

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 *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

the *outward thing signifying*.¹ The *true* worshippers (*ἀληθινὸι προσκυνηταὶ*) are those whose worship has not to do with carnal ordinances, which served for a time for an example and shadow of things heavenly and spiritual, but with the *reality* of which legal types were mere outward signs. The types, the shadows pass away. And the worshippers whose worship of old consisted in sacrifices and ceremonies at Gerizim or Jerusalem² are to pass away too, or to be transformed into those whose worship shall be inward and spiritual, who shall worship in spirit and in truth—in the *truth* foreshadowed by legal ordinances. And these will be the worshippers such as God, who is a Spirit, is seeking. These shall not have to go up to Jerusalem to worship: for these shall be the *true* worshippers, worshippers not in symbols belonging to a local sanctuary, but in the *truth* which belongs to the Jerusalem which is above, which is free, and the mother of all.

N. DIMOCK.

ART. III.—MOSES AND THE PHARAOHS.

PART I.

RECENT discoveries in Egypt have done much to increase our knowledge of the ancient country of the Nile, its people and their rulers, in those long bygone days before even the first books of our Bible were penned. In particular they have *settled*, we make bold to say, which of the Pharaohs it was who so severely and for so long oppressed the Children of Israel in Egypt, and also who the other Pharaoh was in whose

¹ So Origen: 'Αληθινός, πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν σκιάς καὶ τύπου καὶ εἰκόνας ("In Joan," tom. ii., § 4). See especially Trench, "Synonyms of New Testament," pp. 26, 27. See also Godet, "Commentary on St. John," vol. ii., pp. 116, 117, E. T.

² See the excellent commentary of Chrysostom, "In Joan," Hom. XXXIII., Op., tom. viii., pp. 191, 192; edit. Montfaucon, Paris, 1728.

Cajetan well says: "Ecce exclusio cultus in templo. Et per hæc duo exclusa loca. intelliguntur exclusa omnia alia loca. . . . In *spiritu*, non in monte, non in Hierosolymis, non in loco aliquo, non cultu temporali, non lingua, sed interiore cultu consistente in spiritu" ("Evang. Com.," f. 153, edit. 1530).

There is nothing, of course, in our Lord's words condemnatory of suitable external signs of devotion. And none will contend that outward forms, such as bowing the knees and lifting up holy hands, may not be aids conducive to spiritual worship. But the truth remains that *the* worship of the New Covenant is, by our Lord's teaching, not outward, but inward. The presenting our *bodies* as a living sacrifice (our *λογικὴ λατρεία*) is an inward and spiritual act.

reign they made their great Exodus and started for the Promised Land.

A clear and succinct statement of the results of these discoveries seems very desirable. It may be remembered that some remarks made by a speaker at the International Congress of Orientalists held in London, in September, 1892, led to quite a considerable correspondence in the *Times* and elsewhere, as to which of the Pharaohs it was whom the Bible describes as the "King which knew not Joseph," and which of them it was who was the Pharaoh of the Exodus—some correspondents claiming the Pharaohs of one Dynasty, other correspondents claiming different Pharaohs of the same or different Dynasties. And one still hears contradictory voices not unfrequently; so little known and understood seem to be the more recent discoveries and conclusions of the science of Ancient Egyptian things.

Moreover, in these days when, alas! the authority of Moses is so grievously assailed, and when the authenticity of the books which are attributed to him in the New Testament, and which have been so attributed by the Jewish Church and by all Christendom (except a few moderns), is distinctly denied by some and "idealized" by other writers, we believe that a fresh statement of the facts and discoveries of Egyptology to which we have referred, and which in a remarkable manner illustrate and confirm the truth of one section of the history of the Book of Exodus, will be read with interest by the readers of THE CHURCHMAN.

I. Our first and most important point is to determine THE PHARAOH "WHICH KNEW NOT JOSEPH."

These words, which are used both in the first chapter of the Book of Exodus, and also in the dying *apologia* of St. Stephen, might truly describe the Pharaoh of the Exodus, as well as one, or probably more than one, of his predecessors; but it is better to take them as describing in particular one king who, *par excellence*, by long and severe oppression, made the lot of the chosen race so utterly miserable and intolerable in the land that had once welcomed them, that they were thankful indeed to escape from it.

"There arose up a new king which knew not Joseph," says the narrative, and then follows the reason assigned for his not looking with favour upon the posterity of Joseph's family: "And he" (*i.e.*, the Pharaoh) "said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel are more and mightier than we. Come on, let us deal wisely with them, lest they multiply, and it come to pass that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies and fight against us, and so get them up out of the land" (Exod. i. 8-10).

The effect of this somewhat hyperbolic description, and appeal at once to the fears and covetousness of the Egyptians, was such as the royal speaker intended, and is told us in the next verse: "Therefore they [the Egyptians] did set over them [the Hebrews] taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities—Pithom and Raamses."

As the word "Pharaoh" here used is not a proper name, but the title of royalty in Egypt, from the earliest Dynasties to the Ptolemaic, it gives us no clue to the particular holder of the title of whom we are in quest; that is to say, of the Pharaoh under whose reign Moses was born and lived unto manhood, when—St. Stephen mentions that "he was full forty years old"—he visited his countrymen, beheld their bondage, and, his indignation thereat being kindled, he was guilty of an act of homicide. However, for that deed, we are told, Pharaoh "*sought* to slay" him. The word "*sought*" denotes that something hindered him from accomplishing his purpose, and Moses' high, adopted sonship (of Pharaoh's daughter) was at least one difficulty in the way of his doing so. Moses succeeded in escaping to the land of Midian, where he remained during the lifetime of the Pharaoh who had sought his life.

