon. Divo Hieronymo Interpret.* Basil. anno 1535.)

Artaphanes. Nine years later, Artaphanes sought to set up for himself, having a sort of regent power for seven months; was slain by Artaxerxes, who thereby had a *second* beginning of his reign, as he would have a third at the time of his father's death; Thucydides taking the first as reckoned at Greece; Ptolemy's canon the second, as reckoned at Babylon, and Josephus the third."* That a different mode of reckoning the accession of various kings in ancient times by sacred and secular historians alike, may be seen in the several instances of Nebuchadnezzar, Tiberius, and Augustus Cæsar.

19. The result of this investigation appears in what has been already set forth, that Nehemiah, the cupbearer of King Artaxerxes, dates the accession of his master to the throne in the same way as Thucydides and Charon of Lampsacus, and not according to the usual computation of Ptolemy's canon. Assuming then that Artaxerxes was taken into partnership with his father in the twelfth year of Xerxes' reign, B.C. 474, the twentieth year of the son's associated reign, when the decree was granted to Nehemiah to rebuild the broken-down walls of Jerusalem, must be reckoned at B.C. 455; and as Nehemiah tells us he received the commission "in the month *Nisan*," the same as the more ancient name of *Abib*, the first of the Hebrew months, in which the Passover was observed, we may fairly suppose that it was at the time of the Passover that Nehemiah received the decree so favourable to his own people from the king. Bearing then in mind the prophecy of Daniel, that from the issuing of such a decree to the cutting off of the Messiah was to be a prolonged period of 7 + 62 hebdomads, or 69 in all, *i.e.*, in reality 483 years, we may easily calculate that period from the Passover B.C. 455, and we are brought to the Passover A.D. 29, when, as I have shown on historical testimony, the crucifixion took place. It is somewhat remarkable that in these two years the Passover was celebrated on exactly the same day. According to the astronomical tables, the new moon (by which the Jews regulated the beginning of the year) commenced in the years B.C. 455 and A.D. 29, on the 4th of March; consequently the 14th day of the Moon, when the Passover was kept, must have fallen in both those years, on what answers to our 17th of March, the

* Whiston's *Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies*, p. 73. Archbishop Usher in his *Annals*, and the learned Petavius in his *Rationar. Temp.*, par. ii. p. 154, alike adopt the same conclusion respecting the accession of Artaxerxes as being eight or nine years earlier than the canon of Ptolemy allows.

day on which, according to some of the early Christians,* the crucifixion really took place.

20. Remembering that this interpretation of a very famous prophecy has been confirmed by the valuable testimony of the Egyptian monuments, I propose to ask your attention to the further confirmation which those monuments afford to the truth of Biblical chronology, as understood by the ancient Hebrews; and inasmuch as this is rather a complicated subject, I would select a particular point in Egyptian history for the purpose of testing how far the chronologies agree, and then calculate backwards and forwards in order to prove further agreement in the same.

21. Although it is commonly said that sacred and secular chronology do not come into contact until the time of the Babylonish Captivity, *i.e.* during the sixth century B.C., when one, as it were, ends, and the other has its more certain beginning, almost all chronologers are agreed that an event as early as the building of Solomon's temple is a fair starting-point on which the various computations may be said to rest. Scripture chronology places the date of that event at B.C. 1014, which is confirmed by secular chronology in this way. It is a well-ascertained date that Carthage was taken and destroyed by Scipio in the fourth and last year of the third Punic war, which answers to B.C. 146. Solinus and Cato both say that Carthage had then existed 737 years, which would fix the date of its building at B.C. 883. Menander, the Ephesian (who, according to Josephus,† "wrote the acts done both by the Greeks and Barbarians under every one of the Syrian kings," in whose annals the building of Solomon's Temple is specially mentioned as having occurred during the reign of Hiram, King of Tyre, in accordance with the historical statements of 1 Kings v.), gives 155 years from the building of Carthage to the commencement of Hiram's reign, which would bring that event up to B.C. 1038. Hiram reigned, according to Menander, for a period of thirty-four years, and his reign would therefore terminate B.C. 1005. It is quite clear from Scripture, that Hiram was contemporary with both David and Solomon for several years; and according to this computation it must have been in the twenty-sixth year of his reign, which synchronized with the fourth of Solomon's, that the Temple of Jerusalem was begun to be built. Bunsen, who has gone into this matter with very deep research, and based

* The Quartadecimans, see note to end of § 13.

† Josephus, *Contr. Apion.*, lib. i. §§ 17, 18.

upon a different mode of computing the event, concludes that "the year B.C. 1014 is proved to be the year of the building of the temple on coherent critical grounds, and differs very little from the ordinary computation."*

22. Having thus ascertained the date of the building of Solomon's Temple, I proceed to point out the remarkable synchronism it affords to the chronologies of Israel and Egypt. The first step in this investigation is to ascertain the exact date of the Exodus of the Israelites under Moses, from their Egyptian bondage. If we accept the authorized version of 1 Kings vi. 1, as the correct reading, all dispute amongst those who believe in the infallibility of Scripture must be at an end; for in this verse (the sole instance of any mention of an era, alluded to or hinted at in Holy Writ) it is stated that "in the 480th year after the children of Israel were come out of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month of Zif, he began to build the House of the Lord."

23. Counting 480 years from the year B.C. 1014, the date of building Solomon's Temple, we are brought to B.C. 1494, as the time of the Exode, according to what appears to many to be Scripture authority. But we have conclusive evidence that the words "in the 480th year," etc., are an interpolation as late as the third or fourth century of the Christian era. For, first, it does not agree with the summation of years given in the Old Testament, especially a passage in Judges xi. 26, which shows that in the time of Jephthah, the children of Israel had then been occupying the land of promise upwards of "300 years," which would leave only fifty-six years for the interval between Jephthah and Saul, in place of between one and two centuries, such as the book of Judges teaches. Nor does it agree with the chronology of the New Testament, as we find St. Paul distinctly declaring that the rule of the Judges alone until Samuel, lasted "about the space of 450 years" (Acts xiii. 20). Secondly, None of the Jewish writers, such as Demetrius or Josephus, nor of the Christian fathers, such as Theophilus of Antioch or Clement of Alexandria, could have known of such a passage, for their chronology of that period is essentially different. Thirdly, Origen, probably the best authority of the true text of Scripture of his own age, in his "Commentary on St. John," quotes Kings vi. 1, without the disputed clause as follows: "They prepared timber and stones to build the house; and in the fourth year of Solomon's

* Bunsen's *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, book iv. part v. § 1, A. IV.

reign over Israel," etc., omitting all mention of the words "in the 480th year of Exode," which clearly were not in Origen's copy of the LXX. or of the Hebrew; for had they been in either, Origen would surely have inserted them, as they are the most important words in the text. If I am not mistaken, Eusebius is the earliest authority who gives the passage in dispute; and we may therefore conclude, that between the time of Origen (third century) and Eusebius (fourth century) it had some how or other crept into the text.

24. It is certain that this disputed clause was unknown to both Jewish and Christian writers, from the fact that one and all compute a longer period between the Exode and the building of the Temple than the present Hebrew text allows. Thus Demetrius of the third century B.C., and Josephus of the first century A.D., computed the interval at 592 years; Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch in the second century A.D., at 580 years; and Clemens Alexandrinus at 573 years; showing sufficient agreement without any servile copying from each other, when there was no regular era for the period in existence, to afford the approximate estimate of the opinion of chronologers, as to what was the real interval between the Exode and the building of the Temple. And we have now a remarkable secular testimony on this very point. Theophilus, besides giving his own computation of this interval, which he places at 580 and 540 years, according to various readings, says: "There is an account among the Syrian archives about the building of the Temple in Judea, which King Solomon built 566 years after the Jews went out of Egypt."* When we recollect that Hiram, King of Tyre, materially assisted in the building of the Temple, and that Josephus mentions, on the authority of Menander, the historian of Tyre, with what care they recorded important events in their annals, we are warranted, I think, in assuming that, according to contemporary and impartial evidence at the time when Solomon's Temple was built, 566 years had elapsed since the Exodus of the children of Israel.

25. Having ascertained from secular historians the date of Solomon's Temple as B.C. 1014, by adding 566 years on similar authority, we obtain 1580 B.C. as the date of the Exode; and this may be confirmed by the following Egyptian evidence. At the time of the death of the last of Joseph's brethren, there were 126 years unexpired † of the 430

* Theophilus, *Ad Autolyc.*, lib. iii. §§ 22, 24.

† The following table exhibits the Biblical chronology of the 430 years:—

years from Abraham to the Exodus of Israel. By adding 126 to 1580 we arrive at the year B.C. 1706—the very year of a remarkable synchronism in the histories of Israel and Egypt. In the first chapter of the Book of Exodus it is recorded that “Joseph died and all his brethren and all that generation”; and then in the verse but one succeeding it is written: “Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph.” In the 6th of Exodus, v. 16, mention is made of the death of Levi, the brother of Joseph and the last living member of that generation, as we may fairly presume, at the age of 137. According to the computation of all the events recorded in Scripture as having happened during the 430 years from the call of Abraham to the Exode, Levi’s death took place B.C. 1707; and, according to Egyptian chronology, the overthrow of the Shepherd Dynasty by Pharaoh Amosis, and the rise of the celebrated eighteenth Dynasty—an event as important in the annals of Egypt as the Norman Conquest in English history—occurred, according to Manetho, as interpreted by Brugsch* and others, in the following year of B.C. 1706.

26. Having thus arrived at a remarkable synchronism in the

	Year of Call.	B.C.	
Abraham’s visit to Egypt when 75	1	2010	Gen. xii. 1, 4, 10
Isaac born when Abraham was 100.....	25	1985	„ xvii. 1, 21
Isaac married Rebecca when 40	65	1945	„ xxv. 20
Jacob born when Isaac was 60	85	1925	„ xxv. 26
Abraham’s death at 175	100	1910	„ xxv. 27
Joseph born when Jacob was 91	176	1834	„ xlv. 6; xlvii. 9
Joseph sold into Egypt at 17.....	193	1817	„ xxxvii. 2
Isaac’s death when Joseph was 29	205	1805	„ xxxv. 28
Joseph Viceroy of Egypt when 30	206	1804	„ xlv. 46
End of the seven years of plenty	213	1797	„ xlv. 29, 47, 54
Jacob in Egypt in the second year of famine	215	1795	„ xlv. 6
Jacob presented to Pharaoh when 130...	215	1795	„ xlvii. 9
Jacob’s death when 147	232	1778	„ xlvii. 28
Joseph’s death when 110	286	1724	„ i. 26
Death of Levi, Joseph’s brother, when 137	303	1707	Ex. i. 6; vi. 16
Rise of the king who knew not Joseph...	304	1706	„ i. 8
Moses born	350	1660	„ ii. 1, 2
Moses flies to Midian when 40	390	1620	Acts vii. 23
The Exodus when Moses was 80	430	1580	Ex. vii. 7

* *Histoire d’Egypte*, par Henri Brugsch, Canon. Chron. des Rois d Mènes jusqu’à Nectanebos II.

histories of Israel and Egypt, I proceed to trace back the chronology of those nations from the earliest times in order to show how they mutually confirm and support each other. And to those who deny the application of Pharaoh Amosis to the "new king which knew not Joseph," as recorded in the book of Exodus, I will ask them to give due weight to the argument derived from *chronology* both before and after the time of the Exode in favour of its truth; as also to the argument from *history* which has been so ably set forth by my friend Canon Cook in his valuable *Excursus* on Egyptian matters, given in vol. i. of the "Speaker's Commentary of the Bible."

27. Having ascertained the date of the Exode as B.C. 1580, we count back the 430 years spoken of in Exodus xii. 40, in order to arrive at a Scripture date for the call of Abraham, and which must be dated as B.C. 2010. But as this relates to the duration of the sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt, it will be necessary to examine the text with some care in order to ascertain the exact meaning of Scripture on this important point. The authorized version, as a translation of the Hebrew, reads the passage thus: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, *who dwelt in Egypt*, was 430 years." And as some have contended that this means the Israelites were actually in bondage to the Egyptians during the whole of that period, it may be well to point out that our present reading does not necessarily imply this, for it merely asserts that though their "sojourning" lasted for 430 years, it was only during a portion of that time that they dwelt in Egypt; which view is confirmed by the inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 9), who says: "By faith Abraham *sojourned* in the Land of Promise, *as in a strange country*, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise." And this view is confirmed by the reading both of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX. version, all of which MSS., as the learned Kennicott* in his celebrated "Dissertation" has pointed out, are uniform on this 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." The New Testament confirms this reading by St. Paul's assertion in Galatians (iii. 16, 17), that "the promises to Abraham and his seed were confirmed by the law (given at Sinai), which was 430 years *after*" they had been first made.

* Kennicott, *Dissert.*, ii. pp. 164-5.

28. That the Jews of all ages so understood the text may be seen by this. Demetrius,* who flourished in the third century B.C., reckons 215 years from the call of Abraham to the going down into Egypt, 135 years from this last epoch to the birth of Moses, and 80 years from that to the Exode, which adds up, $215 + 135 + 80 = 430$. Josephus, in the first century A.D., expressly says that "the children of Israel left Egypt in the month Xanthicus, on the 15th day of the month, 430 years after our forefather Abraham came into Canaan, but 215 years only after Jacob removed into Egypt."† Both the Talmuds ‡ speak of the sojourning of the Israelites as including that "in Egypt and in all lands" besides. Aben Ezra interprets the words, as also does Joseph Ben Gorion, a Rabbinical writer of the tenth century, in the following way: "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—'descend,' 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."§

29. The testimony of the early Christian writers is to the same effect. Eusebius|| distinctly says that it is "by the unanimous consent of all interpreters" that the text should be so understood. Augustine,¶ in his forty-seventh question on the book of Exodus, as well as in his work "On the City of God," taught that the 430 years included the sojourn in Canaan as well as in Egypt. And the historian Sulpicius** Severus says "from the entrance of Abraham into Canaan until the Exode were 430 years." These Christian interpreters of the Old Testament doubtless understood an argument, which some in the present day have strangely overlooked, that if the 430 years is to be counted only from the time of Jacob's descent into Egypt until the Exode, *the mother of Moses would have borne him 262 years after her father's death*, according to the Biblical computation, which all admit is a physical impossibility. On which Clinton has justly observed: "Some writers have very

* Demetrius, apud Euseb. *Præp. Evang.*, ix. 21, p. 425.

† Josephus, *Antiq.*, ii. xv. § 2.

‡ T. Hierosol. Megillah, fol. 71, 4. T. Babyl. Megillah, fol. 9, 1.

§ *Historie of the latter Tymes of the Jewes Common Weal*, by Joseph Ben Gorion. Translated by Peter Morwing. Oxford, 1567, pp. 2, 3.

|| Eusebius, *Chron. Canon. Liber Prior*, § 19.

¶ August., *De Civitat. Dei*, lib. xvi. § 24.

** Sulpic. Sever., *Hist. Eccles.*, I. xxvi. 4.

unreasonably doubted this portion of the Hebrew chronology, as if it were uncertain how this period of 430 years was to be understood. Those who cast a doubt upon this point refuse to Moses, an inspired writer—in the account of his mother, and father and grandfather—that authority which would be given to the testimony of a profane author on the same occasion.”*

30. Accepting, then, the date of 1580 B.C. for the time of the Exode, and counting back 430 years, we obtain the time of the call of Abraham as B.C. 2010. According to the Hebrew chronology, the call of Abraham bisects the whole interval between the Deluge and the Exode; and thus by counting back another 430 years we arrive at B.C. 2440 as the Biblical date for the Noachian Flood. And I think we have some incidental secular testimony in confirmation of the same. In the Chinese “Annals” it is stated that a conjunction of the planets Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, and Mercury in the constellation termed “*Shi*,” was assumed by the Emperor Chuen-hio as a very important epoch in the history of the world; and it has been discovered by the astronomer De Mailla that such a conjunction did take place on February 9th, B.C. 2444. † I do not lay any undue stress upon this synchronism, but think it possible that it may have a bearing upon the harmony between the chronologies of Israel and Egypt in a way which I propose now to endeavour to prove.

31. Although there is no positive evidence on any Egyptian monument (as there is of the Biblical record of the Temptation) that the Egyptians knew the story of the Deluge, it is more than probable that they had some tradition concerning it. In that remarkable work known as “The Book of the Dead,” which has been so skilfully translated by my learned friend Dr. Birch, of the British Museum, in the fifth volume of Bunsen’s work on Egypt, we find frequent mention of the name of Noah, variously written as *Nh*, *Nuh*, and *Noa*, who was worshipped in Egypt as “the god of water,” and who has been identified by Dr. Birch with the deified man who was entitled “the father of the gods,” and “the giver of mystic life to all beneath him.” According to Plutarch, the Egyptian tradition represents Noah under the last-named title; when Typhon, a personification of the ocean, enticed him into the ark, which, being closed, was forced out to sea through the Tanaitic mouth of the Nile; which things, says Plutarch, ‡

* Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. i. p. 299, Appendix.

† See Chambers’ *Astronomy*, Oxford Clar. Press Edit., p. 42.

‡ Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, § 13. Plato also, in his *Timæus*, § 5,

“were done upon the 17th day of the month *Atayr*, when the sun was in Scorpio, in the 28th year of the reign of Osiris.” We recollect that it was “in the 600th year of Noah’s life, in the second month, and the 17th day of the month, the same day,” according to the book of Genesis, that the Flood commenced. And the fact that two such different authorities as Moses and Plutarch make mention of a great Flood beginning on the 17th day of the month, seems to show that they are speaking of the same event.

32. Accepting the date of the Flood as B.C. 2440, according to the Hebrew chronology, let us consider how far this agrees with that which is deducible from the Egyptian monuments and the papyri, which throw considerable light on that early portion of the world’s history. The colonization of Egypt could not have taken place until after the destruction of the Tower of Babel and the scattering of the families and descendants of Noah over the face of the earth, which Scripture places just one century after the time of the Flood; in other words, as having taken place *circa* B.C. 2340. Now, there is an incidental confirmation of this date, which it may be well to notice. M. Oppert, it is well known, has discovered among the cuneiform inscriptions a record of the building of the Tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues, in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, who speaks of the magnificent monuments which he had erected at Babylon, and amongst them one called “the *Temple of the Seven Lights of the Earth*, the most ancient monument of Borzippa, which a former king originally built 42 ages or generations ago, but did not finish it, since which time people have abandoned it, without order expressing their words.”* If we may reckon three ages or generations in round terms to a century, and compute from the era of Nabonassar B.C. 747, which was to the Babylonians what the Christian era is to ourselves, we obtain B.C. 2343 as the approximate date for the

appears to give an intimation of the Noachian Flood having been known to the Egyptians. *Atayr*, or *Athyr*, or *Athôr*, as it is variously spelt, was the *third* month with the Egyptians, who counted *Thoth* as the first month, and was supposed to answer to parts of January and February; but inasmuch as the first month was not fixed as ours, but varied according to the heliacal rising of Sothis, we are unable to conclude anything positive from Plutarch’s mention of the name. Berosus, the Chaldean historian, mentions that “the Deity Chronos appeared to Xisuthrus (the Babylonian Noah) in a vision, and warned him that upon the 15th day of the month *Dæsius* there would be a flood by which mankind would be destroyed.”

—Eusebius, *Chron.*, v. 8.

* *Expédition en Mésopotamie*, i. 208.

building of the Tower of Babel, according to the current chronology of that land.

33. It is a significant fact that there is no authentic chronology, whether it be Chinese, Indian, Assyrian, Babylonian, or Egyptian, that can trace back to an earlier date than that which we may compute from the Hebrew, as the Scriptural date of the Flood. It is true that many nations claim a higher antiquity for their beginning than the date already mentioned; but upon examination they all fail in the matter of authenticity. And Champollion went so far as to say that he had "demonstrated that no Egyptian monument was really older than the year B.C. 2200."* Later researches have discovered monuments about one century earlier than that date; the oldest one known is unquestionably a tablet now in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, from the tomb of a priest named Shera, of the second of Manetho's dynasties; and which may be approximately dated B.C. 2300.†

34. The mention of Manetho's name will naturally lead us to consider how far his chronology is to be received as an authentic witness to what the Egyptians believed to be true. Notwithstanding the high estimation in which Manetho was held by the late Baron Bunsen, who considers him far more trustworthy than all the sacred writers put together, going so far as to say: "Truth have I sought at thy hand; truth have I found by thy aid;" ‡ it may be proved without difficulty, from both the monuments and the papyri, as well as from his fellow-historian Eratosthenes, that in all that relates to the early chronology of Egypt, Manetho is perfectly unreliable; and until we come down to the time of the eighteenth Dynasty, either from the imperfect way by which the few fragments of history which bear his name, have been preserved, or from some other cause, there is no dependence upon him whatever. And, in order to show this, it may be sufficient to mention that in his first book, which contains all that we have of history of the first eleven dynasties, he gives a list of 192

* *Ancient Egypt: its Monuments and History*, p. 56.

† Some consider that the Pyramid of Degrees, of which there is a relic in the Berlin Museum, is older than the Oxford Tablet, assigning its age to the time of Ata, the fourth king of the first Dynasty; but there is no record or king's name to tell us in whose time this pyramid was built; whereas the Oxford Tablet contains the name of King Senta, the thirteenth name on the list of kings in the Tablet of Abydos, which answers to the fifth king of Manetho's second Dynasty.

‡ *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, ii. 392.

kings, who "reigned during a space of 2,300 years and 70 days," making three of the kings of the sixth Dynasty reign on an average over sixty years each; while in the seventh Dynasty he mentions seventy Memphite kings, who altogether reigned only "seventy days"!

35. There are no less than three authentic testimonies which are completely subversive of what I cannot refrain from calling a wild and impossible theory. The newly-discovered Tablet of Abydos, which happily has that portion perfect that is wanting in the old Tablet of Abydos, which has so long adorned the walls of the British Museum. For the first eleven dynasties, the new tablet gives a list of fifty-eight kings in place of Manetho's 192; and inasmuch as other Egyptian monuments confirm the testimony of the tablet, we have in that "Sermon in Stones" a far earlier as well as a far more accurate witness to the chronology of Egypt. The tablet was erected by Pharaoh Seti, the head of the nineteenth Dynasty, in the fifteenth century B.C., whereas Manetho lived in the third century B.C., and therefore twelve centuries later.

36. If the Tablet of Abydos is subversive of Manetho, in respect to the number of kings before the time of the twelfth Dynasty, the Turin papyrus is no less so in regard to the duration of their reigns. For it states that from the time of Menes, the proto-monarch of Egypt, and the same as Mizraim, the grandson of Noah, according to Syncellus, there were only 355 years in place of "the 2,300 years and 70 days" specified by Manetho; for the Tablet of Sakkarah discovered by Mariette, like the tablet already mentioned, shows that in the order of succession the sixth Dynasty is immediately followed by the twelfth. All the Tablets in Egypt containing lists of the Pharaohs, may be compared to the series of English sovereigns, such as they are represented in the painted windows of the House of Lords or the figures on the walls of the Crystal Palace. It would be a strange perversion of lost history and chronology if any one were to assert that during the Caroline era several centuries had been omitted from the domain of history. Yet some of our Egyptologers have no hesitation in asserting that the rule of the Shepherds, whose names are omitted from the Tablet of Abydos, lasted some thousands of years in place of about a century, the authentic duration of that Dynasty, which Bunsen computes at 920 years. Lepsius reduces the period to 500 years,* while De Rougé elon-

* I would suggest the following considerations as a possible solution of this difficult question; viz., the duration of the Shepherd Dynasty in Egypt, which Lepsius estimates at 500 years, upon the grounds I conclude

gates it to 2,017 years. Such speculations can only be compared to the case of a foreigner, like M. Guizot, who has so ably written the history of the Commonwealth, if he were to speculate on its duration as having been either five or ten, or twenty centuries! For had the Shepherds reigned in Egypt as long as De Rougé supposes, they would have ceased to have been regarded as foreign conquerors, just as our Plantagenet kings were within two centuries after the Norman conquest. The impossibility of De Rougé's theory may be estimated by supposing the descendants of Julius Cæsar to have been ruling in England since the first Roman invasion, and the present generation of Englishmen, headed by a descendant of the ancient British kings, rising in rebellion against them, and expelling them from the country in consequence of their being foreigners!

37. The testimony of Eratosthenes, the celebrated librarian of Alexandria under Ptolemy Fuergetes, is in direct conflict with the chronology of his contemporary Manetho, as may be thus shown. Eratosthenes gives 986 years from the time of Menes, the proto-monarch of Egypt, to that of Pharaoh Nilus, whom Herodotus (II. 3) calls the son and successor of Rameses the Great. Dicaearchus, a Greek historian of the fourth century B.C., says, "From the time of Pharaoh Nilus to the 1st Olympiad there were 436 years."* Supposing Dicaearchus refers to the time when the Olympic games were first instituted by Iphitus, B.C. 884, this chronology would give 1320 as the date of the reign of Pharaoh

of the following fragment of Manetho's history respecting the Sixteenth Dynasty, "Of thirty-two Hellenic Shepherd Kings who reigned 518 years." There are grounds, from the little which Herodotus says respecting the building of the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh, that "Philition a shepherd, who at that time fed his flocks about the place," had something to do with the building of it. (See *Herod.*, lib. ii. ch. 124—128.) Now there are reasons for supposing that there were several invasions of Egypt by the Shepherds; and all that we can gather from the fragments of Manetho's history which have come down to us is just this; viz., that they are met with for the FIRST time in Egyptian history at the epoch of the building of the Great Pyramid, which for reasons given in this paper may be dated B.C. 2170; and, for THE LAST time, during the reign of Thothmes III., who succeeded finally in expelling them from Egypt during his reign, which began, according to Manetho, about the year B.C. 1642, or 518 years after the time when the Great Pyramid was built. I think, therefore, it is possible that Manetho, writing fourteen centuries after these events of history, may have meant by his 518 years for the duration of the "Hellenic Shepherd Kings," that they are to be found in Egyptian history both at the commencement and the termination of that period.

* Dicaearchi Mess. de Sesos. Rege Frag., as given by Bunsen in his *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, i. 712; v. 19.

Nilus, the successor of Rameses the Great, and in perfect accordance with the testimony of Eratosthenes, as well as with the general system of chronology that may be gathered from the monuments of Egypt. And if we add the 186 years mentioned by him as the interval between Menes and Pharaoh Nilus, we obtain B.C. 2309 as the date for the commencement of the Egyptian monarchy; and which approximately accords with the date for the dispersion of mankind after the overthrow of the Tower of Babel, according to our computation of the chronology of Scripture.*

38. In an event between the time of the first colonization of Egypt and the accession of the twelfth Dynasty, for which the Turin papyrus allows 355 years, we have a striking confirmation to the truth of this chronology. All authorities are agreed that the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh was built during the reign of Pharaoh Cheops, as Herodotus calls him, the twenty-first king on the Tablet of Abydos, and second king of Manetho's fourth Dynasty. The supposed age of the Great Pyramid has been calculated by Sir John Herschel, upon the assumption that the Polar Star could be seen by an observer standing in the passage leading to the chambers of that wonderful monument, and determined by him to fall within the years 2171—2123 B.C.† This theory has been further confirmed by Professor Piazzi Smyth, the Astronomer Royal of Scotland, who sums it up in the following words: "It would seem that the resulting conclusion should be in favour of a high probability, and something that *must* be admitted until more direct and positive evidence can be adduced on the opposite side—that if we could by a miracle overtake the time that is passed and revisit the Jeezeh Hill at the date of B.C. 2170,

* The best and most authentic Chinese chronology, on the authority of Confucius, gives B.C. 2334 as the commencement of the Chinese Empire. See Jackson's *Chronological Antiquities*, ii. 489.

† See Howard Vyse's *Pyramids of Ghizeh*, ii. App. p. 107; and Piazzi Smyth's *Life and Work at the Great Pyramid*, iii. 287. The following table will show the great variety of dates assigned by scholars to the building of the Great Pyramid:—

Le Suer dates it	B.C.	4975
Brugsch	"	3657
Bunsen	"	3460
Lepsius	"	3426
Poole	"	2352
Piazzi Smyth	"	2170
Palmer	"	1903
Sir G. Cornwall Lewis	"	993

Showing a difference of more than 4,000 years!

as indicated by the theory, we should certainly find some part or other of the building of the Great Pyramid then in progress; or, in other words, the operation itself would be abundantly visible from that computed point of time—even as the consequences of the operation are to be seen now, from the similarly computed point of space.”

39. Between the first colonization of Egypt and the rise of the twelfth Dynasty, the Turin papyrus allows an interval of 355 years; for we have authority in affirming that the sixth Dynasty was immediately succeeded by the twelfth; and this is a very important help towards a correct understanding of early Egyptian chronology. Mariette Bey, one of the highest of living authorities in such matters, discovered at Memphis a priest's tomb containing forty cartouches showing that the twelfth Dynasty was in immediate sequence to the sixth; all the intermediate ones mentioned by Manetho, which add so many years to his prolonged and incredible system of chronology, occupying the same position as our Saxon kings during the Heptarchy previous to the monarchy of Alfred the Great.

40. Osburn, in his “Monumental History of Egypt” (vol. i. ch. vii.), has adduced strong evidence in favour of Abraham's visit to Egypt occurring just previous to the accession of the twelfth Dynasty; and, according to our Biblical chronology, about the year 2010 B.C. Josephus, who lived when the temple records of Egypt still existed, relates that Abraham taught the Egyptians “arithmetic and the science of astronomy, for before he went to Egypt they were unacquainted with that sort of learning.”* Berosus and Eupolemus, both of whom flourished about three centuries before Josephus, confirm this statement respecting Abraham. And Osburn states that there does not exist a single record of any Pharaoh, or subject *with a date* previous to the time of Pharaoh Amenemes I., head of the twelfth Dynasty, whereas tablets belonging to his reign with dates inscribed upon them are not uncommon. Now in the sepulchral grottos of Bennee Hasan, on the banks of the Nile, there are still to be seen certain inscriptions belonging to the early kings of the twelfth Dynasty. Special mention is there made of what is termed “The Panegyry or Festival of the First Year”; which Poole† considers to refer to the commencement of the *tropical cycle*, *i.e.* a perfectly exact circle of the sun, moon, and vague year, and which he proves by an elaborate

* Josephus, *Antiq.*, I. viii. § 6.

† Poole's *Horæ Egypt.*, pt. i. § 11.

calculation, confirmed by the authority of Sir G. Airey, the Astronomer Royal, is fixed to B.C. 2005. By which means we obtain something approaching a synchronism between the chronologers of Israel and Egypt.

41. Believing that the commencement of the twelfth Dynasty may be approximately dated *circa* 2000 B.C., according to Egyptian chronology, and that this date agrees with the time of Abraham, according to the computation of Scripture chronology, we have the harmony of the two further confirmed on this wise. An existing tomb at Eilethya, in Upper Egypt, belonging to one of the nobles of Pharaoh Amosis, the first sovereign of the eighteenth Dynasty, who bore the rank of "Admiral of the Nile," contains a genealogical record of much importance.* The names from the time of the original founder of the family, who lived during the reign of the Pharaoh who immediately preceded the twelfth Dynasty, are recorded in regular succession from father to son through eleven descents; a descent, according to Herodotus (II. 14, 2), may be computed as a period of about 30 years; consequently, eleven descents, calculated from the time of the Pharaoh who immediately preceded the twelfth Dynasty, and which may be approximately dated at B.C. 2036, would represent a period of about 330 years, and bring us down to B.C. 1706, for the time of the conquest by the Shepherds by Pharaoh Amosis, and agrees with the date given by Brugsch and other Egyptologists, as I have before shown, for that event, as important in the annals of Egypt as the Norman Conquest is in the history of England.

42. Between the time of Abraham and the expulsion of the Shepherds from Egypt, the vicerealty of Joseph and the descent of Jacob with his sons into that country had taken place. One of the most noteworthy events connected with Joseph's rule, as recorded in Scripture, was "the seven years' famine," a matter of frequent occurrence in that land, where rain is so rarely known. Bunsen supposed he had discovered a synchronism between the chronologies of Israel and Egypt by pointing to a tomb-inscription belonging to the reign of the second king of the twelfth Dynasty, and therefore about the time of Abraham's sojourn in that country. The inscription has been deciphered by Drs. Birch and Brugsch, a portion of which reads as follows: "*When in the time of Sesertesen I. the great famine prevailed*

* Osburn, *Monum. Hist. of Egypt*, ii. 160. A full account of this important monument is to be seen in the Vicomte de Rouge's *Mémoire sur l'Inscription du Tombeau d'Ahmes, Chef des Nautoniers*.

in all the other districts of Egypt there was corn in mine."* This Bunsen pronounced to be "a certain and incontrovertible proof" of the seven years' famine in Egypt. Brugsch more wisely considers that Bunsen's conclusion is "impossible for reasons chronological,"† which seems to be the more correct view; for independent of the fact, that the reign of Sesertesen I. preceded that of Joseph's Pharaoh by fully two centuries, which compels us to reject this theory, if we note what is said in Scripture respecting the famine, we shall at once see the distinction between the two. "And the seven years' dearth was *in all lands*; but *in all the land of Egypt there was bread*. And the famine was over *all the face of the earth*. And all countries came into Egypt to Joseph to buy corn; because that the famine was so sore in all lands."‡ I can scarcely imagine that these two statements speak of the same event; for whereas the inscription specifies that the famine extended *over all Egypt*, save in that one Nome or district of which *Amenj Amenemha*, the occupant of the tomb, had been governor, Scripture records that the seven years' famine was *in all lands but Egypt*, where want was unknown through the wise provision of Joseph.

43. We have in the annals of another nation a very singular confirmation of the truth of the Scripture record respecting the seven years' famine, as well as of the time of its appearance. In the archives of the Chinese empire it is recorded that "in the beginning of the reign of *Ching-tang* there happened a drought and famine all over the empire, which *lasted seven years*, during which time no rain fell."§ According to Biblical chronology the seven years' famine in Egypt may be dated B.C. 1796—1789. According to the "Chinese chronology," the Emperor Kie, the immediate predecessor of Ching-tang, began to reign B.C. 1823, and Ching-tang died B.C. 1758. Kie is represented in Chinese history as the greatest monster of vice and cruelty ever known. His cruelties, which commenced in the nineteenth year of his reign, caused the nobles to rebel

* *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, vol. iii. p. 334. In the interesting *Memoir of Baron Bunsen*, published in 1868, his daughter writes: "My father received a communication (April 8, 1853) from Mr. Birch which greatly delighted him; that he had found an inscription on the tomb of an official in the time of Sesortosen, alluding to the *great famine* which had taken place; a confirmation of the opinion my father has held for years, that just under *that king Joseph* had lived." Vol. ii. p. 311.

† Brugsch, *Histoire d'Egypte*, p. 56.

‡ Genesis xli. 54—56.

§ History of China, collected out of Martinus, Couplet, and Du Halde, by Jackson, in his *Chronological Antiquities*, vol. ii. p. 456.

against him. And the confusion arising from the long civil war which ensued, makes the exact date of Ching-tang's reign less clear than it otherwise would be; but since the two reigns, which include a period of sixty-five years, contain the time of the seven years' famine in Egypt, we have fair grounds for assuming that in the two statements we have a record of one and the same event.

44. Mariette Bey's discovery of a stèle in the ruins of the great temple at Tanis (the Zoan of Scripture), bearing a date of "the year 400," affords further confirmation of the correctness of this chronology. The stèle was erected by Rameses the Great, in honour of "Sutech, the god of the Shepherds," in which mention is made of the 400th year of the era of Nubti at the time when the tablet was set up. Egyptologists are tolerably well agreed as to the exact meaning of the term Nubti. De Rougé considers that "the name Nubti belongs to the Dynasty of the Shepherd Kings, and that Rameses liked to trace back his genealogy to him," adding that "Nubti is the Egyptian name for the god Sutech."* I have endeavoured to show in a previous paper† the grounds for believing that *Sutech* was the national god of Syria, and that the Pharaoh who so readily recognized the power by which Joseph had interpreted his dream, saying, "*Forasmuch as God has showed thee all this,*" &c., accords with what Moses wrote—"A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt and sojourned there, &c." (Deuteronomy xxvi. 5.) Hence it is not improbable that "the era Nubti," or Sutech, may have taken its rise from Pharaoh's recognition of Sutech as "the god of the Hebrews"; and this agrees chronologically with what Egyptologists have assumed for the commencement of the Nubti era upon totally different grounds. M. Vincent, a member of the French Institute, asserts that B.C. 1801 is the exact year for the beginning of the era,‡ and Joseph's viceroyalty commenced, according to the Hebrew chronology, B.C. 1803. Now, counting on 400 years, we are brought to the date B.C. 1401, at which time all are agreed that Rameses the Great was reigning in Egypt. It is, of course, not certain when "the Nubti era" commenced, whether as I have suggested, or as Mariette considers with the commencement of the rule of the

* *Revue Archéologique*, 1864, vol. x. p. 130; and for Mariette's account of the stèle, see *Revue Arch.*, 1865, vol. xi. p. 169.

† *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, Vol. VI. p. 99.

‡ *Revue Archéologique*, 1864, p. 489.

Shepherds after the name of Nubti, whom he terms the Patriarch of the Shepherd Dynasty, and the same as the *Beon* of Manetho, whose name has been discovered on an Egyptian monument. Mariette Bey dissents from M. Vincent's interpretation of the Nubti era, but concludes that "we must reckon 400 years from some unknown year of Rameses the Great to an unknown year of the Shepherd King Nubti and nothing more."*

45. Between the time of Joseph's viceroyalty and the reign of Rameses the Great, *i.e.* during some year in the Nubti era, occurred that important event in the history of both Israel and Egypt, the overthrow of the Shepherd Dynasty, the rise of the king which knew not Joseph, and the commencement of the bondage of the children of Israel, from which they were released at the time of the Exode. I have endeavoured to show that the rise of this "new king" took place B.C. 1706, according to the concurrent testimony of Egyptian, Tyrian, and other secular chronologies, in agreement with that which we obtain from Scripture; and I think this a very strong argument in favour of those who contend that the Exodus took place during the time of one of the kings of the eighteenth Dynasty.†

46. I propose now to offer some more synchronisms between the histories of Israel and Egypt in order to confirm the truth of the Scripture chronology. It is much disputed as to the name of the Pharaoh in whose time the Exodus took place. Julius Africanus, in his transmission of Manetho, names *Amosis*, the first king of the eighteenth Dynasty, as the Pharaoh of the Exode. Canon Cook names Thothmes II.; Sir Gardner Wilkinson, Thothmes III.; others have considered the weight of evidence leans to Thothmes IV.; upon the grounds chiefly that his reign was a short and turbulent one, and that no trace has been found of his tomb in the royal burial-place of his Dynasty; though that of his successor, Amenophis III., is still to be seen in a valley adjoining the cemetery of the other kings.‡ Now, this may be explained either by the fact that he was drowned in the Red Sea along with the rest of his army, or, as Eusebius in the "Armenian Chronicle"§ describes him as the Pharaoh, under the Greek name of *Danaus*, who was expelled from Egypt in the fifth year of his reign by his brother; and

* *Revue Archéol.*, 1865, p. 169.

† For the arguments on both sides of this question, see Canon Cook's valuable *Excursus* in vol. i. of "the Speaker's Commentary."

‡ Wilkinson's *Thebes*, pp. 122, 123.

§ Euseb. *Chron. Canon. Liber Prior*, cap. xx.

that he fled to Greece, where he established another kingdom. Other authorities give the name of "Cecrops"* to the Pharaoh who first led a colony from Egypt to Greece. Accepting this as one of the traditional legends connected with the Exode of the children of Israel, we have a singular confirmation of the Biblical date for that important event. For the Parian Chronicle, now at Oxford, a monument of the very highest authority, inasmuch as it was engraved as early as B.C. 264, opens with this announcement: "Since Cecrops (a native of Sais, in Egypt, who led a colony to Greece) reigned at Athens, and the country was called Actica, from Actæus, the native, 1318 years have elapsed."† Now, $1,318 + 264 = \text{B.C. } 1582$, *i.e.* within two years of our computation of the date of the Exode according to the Hebrew chronology.

47. Another argument in support of this theory is to be found in the understanding of the Apis cycle. Not the least interesting or valuable of the many discoveries of Mariette Bey, so long the director of the Boulaque Museum near Cairo, are these at the Serapeum, "arising," as Bunsen justly says, "from the light shed on chronology by the sepulchral and votive tablets dedicated to the mummies of the Bull Apis from the eighteenth Dynasty to the Romans."‡ They commenced in the reign of Amenophis III., who succeeded Thothmes IV., as I have already shown, B.C. 1580; and the discovery by Mariette of sixty-four of these reminiscences of the mummied Apes, or Sacred Bulls, will give us a clue to the chronology of the period. It is well known that the Apis cycle represented a period of twenty-five years; and without attempting to enter upon the disputed question as to the exact period which each sacred Bull was permitted to live, it will be sufficient for our purpose if we notice that $64 + 25$ gives us in round numbers the sixteen centuries which intervened between the time of Amenophis III. and the Romans. But we have a more exact confirmation of the chronology in the following recorded fact. The death of the fortieth of the sixty-four Sacred Bulls is related as having taken place in the twelfth year of that Pharaoh Hophra, who is mentioned by

* Augustine says that "in the reign of Cecrops, King of Athens, God brought his people out of Egypt by Moses." (*De Civitate Dei*, lib. xviii. § 8.)

† *Marmora Arundelliana*, p. 6, Selden's edition, London, 1628. This is one of the few uninjured inscriptions when Selden published his work.

‡ *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, book i. § 1. See Bunsen's account of the Apis Cycle and the tombs of the sacred Apes, taken from Mariette's *Serapeum*, fol. Paris; *Choix de Monuments*, 4to., Paris, and other works which treat on this difficult subject.

Jeremiah as reigning at the time when those Jews (who were not carried captive to Babylon) fled to Egypt, which took place, according to our Biblical chronology, B.C. 589. Hophra reigned rather more than eighteen years, according to the concurrent testimony of Brugsch* and Lepsius, from B.C. 590—572; consequently his twelfth year would fall within B.C. 580—579. Reckoning the Apis cycle at twenty-five years from the commencement of Amenophis III.'s reign, B.C. 1580, the end of the fortieth cycle would fall in the year B.C. 580, the twelfth year of Pharaoh Hophra's reign, and the very one recorded on an Egyptian monument as the date of the death of the fortieth Sacred Bull.

48. An incident recorded by the Father of history affords, I venture to think, another possible synchronism between the histories of Israel and Egypt, in confirmation of the Biblical chronology. Herodotus (lib. ii. § 102) mentions the conquests of a Pharaoh under the name of "Sesostris" in Syria, where he erected pillars in commemoration thereof, stating that he had reduced to subjection those who withstood him by the might of his arms; but those, who submitted without a struggle, were specially designated by the proud conqueror as "a nation of women, *i.e.* unwarlike and effeminate." Sufficient remains of these memorials still exist on the rocks above the mouth of the river Lycus (now called *Nahr el kelb*), in Syria, to prove that they were erected by Rameses the Great, whose long reign (the British Museum contains a monument of his sixty-sixth year) extended from B.C. 1407—1341. On referring to Scripture, we have similar proof of the effeminacy of some of the nations of Syria at that exact period of history. For in the well-known story of Deborah—who appears to have ruled Israel for "forty years," according to Hebrew chronology, from B.C. 1361—1321, *i.e.* during the reign of Rameses the Great—when Jabin, King of Canaan, and Sisera the captain of his host came against Israel with his multitude of chariots and a mighty army, it is emphatically recorded in the book of Judges (iv. 9, 23), that they were conquered by "hand of a woman"; and it is likewise added, "So God subdued on that day Jabin the King of Canaan before the children of Israel."

49. A further confirmation of the accuracy of the Egyptian chronology during the period of the rule of the Rameses, of

* *Histoire d'Égypte*, par H. Brugsch, Canon Chronol. des Rois d'Égypte de Ménès jusqu'à Nectanebos II.; *Königsbuch der Alten Aegypter*, von C. R. Lepsius, Synoptische Tafeln der Aegyptischen Dynastien.

whom no less than twelve of that name were recognized as legitimate Pharaohs—the first two belonging to Manetho's nineteenth Dynasty, while the twentieth Dynasty was occupied in uninterrupted succession by the remaining ten. Lenormant* states, on the authority of the illustrious French astronomer M. Biot, that the commencement of the reign of Rameses III. is fixed by astronomical science to B.C. 1311, which very well accords with the date we obtain from Manetho for the beginning of that Dynasty. Palmer has called attention in his "Egyptian Chronicles" to a very remarkable confirmation of this chronology, which deserves a few minutes' attentive consideration, for it throws light on another important synchronism between the histories of Israel and Egypt.

50. Between the time of Moses and the reign of David all intercourse, as far as we gather from Scripture, had ceased. Indeed, it is not until the time of David's grandson that we have signs of intercourse between the two countries. Hence Bunsen considers that the reign of Shishak I., the first king of the twenty-second Dynasty, offers the "first certain synchronistic point in Egyptian and Asiatic history," of which we have the following proof. Scripture declares that "in the fifth year of Rehoboam, Shishak, king of Egypt, came up against Jerusalem, and he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord and of the king's house, and all the shields of gold which Solomon had made" (1 Kings xiv. 25, 26). According to the Hebrew chronology, the fifth year of Rehoboam = B.C. 971; and as Shishak began to reign B.C. 980, the ninth year of his reign, when he marched against Jerusalem, synchronizes with the fifth of Rehoboam. It is well known that Champollion discovered on the outside of the great Temple of Karnac, at Thebes, a lengthy record of the conquests of Pharaoh Shishak. Amongst them we find certain names which are to be met with in Scripture; such, *e.g.*, as land of *Mahanaim*, mentioned in Genesis xxxii. 2; the two *Bethorons*, which Solomon fortified, according to 2 Chronicles viii. 5; *Megiddo*, spoken of in 2 Kings xxiii. 29; but the most interesting of all is undoubtedly that which is read *as the kingdom of Judah*, the conquest of which Shishak records exactly as related in Scripture.

* Speaking of an instance of the Vague year of 365 days agreeing with the Solar year of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, Lenormant says, "Les calculs de l'illustre Biot ont établi que cette coincidence rare et solennelle s'était produite en l'année 1300 av. J. C. Par conséquent nous pouvons insérer avec une certitude mathématique et absolue l'avènement de Rhamsès III. à l'an 1311."—*Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient*, vol. i. p. 300.

51. But it is not the historic fact, so much as the chronological synchronism which we need to prove, and this, as I have before remarked, has been very fully done by Palmer in his "Egyptian Chronicles." He calls attention to two Egyptian inscriptions, from which he draws the following conclusion. Pharaoh Shishak, before recording his conquests alluded to above, ordered the "chief architect of all Egypt for the time being to quarry stone for this purpose at Silsilis, and he recorded his sovereign's order by an inscription in the quarries, which, together with the work itself, was left imperfect at his death, but was completed by his son and successor. In this tablet, which is dated in the twenty-first year of the reign of King Shishak, the name of the chief architect to whom the order had been first given is recorded as *Hor-em-bes-ef*. Now, it is a well-known fact that in ancient Egypt it was customary for the son to inherit the employment or profession and even the dignities of the father, just as in England the office of High Constable was once hereditary in the family of de Bohun, or as that of Earl Marshal is held by the Dukes of Norfolk in the present day.

52. In another quarry on the Cosseir road, between Coptos and the Red Sea, there is another inscription dated the forty-fourth year of Amasis, who succeeded Pharaoh Hophra, and whose reign lasted until the year before the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses, which all chronologers are agreed in dating B.C. 525. In this inscription the chief architect of all Egypt of that time, by name *Aahmes-si-Nit*, has recorded on the rock the pedigree of his ancestors, who had each in turn been architects of all Egypt, going back to the twenty-fourth generation, *i.e.* twenty-three generations above his own. Now twenty-four generations calculated backwards at the ordinary rate of three to a century, would carry us up 800 years, from B.C. 525 to B.C. 1325, *i.e.* just before, as we have already seen, the reign of Rameses III. began. If, therefore, we reckon either down from that year B.C. 1325 or up from the year B.C. 525 at the afore-named rate of three generations to a century, we arrive at the years B.C. 992 to 959 for the eleventh name, which proves to be that of *Hor-em-bes-ef*, occurring just where it ought to do—*i.e.* during the period that we know from other sources Pharaoh Shishak was on the throne, and who had commanded his chief architect to record the order in the twenty-first year of his reign.

53. Palmer observes on this striking confirmation of the agreement between the chronologies of Israel and Egypt at this period of history:—" *Hor-em-bes-ef* is the chief architect of

Shishak I., named in the inscription of Silsilis as being already dead in the twenty-first and last year of that king. So *Hor-em-bes-ef* and Shishak I. may be regarded as contemporaries, representing one and the same generation from beginning to end; this generation beginning in B.C. 992, and ending in B.C. 957. And the reign of Shishak, which began according to the chronicle in B.C. 978—seemingly the later of two distinct accessions,*—ended after twenty-one years in B.C. 957; so that the chronological place and end of his reign, according to the chronicle, agrees perfectly with the place and end of his generation, according to the inscription at Hammamat. And his synchronism with Solomon and Rehoboam, according to the chronology of the Bible, is justified by both these Egyptian reckonings." †

54. These are the chief points which I have ventured to bring forward in proof of what may be fairly considered as synchronisms between the histories of Israel and Egypt, and in confirmation of what I believe to be the chronology of the Bible. I do not say the proof is perfect, nor do I doubt but that some may detect weak links in my chain of evidence, but I think the united testimony of so many synchronisms may be accepted as tending to confirm the truth and accuracy of what is commonly called the chronology of the Bible.

Far be it from me to attempt to dogmatize where the light is not so clear as we could desire, and where different conclusions are arrived at by those who are equally desirous of discovering the truth. Of this we have a remarkable instance in two deeply learned writers who have given much time and attention to that part of chronology where sacred and secular chronology are commonly said to meet, about the period of the Babylonish Captivity in the sixth century B.C. And, strange to say, the divergence between the two amounts to this: that whereas Mr. Bosanquet considers the common chronology of that period to be more than twenty years in error by *excess*, Mr. Parker, the Rector of Luffincott, considers it to be the same number of years in error by *defect*. Mr. Bosanquet holds that Darius the Mede, the son of Ahasuerus, mentioned by Daniel, is the same as Darius the Persian, the son of Hystaspes, described by the Greek historians, and that, consequently, the common chronology must be lowered, as I have already mentioned. ‡ Mr.

* Manetho, as interpreted by Brugsch, dates Shishak's twenty-one years' reign B.C. 980—959.

† *Egyptian Chronicles*, by William Palmer, M.A., pp. 592—596.

‡ Mr. Bosanquet's theory is to be found fully set forth in many letters

Parker, on the other hand, considers that between the time of Cyrus and the conquest of Persia by Alexander the Great, which all agree in dating B.C. 330, twenty years have, somehow or other, dropped out of sight and mind, and that, consequently, the common chronology ought to be raised by about that period. And this very divergence between two learned men, who have alike advocated their theories with great skill, will incline most people to be content with the canon of Ptolemy, which has the sanction of ages in its favour; besides being, as it is, the *juste milieu* between two extremes.

55. In confirmation of the truth of the common chronology at this period of history, I would adduce the testimony derived from a large number of clay seals discovered by Layard at Kouyunjik, the palace of Shalmanesar, near the ancient Nineveh, some of which are now in the British Museum. Amongst them are two hieroglyphic impressions, with the name of *Shabaka* in the usual cartouche, the second king of the twenty-fifth Dynasty, who reigned, according to Egyptian chronology, B.C. 733—721, and termed by Manetho Σίβιχως. The Hebrew of 2 Kings xvii. 4, which records the application of Hoshea, who reigned B.C. 730—721, to "So, King of Egypt," for aid against the King of Assyria, spells the name either as *Soa* or *Seva*, dependent upon the position of the vowel points; and the LXX. write it Σηγῶρ or Σῶα. This seal, therefore, assumes an important character, by showing the synchronism of the three monarchs of Assyria, Egypt, and Israel; and refutes, as I think, the proposal of lowering the chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah by twenty-five years, the effect of which would be to deny the contemporaneity of "So, King of Egypt," and Hoshea, which Scripture and the Nineveh seal alike combine to prove.*

56. This chronology may be further confirmed by the tablets in the British Museum, containing what is called "the Assyrian Canon," or the list of the Annual High Priests of Nineveh, extending from B.C. 938—648, with an interval of forty-eight years, representing, it is supposed, a period of confusion. Although it would trespass too much on our time to show how far the Assyrian Canon accords with the chronology of Scripture, I

to the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, about fifteen years ago; and also in his valuable work entitled *Messiah the Prince, &c., A Compendium of Sacred and Secular Chronology*. The Rector of Luffincott's theory is no less ably advocated in various works, such as *The Archons of Athens, The Parian Chronicle, A Light thrown upon Thucydides*, and especially in his volume exclusively devoted to the subject of *Chronology* in general, and his own special branch of it in particular.

* See Dr. Birch's note in Layard's *Babylon and Nineveh*, pp. 157—159.

would briefly notice three eclipses which seem to confirm the same. The time of Sennacherib's reign—the contemporary of Hezekiah, B.C. 726—698—has been confirmed by the record of an eclipse in an inscription at Nineveh, which says, respecting the commencement of his reign: "In the month *Tisri* (answering to our September) the moon was eclipsed, and the moon emerged from the shadow *while the sun was rising*." On referring to the celebrated French work, "L'Art de Vérifier les Dates," I find there was a *total* eclipse of the moon September 12th, B.C. 721, at six A.M. mean time for Nineveh; and inasmuch as this eclipse fulfils all the conditions required by the inscription, we can scarcely doubt but that it refers to the one which was visible at Nineveh in the commencement of Sennacherib's reign; and which agrees with the chronology of Scripture in making him thereby the contemporary of Hezekiah.

57. Again in the year answering to B.C. 809, when *Pur-el-salke*, according to the Assyrian Canon, was high priest of Nineveh, mention is made of "the sun having been eclipsed in the month of *Sivain* (June)" of that year, which is confirmed by the Astronomical tables which mark a solar eclipse as having been visible at Nineveh on the day which answers to our June 13th, B.C. 809.

58. The third eclipse mentioned in the Canon is that which occurred in the year of *Assur-nasir-habil's* accession, B.C. 930; and accords with the Astronomical tables, which give a solar eclipse, visible at Nineveh, on June 2nd of that year. And a mention is also made in that year of the death of Ahab, King of Israel, which took place, according to the Hebrew chronology, B.C. 900, during the high priesthood of *Dayan-Assur*, the thirtieth in succession from *Assur-nasir-habil*, his year of office must have answered to B.C. 900; in which we have a striking confirmation of the chronology which places the building of Solomon's Temple B.C. 1014, and the death of Ahab, which is dependent on that date, B.C. 900; instead of *lowering* it, as some have proposed to do, by a period of twenty-five years, the effect of which would be to date Ahab's twenty-two years' reign, B.C. 887—765, and to deny his being contemporary with *Dayan-Assur*, the High Priest of Nineveh, according to the Assyrian Canon, as explained by the solar eclipse of B.C. 930.*

59. Both Mr. Bosanquet and Mr. Parker, however, rest their conclusions respecting chronology upon what they consider to be its perfect agreement with that deducible from Scripture.

* For a full account of the Assyrian Canon, see M. Oppert's papers in the *Revue Archéologique* for 1868, pp. 308 et seq.

Eminent German scholars, who have given much attention to this subject, appear to have dismissed Scripture chronology altogether from their calculations. We have a notable instance of this in what is commonly termed "the sojourn in Egypt." I have already shown from both the Old and New Testament, and confirmed its accuracy, as far as may be, by Egyptian evidence, that from the call of Abraham to the Exode was exactly 430 years, of which number the Israelites sojourned in Egypt for half that period, or 215 years. Now, of three learned Germans, two of whom rank amongst the most eminent Egyptologists in the world, Lepsius states that "only ninety years intervened from the entrance of Jacob to the Exodus of Moses." Brugsch affirms that the Israelites were in Egypt the whole of the 430 years. Bunsen writes in one place that "the duration of the sojourn in Egypt was 1434 years"; while in another part of the same work he limits the time to 862 years. Such are the differences amongst eminent scholars on the subject of chronology, who refuse to Scripture that authority which is so justly its due.*

60. Permit me to conclude, while conscious of having done but scant justice to the important subject of the "Harmony between the Chronology of Egypt and the Bible," and fearful of having wearied you by the length into which I have been unintentionally led, in the words of an ancient author:—

"Here will I make an end; and if I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired; but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto."†

The CHAIRMAN proposed a vote of thanks to the Rev. B. W. Savile for his paper, and then, under the pressure of Parliamentary engagements, vacated the chair, which was taken by

Mr. J. E. HOWARD, F.R.S.—I think we must all feel much indebted to Mr. Savile for his elaborate paper. With reference to the sixty-nine hebdomads of Daniel, I believe the statements in the paper will be found very interesting when they are studied; but the way in which Mr. Savile has brought out that point cannot, I fear, at present, be done full justice to.

* Lepsius's *Letters from Egypt*, p. 475. *Histoire d'Égypte*, par H. Brugsch, p. 80. Bunsen, *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, iii. 357; and v. 77. Until German Egyptologists present the world with results somewhat more harmonious, we need not feel disquieted by the ridicule which Bunsen endeavours to excite against believers in the chronology of the Bible, when he says, "*einige weise Männer und Knaben England's schlau andeuten.*"

† 2 Maccabees xv. 37, 38.

I rather wish that he had referred to the two years which are in question with regard to the beginning of the Olympiads ; but a paper on that subject lately read before the Society of Biblical Archæology may be referred to with advantage by those curious upon the subject. I think that Mr. Savile has shown in some parts of his paper the very great accuracy of the Scriptures ; but in reference to that part of it which deals with the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, I would submit this consideration to the author,—whether the length of the period of the sojourn is not the cause of the great difficulty which we find in ascertaining the era of the Exodus. We are able, through the mists of antiquity, to trace some points somewhat distinctly. The date of the erection of the Great Pyramid is believed by some to have been fixed astronomically ; and there is a fair amount of agreement as to the time when Abraham was in Egypt, and as to the era of the expulsion of the Hyksos ; but, with reference to the question of the date of the Exode, we can only say, *Adhuc sub judice lis est*. The duration of the sojourn of Israel in Egypt is stated in Scripture very distinctly to be 430 years. In the 15th of Exodus the prophecy was, that the nation to whom they should be in bondage should afflict them evil for 400 years, and in Exodus we are told that the period of their sojourning in Egypt was 430 years. I cannot help thinking, though I know the difficulties in the way, that the Israelites were really 430 years in Egypt, and more or less under the oppression of the Egyptian policy for 400 years of that time. There is one chronology of the descendants of Ephraim in 1 Chron., chap. vii., which gives eighteen generations. This relates to no less important a point than the descent of the Leader of the host of Israel, and is as follows (see Osburn's "Monumental History of Egypt," ii. 630) :—The sons of

1. Ephraim.	10. Beriah.
2. Shuthelah (his firstborn, Numb. xxvi. 35).	11. Rephah.
3. Bered.	12. Resheph.
4. Tahath.	13. Thelah.
5. Eladah.	14. Tahan.
6. Tahath II.*	15. Laadan.
7. Zabad.	16. Ammihud.
8. Shuthelah II.	17. Elishama.
9. Ezer—Eliad.	18. Non.
	19. Joshua.

* It was an Egyptian custom to name the firstborn after his grandfather.
—(J. E. Howard.)

Thus giving a series which would coincide with the 430 years period. Again, after the expulsion of the Hyksos we have, according to Manetho, the whole of the eighteenth Dynasty, which comprehends at least sixteen monarchs, to place in that interval ; which, if it is so very much abbreviated, as is commonly done, does not appear to allow space for the Israelites amounting to such a multitude. I believe that the period has been too much abridged, and that the longer period is none too long to allow for the increase.*

Mr. J. ALLEN.—I should like to ask a question. Mr. Savile has spoken of some ages, and he has assigned thirty-eight years as the probable length of a generation. Is there any special reason for assigning such a length of time ; further than that, when it is multiplied by the number of generations, you obtain the period required ?

Mr. W. M. WALTERS.—The author of the paper has stated that, according to some Chinese historians, a conjunction of planets took place in the year 2440 B.C., which was the year of the Deluge. Now, if we go to Chinese history for a point of this kind, how far does it go to show that the Deluge was not universal ? If we admit history to show that a conjunction took place then, it seems evidence to prove that the Deluge was not universal, and therefore, in seeming to support the chronology of the Bible in one point, we appear not to do so in regard to the universality of the Deluge. Then as to Pharaoh Cecrops going into Greece, is not that against the Biblical narrative, which speaks of Pharaoh as being overwhelmed in the Red Sea ?

Mr. S. M. DRACH.—I believe, with regard to the Creation, that its duration originated from that verse in the Psalms which says, a thousand years are as a day ; and in the same manner, having set forth six days for the Creation, it was easy to say that it took 6,000 years. As to the duration of the captivity of the Israelites in Egypt, it is stated with great emphasis in Exodus, as having lasted 430 years, because, on the self-same day, “at the end of the 430 years, the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt.” The date of the building of Solomon’s Temple has been the subject of a great deal of discussion, Mr. Bosanquet believing that a period of 490 years exactly intervenes : thus the idea being that there was a special interval between the salient points of Biblical history,—between the Exodus and the building of Solomon’s Temple, and between the building and the destruction of that temple.

A MEMBER.—There is another matter to which I should like to draw attention for a moment. I have often been struck, when looking at the Egyptian monuments in the British Museum, with the thick lips and peculiar cast of countenance given by them to the Egyptians,—characteristics which it seems difficult to reconcile with the fact, that the date at which these monuments came into existence has to be carried back for many centuries before Christ. If we take the account in the Bible to be correct, and believe that all

* This subject has been taken up before. See Vol. V. p. 349, *et seq.*

the human race sprang originally from two persons, there seems to be a great difficulty in reconciling this idea with the features which we see in the large marble busts of Thothmes and others, because it must have required a very great number of years to have produced such a diversity of features from the time of Adam ; it must have required a much longer period than we suppose to have elapsed.* The question which I wish to ask is one that is founded on this point. It struck me, on looking at the photograph which has been produced from the Ashmolean collection, that it corroborated what I have myself noticed,—namely, that the character of face, the thick lips and the peculiar features of Egyptian statuary, did not belong altogether to the earlier specimens. I would ask Mr. Savile whether his attention has been at all directed to this point ; because, if it be true that the earlier specimens do not bear that marked development, it is rather an answer to that difficulty, in the way of ignorant persons, of accounting for such a very marked character at that time.

The CHAIRMAN (pointing to one of the drawings exhibited by Mr. Savile) : You should notice the features of this Pharaoh, supposed to be the patron of Joseph. He is one of the Hyksos or Shepherd kings, who were the descendants of Shem. The eighteenth Dynasty were descended from Ham, which makes a great difference.

Mr. SAVILE.—In replying upon this discussion, I must ask leave to make my answer as brief as possible. I have been obliged to curtail the paper in consequence of the limit of time at my disposal, but many of the subjects which have been mentioned by speakers are touched upon in the paper, and when it is printed you will be able to consider more in detail my reasons for arriving at such conclusions. As to the date of the erection of the Great Pyramid, which has been alluded to, I am sorry to say that Egyptologists differ about it to the extent of no less than 4,000 years ; *e.g.*, a French author, Le Suer, dates it at 4,975, and the late Sir George Cornewall Lewis, assuming the strange chronology of Herodotus to be correct, dates the erection of the Great Pyramid as B.C. 903, or a century later than that of Solomon's Temple ! The idea for estimating the approximate date which I have selected, *viz.* B.C. 2170, originated with Col. Howard Vyse, who lived at the Pyramids fifty years ago, and induced the late Sir John Herschel to work out an astronomical theory from it. He first of all assumed, that an observer standing in the passage of the Pyramid leading to the King's chamber, at the time

* Dr. Kitchen Parker, F.R.S., has called my attention to the distinct race the Americans are becoming, and how a short time has produced a considerable change ; he adds : "The Yankee is a good sub-species already, and a very fine type he is." Principal Dawson, F.R.S., in his address as President of the Montreal Natural History Society (May, 1874), says, in regard to changes culminating rapidly, and then becoming stationary, each "specific type has capacities for the production of varietal and race forms which are usually exercised to the utmost in the early stages of its existence ; and then remain fixed, or disappear and reappear, as circumstances may arise. Finally, the races fall off one by one, as it approaches extinction."—Ed.

the Pyramid was built, and looking out to the north aspect, would see the polar star of the period. This theory has been elaborately calculated by Professor Piazzi Smyth, the Astronomer Royal of Scotland, who has discovered that there is only one period in 10,000 years which would answer all the conditions of the problem, and which accords with the date B.C. 2170 ; and it is satisfactory to know that other things, particularly the duration of the Pharaohs, as shown by the recently discovered tablet of Abydos, tend to confirm that view. Then, with regard to the date of the Exode, two speakers have touched upon that question, which has been much controverted by many Scriptural commentators, as to the meaning of that famous text in Exodus, giving the date of the sojourn in Egypt. I have quoted in my paper the learned Dr. Kennicott, who published the best text of the Hebrew Bible in the last century, and who was firmly convinced that the true reading of that text is not confined to a "sojourning" in Egypt exclusively, as our Chairman considers, of 430 years, but to a sojourning in Canaan as well as in Egypt. That is in the text.

THE CHAIRMAN.—Not in the Hebrew.

MR. SAVILE.—Yes ; Kennicott gives it in the Samaritan Pentateuch. The question is as to the authenticity of the Samaritan Pentateuch. I only quote his evidence on the point, but cannot go into it. I would ask your attention to section 29 of my paper :—

The testimony of the early Christian writers is to the same effect. Eusebius distinctly says, that it is "by the unanimous consent of all interpreters" that the text should be so understood. Augustine, in his 47th question on the book of Exodus, as well as in his work *On the City of God*, taught that the 430 years included the sojourn in Canaan as well as in Egypt. And the historian Sulpicius Severus says, "from the entrance of Abraham into Canaan until the Exode were 430 years." These Christian interpreters of the Old Testament doubtless understood an argument which some in the present day have strangely overlooked, that if the 430 years is to be counted only from the time of Jacob's descent into Egypt until the Exode, *the mother of Moses would have borne him 262 years after her father's death*, according to the Biblical computation, which all admit is a physical impossibility. On which Clinton has justly observed :—"Some writers have very unreasonably doubted that portion of the Hebrew chronology, as if it were uncertain how this period of 430 years was to be understood. Those who cast a doubt upon this point refuse to Moses, an inspired writer—in the account of his mother, and father, and grandfather,—that authority which would be given to the testimony of a profane author on the same occasion."

To me, this seems to be a conclusive argument in favour of the view that the sojourning "in Egypt" only lasted for half the period of 430 years. Then Mr. Allen put a question which I expected would be asked ; namely, —how it was that I reckoned the length of a generation at thirty-eight years ? We have a monument belonging to the age of Nebuchadnezzar, referring to the confusion of tongues and the building of the Tower of Babel, as having occurred forty-two ages or generations before his time. Herodotus gives three generations to a century, making each between

thirty-three and thirty-four years. I have assumed thirty-eight years as the duration of each generation, and we have ample evidence that occasionally this duration is exceeded. Three generations of thirty-eight years each would include an interval of 114 years—a duration not uncommon in our own days. I may be entirely wrong in my assumption, and only venture to give it for what it is worth; but, after all, there is not such a very great difference between the thirty-four years of Herodotus and the assumption of thirty-eight years, from the Cuneiform monument, as the possible duration of an age or generation, according to the estimate of the ancient Chaldeans. As to the Chinese date of the Deluge, I remember that in Chambers's Astronomy, a writer brings the argument or inference forward in the same way. All we can say is that the Chinese had a tradition, that in a year which answers to our B.C. 2440, there was a conjunction which may have accorded with the date of the Deluge. If you look into Chinese annals you will not find any authentic Chinese history previous to the year 2300. Confucius, who lived B.C. 500, and who was to the Chinese what Moses was to the Jews, seems to admit that there is no earlier evidence of real history than that. Now 2300 B.C. would answer to the time when we believe the scattering of the nations occurred, and they quickly spread over Asia, about a century after the Noachian Flood. All authentic history, whether Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, or Chinese, does not extend to an earlier date than 2300 B.C. All beyond that date is fabulous, legendary, and untrue. This fact is a remarkable confirmation of Biblical chronology. Further, there is a very singular confirmation of Biblical chronology, which I have already adduced in a paper that I had the honour of reading at this Institute three years ago, which relates to the seven years' famine in Egypt in the time of Joseph. It is expressly stated to have extended to "all lands," and to have lasted "*seven years.*" Now it is a proved fact that the Chinese annals do record a dearth lasting "*seven years,*" during which it is said that no rain fell, and these seven years do agree with the seven years of Biblical chronology as set forth in the Hebrew Scriptures. Then, as to the date of the Exode and Cecrops. I have adduced the testimony of a Greek inscription on a monument, now at Oxford, and known as the Parian Chronicle or Arundellian Marble, to show that at the period when the exodus of the Israelites took place, the Greeks had a tradition that their country was first colonized by emigrants from Egypt, and that Cecrops is mentioned as having fled from that country at that very period. It is not impossible, therefore, that this tradition, which was current in Egypt about twelve centuries (the date of the Parian marble) after its occurrence, may refer to the same thing. It is necessary to point out that the photograph of an Egyptian monument now in the Ashmolean Museum, which I produced at the meeting, affords very different evidence from that other monument at Oxford referred to as the Parian marble. In point of time, there were more than 2,000 years between the two; and the former inscription was adduced only on account of its very high antiquity. It belongs to a period

before the name of "Pharaoh" was known, to a king of the second Dynasty, and is undoubtedly the oldest authentic *proof* of man on earth which has yet been discovered, notwithstanding what sceptics may say to the contrary. With reference to the testimony of Barnabas and the 6,000 years, what I meant to say was, that from the time of Adam the age of mankind is supposed to have lasted about that period. With regard to Mr. Bosanquet, I have corresponded with him and studied his works very closely. He is a valuable writer, and a very learned man. I know his work on the Messiah ; but cannot assent to his interpretation of the important question about the 490 years, and my chronology conflicts with his, especially on those two most important dates, viz. the birth and death of Christ. I have looked at his arguments from every point of view, and am obliged to own that I think the weight of evidence is against him. Nevertheless, his object is the same as mine,—a desire to ascertain the truth and accuracy of what is Scripture chronology. As to the important point, that it was a comparative afterthought of the Jews to overthrow the tremendous weight of testimony as to the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy respecting the death of our blessed Lord, they have skilfully endeavoured to alter the chronology in order to prove the falsehood of our Scriptures ; but I believe secular chronology is so clearly on our side that the Rabbinical chronology may be left to itself. With regard to another question respecting what may be termed the argument from "race," a gentleman has referred to the cast of countenance of Thothmes III. We all know that cast of countenance. We have an original bust of him in the British Museum, and, as it was carved when he was reigning, we may suppose that it is a true and accurate representation of that king. But I cannot quite agree with the member who has spoken as to the lesson we may derive from it. Thothmes III. had an elder half-sister, and that sister, I believe, was the veritable "Pharaoh's daughter" who preserved Moses, and who was the only instance of a queen regnant that we meet with in history during the long course of the Egyptian Pharaohs. She erected many magnificent buildings, and amongst them a beautiful obelisk, still standing amid the ruins of Thebes, on which is still to be seen the well-known term of "Pharaoh's daughter." She is known to have occupied the throne for nearly twenty years previous to the accession of Thothmes III., her younger half-brother. There is a fair inference that she offered the throne to her adopted child, Moses ; the Scriptures do not state it, but we infer that he who rejected all the treasures of Egypt, "and refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter," did refuse the throne which his adopted mother, as Queen Regnant, alone had the power to offer. Rossellini, in his great work, has given a very accurate representation of this sister of Thothmes III., who is known by the name of Queen Hatasu ; but what is her countenance ? One in which there is the most beautiful intermingling of the Grecian and Roman features that I ever saw ! How do you account for that, if her half-brother in blood had the countenance of a negro ? I have a representation here of Pharaoh

Apophis, concerning whom all the authorities agree that he was the patron of Joseph, and I believe there is abundant proof of that. Here is the countenance of a Shepherd king, who was of the race of Shem, with the thick lips of a negro, as clearly developed as in the bust of Thothmes III., who was of the race of Ham. I have here also a representation of Queen Hatasu, whose nose is strictly aquiline, so that the argument which has been offered to us on the cast of features seems to fall to the ground. There is only one more point to be noticed. The Chairman considers that, as "in Ephraim we have eighteen generations between Ephraim and Joshua," it is fatal to my contention that the duration of the sojourn *in Egypt* was confined to 215 years. I have carefully studied the passage in 1 Chron. vii., where Ephraim's genealogy is given, and am constrained to the opinion that the true reading of that passage must confine the number of descents to eight in place of eighteen. Osburn, in his "Monumental History of Egypt," has adopted the larger number, and speaks of "this invaluable genealogy as settling the question of the duration of the sojourn." But how does he manage this? Simply by interpreting Ephraim, in v. 20, to mean *an individual*, and the same name, in v. 22, to mean *the whole tribe!* Moreover, in place of Ephraim being the father of Beriah, as is plainly declared in v. 23, he interprets the text of Ezer, *i.e.* one of his own grandchildren. To my mind, such a mode of interpretation must be fatal to all reasonable understanding of Scripture. I would therefore reply, with all respect to the Chairman, that the argument I have used in my paper in support of the shorter duration of the sojourn in Egypt, viz, that if it were otherwise, "Moses's mother must have given birth to her son 262 years after her father's death," seems to be conclusive that the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt was only a moiety of the 430 years, and must again refer to Dr. Kennicott's able dissertation on this subject.

The Meeting was then adjourned.

REMARKS BY S. BIRCH, ESQ., LL.D.,

President of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.

BRITISH MUSEUM, 14th May, 1875.

Although chronology, owing to its uncertainty, has never occupied much of my attention, at your request I put down a few notes on Mr. Savile's very exhaustive paper. It goes over a deal of disputed ground, such as the date of the Nativity and Crucifixion, the general tendency of chronologists being to elevate the Nativity to B.C. 6. There is some proof that Xerxes and Artaxerxes may have reigned conjointly, as stated in § 18-19. There is, however, some difficulty about Xerxes, the Egyptian inscription mentioning him as at one time expelled, and that the true ruler of Egypt was Kabash, who reigned at least two years. As to the period of the visit of Abraham to Egypt, the dynasty at the time must be considered conjectural; but the date of the Exodus is generally placed after the reign of Menephah, of the XIXth, and not Amosis I., of the XVIIIth, dynasty; the reason, of course, being, that the name Raamses applied to the land given to Jacob, and the treasure city, must be that of a king of the XIXth dynasty. On the hypothesis that the text handed down of the Books of Moses has retained the names of these places as they were called in the days of Moses, there is this one point to determine the period of the Exodus. Take that away, and assume that the version is as late as the kings, and that the name of the fort and land was known as Raamses at the regal period, all synchronism is conjectural and external. If the Hebrews went in and out with the Shepherds, it is remarkable to find the expulsion of the Shepherds not alluded to in the Scriptures; but the version implies a new dynasty, though not necessarily an internal revolution. In § 31, *Nu* is the name of the "celestial water" or ether; but it is difficult to interpret the myth of Osiris in the manner there stated. In § 32, Oppert's translation is not now recognized. The passage referred to the destruction of a temple by time and rain, and the subsequent rebuilding by Nebuchadnezzar. The part about the confusion of tongues was erroneously translated, and had no such meaning. The chronology of the intermediate periods, 6-12, dynasty 12-18, is uncertain, and its length monumentally unknown (§ 40). The Festival of the First year, considered as a cycle, is an error. It occurs only at the time of Cheops, and the hieroglyphics have other meanings than the first month of the first year of a cycle. The age from king Nubti or Sutech to Rameses II.,

of 400 years, cannot be quite defined, for the reasons given by Mariette Bey.* The assignment of the Exodus to the reign of Thothmes II. is from computation and Josephus's account. Thothmes III. is impossible; Thothmes II. doubtful, and nothing is known of his reign; but Thothmes III. fought the battle of Megiddo with the Khita, and it is difficult to reconcile Egypt marching through Palestine to Mesopotamia, and yet so weak as to let the Hebrews settle in Canaan or Mount Sinai, where both monarchs held garrisons. It is quite right to quote, as in § 51, the genealogy of families in support of chronological hypothesis, but it is always necessary to be quite sure that the persons at the head of the list are identical with those otherwise found, as upon that the whole argument rests; and this fixed point is very often uncertain, owing to many persons about the same period, and even later, bearing the same name. The tendency of the family genealogies is to reduce the chronology.

Yours truly,

S. BIRCH,

CAPTAIN F. PETRIE.

Mr. W. R. COOPER, Secretary to the Society of Biblical Archæology, says:—"In regard to Mr. Savile's paper, I cannot consider some of the authors quoted quite trustworthy, notably the 'Acta Pilati,' Abgarus of Edessa (Cowper, the *Apoc. N. T.*), Usher, and Bunsen; many did not write from their own knowledge of the circumstances they recorded; I may add that the lists of Manetho are still too confused to settle any point definitely, and there are no certain Egyptian dates prior to Tirhakah, the star risings and astronomical observations being very carelessly recorded. (See Renouf, 'Calendar of Astronomical Observations in the XXth Dynasty,' in *Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch.*, vol. iii. p. 1.)"

Mr. SAVILE sends the following reply upon Dr. Birch's remarks:—I entertain so sincere a respect for any opinion expressed by my valued friend Dr. Birch, especially on the subject of Egyptology, that it is with diffidence I venture to reply to the brief remarks he has made upon my paper. The "twelve years" on the Egyptian monument, as the true length of Xerxes' sole reign, appears to me the only way of harmonizing the fact which Thucydides—an almost contemporary witness—records of his son, Artaxerxes, being on the throne when Themistocles fled

* See the whole inscription in *Records of the Past*, vol. iv.

from Greece to Persia; which event occurred (according to Eusebius's *Chronicle*) B.C. 473, — *i.e.* eight or nine years previous to the death of Xerxes, according to the Ptolemaic Canon.

I quite agree with Dr. Birch that the ruling dynasty at the time of Abraham's visit to Egypt must be "conjectural"; but cannot think it is so with regard to the time of the Exode; and I venture to refer him to Canon Cook's able dissertation on that subject in the first volume of the *Speaker's Commentary*; altogether I think the weight of evidence points to Thothmes IV. as the Pharaoh of the Exode, rather than to either of his two predecessors of the same name, to whom Dr. Birch alone alludes. As regards the name of "Raamses" being a guide to the time of the Exode, Dr. Birch has omitted to notice that this name is to be found amongst the royal family of the 18th Dynasty, as well as in the line of kings belonging to the 19th and 20th dynasties.

The mention of *Nu* or *Noah* as the "celestial water," § 31, must stand on its own merits; and I think we are warranted in supposing that the tradition respecting Osiris, recorded by Plutarch, may possibly have arisen from his knowledge of the Biblical statement concerning the Noachian Flood. I was not aware of M. Oppert's reading of the Cuneiform monument respecting the Tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues having been subsequently "recognized to be erroneous"; but if it be so, we may console ourselves with the fact that Mr. George Smith, the well-known discoverer of the Cuneiform record of the Flood, has also confirmed, from another monument, the Chaldean version of Babel as related in Scripture. I did not know that Mariette Bey had subsequently thrown doubts upon his own discovery of the tablet recording the Nubti era, as Dr. Birch says; which of course relates to the genuineness of the tablet in question, as there can be no doubt of the correct reading of "400 years," as given in all the copies of that monument. Palmer's application of the genealogical hypothesis, in order to show the harmony between the chronologies of Israel and Egypt, appears to be as perfect as anything of that nature can well be; and if such a fair system of induction be disregarded, it will be quite useless for any one ever to attempt to bring forward proofs of a similar nature.

In reply to Mr. Cooper's remarks, I would observe that the value of the quotations from the "Acta Pilati," and from the letters of "Abgarus of Edessa," must depend upon the credit which we may give to the testimony of Justin Martyr and Tertullian respecting the first, and that of Eusebius in reference to the last. Justin Martyr and Tertullian alike, speak of the "Acta Pilati" as if they were in existence in their own day, as they appeal to them in proof of their assertion concerning the founder of the Christian religion, and of his having been put to death in the reign of Tiberius. And as regards the interval of time between them and the events which they record, it may be compared to that of any historian in the present day describing an Act of Parliament passed in

the reign of George I. Eusebius states respecting Abgarus, king of Edessa, what he had found in the archives of the city and had faithfully copied, observing at the same time : "There is nothing like hearing the epistles themselves, *taken by us from the archives*, and the style of it, as it has been literally translated by us from the Syriac language." (*Ecl. Hist.*, i. c. xiii.) This may be compared to Froude the historian copying the Simanca MSS. relative to affairs which happened in this country at the time of the Reformation ; and no doubt has been thrown upon the admissibility of such evidence.

To the foregoing Dr. BIRCH replies :—It is with great reluctance that I take up my pen to offer a few additional remarks to those already given on the paper of my excellent friend Mr. Savile ; but as there has been some misconception about one or two expressions I have used, it is desirable, for various reasons, that an explanation of what they meant should be given. Mariette-Bey has never to my knowledge doubted the authenticity of the tablet of the 400 years ; but I have, and up to the present moment my suspicions are not allayed. The question with Mariette-Bey was, how it was to be computed who was the Shepherd king intended, and what was the year of Rameses II. from which it was reckoned : without these data determined little light is thrown on the chronology by it. For example — if the Shepherd Saites, or Salatis, as the lists give the name, is intended by Set-Nubti, then the 400 years are from the commencement of the Shepherd Dynasty ; if Nubti means the An-nub of the Turin Papyrus, the 400 years commence with Bnon, Bænon, or Beon. The question of Raamses has been so exhaustively treated by Egyptologists—especially Chabas, *Mélanges*, 1864, p. 108—that it is scarcely necessary to refer to it. The name of the prince in the grave of Der-el-Medinet, now in Berlin (Lepsius, *Königsb.*, Tav. xxi. No. 320), is the one straw by which it is attempted to connect the name of Raamses with the 18th Dynasty ; but the following reasons are urged against it ;—that it is not certain that this name is not that of Ramses I. before his accession to the throne ; that the name of the prince is written with one *s*, whereas that of Raamses or Ramessé is written with two, or a double *s*,—exactly as the names Rameses or Ramses of the kings of the 19th Dynasty ; that there is no known Egyptian instance of forts or cities being named after any person of lower rank than the sovereign, and that, with all his titles, the prince Rameses seems only an associated son or adopted successor of some unknown king ; that there are several examples in the Egyptian texts of cities, forts, and other places named after the monarchs called Rameses or Ramessu, of the 19th Dynasty. As yet the probability tends to the Exodus being at the time of the 19th Dynasty, supposing the text of Exodus to be contemporaneous with it.