"And it came to pass, in process of time, that the king of Egypt died"; then the Lord began to look favourably upon his people, and to call Moses back to their deliverance.

"In process of time," more literally, "in those many days," is a phrase signifying that the Pharaoh died after a very long reign. Moreover, during all his reign, his despotic oppression of the chosen people was not lightened, for the verse continues, "and the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried, and their cry came up unto God by reason of the bondage. And God heard their groaning."

After some hesitation and delay, lasting we know not how long, but probably for some years, Moses obeyed the call and returned to Egypt. He was four-score years of age, we are told (Exod. vii. 7), when he and Aaron appeared in the presence of Pharaoh to petition for Israel's departure.

Here we are come pretty nearly to the end of the information the sacred narrative affords us as to whom the Pharaoh we are seeking was, and, among other things to help us, we have gained this important evidence, namely, that *from the birth of Moses until the Exodus was eighty years, and much the larger part of that time was occupied by the reign of one king, who sorely oppressed the Children of Israel—he was the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph."*

We must now turn to Egyptian history to find two Pharaohs

whose consecutive reigns lasted fully eighty years, the former of the two having a conspicuously long reign. And that we may know *whereabouts* to look for these in the long, long roll of Pharaohs, it will be well to determine, approximately, in which of the thirty Dynasties of ancient Egypt the kings we seek for ruled. We say "approximately," because we here enter upon questions of chronology, and the chronology of the East is always wanting in exactitude; it is so in that of the Bible; it is much more so, as we shall presently see, in that of the Pharaohs. In dealing with both systems, therefore, we have the difficulties of a double series of inexactnesses to deal with. Still, an investigation of the facts, so far as known in both histories, will bring us somewhere near to the time we want.

Before proceeding with this investigation, it may be worth while to enumerate the historical materials at our disposal for this purpose.

Besides the Bible we have certain Greek writers, notably Herodotus and Diodōrus Siculus, and the Epitomists of Manetho (about which we will speak a word later). Then, far more trustworthy, are the contemporary monuments of the different Pharaohs, inscribed and painted upon wood and stone, and written upon papyrus. Unfortunately for nineteenth century science, these records were not made in accordance with any system of chronology, and they determine the lengths of the reign of comparatively few of the kings. There are some four or five monuments which, however, are exceptions to this rule. They give lists of kings generally in historical succession, and sometimes the order of the Dynasties, and the number of years each king reigned.

These monuments are (1) the little "Hall of Ancestors," otherwise called the Tablet of Karnak, of Thothmes III. of the Eighteenth Dynasty; (2, 3) the two Tablets of Abydos; and (4) one of Sakkarah; and (5) by far the most useful of all, were it not now in such a sadly mutilated condition, the Turin Papyrus. The last four monuments all date back to the Nineteenth Dynasty.

But the most important of all our sources as a single "document," because the most comprehensive and systematically arranged, are the remains of a compilation of ancient Egyptian history which was written down in Greek by Manetho, an Egyptian priest of high repute, in the Court of the first Ptolemy—Ptolemy Soter—who reigned B.C. 328-285. Unfortunately, however, Manetho's books are lost, and until the hoped-for day when the spade of the explorer shall exhume some long-buried copy, we have to be content with those epitomes of the books which, in the way of lists of the Dynasties and

kings, have been preserved, in a nearly complete form, by Julius Africanus, Eusebius and George the Syncellus. These are sometimes spoken of as "the Greek Epitomists." There are, however, discrepancies in these three reproducers of Manetho, and we cannot now verify their quotations. There is, furthermore, the "Old Egyptian Chronicle," preserved by the Syncellus and Eusebius, being a translation of a tablet enumerating the mythical Dynasties and most of the thirty historical ones, with the number of the kings in each, and the number of years that each Dynasty lasted.

Such being our Egyptian sources of information, we resume our inquiry.

Our first *fixed* point in the two histories—the history of the Chosen People and that of Egypt—is the reign of *Shishak*, who, we learn from Scripture, was contemporary with the later years of Solomon's reign in Judah. With him, *Jeroboam*, afterwards the first king of the Ten Tribes, found refuge when he had to flee from Solomon.

Pharaoh Shishak—or Shishonk or Sheshenk—is well known from the Egyptian monuments. He was the first king of the Twenty-second Dynasty. He invaded Jerusalem in the tenth year of his reign, which was the fifth year of King Rehoboam, and this, according to the carefully calculated chronology of Archbishop Ussher (given in the margin of our reference Bibles) was B.C. 971. From this date, then, we have to work back to the time of Moses.

Now the date of the death of the king of Egypt from whom Moses fled into Midian (the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph"), according to Archbishop Ussher's reckoning, was B.C. 1531—exactly 560 years before Shishak's invasion of Jerusalem.

We must now turn to our Egyptian authorities to find the Pharaoh—or at least the Dynasty—ruling over Egypt 560 years before the invasion of Shishak.

Referring first to the "Old Chronicle," and counting back the 560 years, we are brought to the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

We test this result by making the same calculation according to Manetho's list, and, comparing the result with what the monuments tell us, we find ourselves in a nest of difficulties. For, first, a strict reckoning of 560 years brings us to the reign of a certain Acherres or Achenchres, whom Petrie identifies with Rasmekh-ka, successor of Akhenaten, or Khuen-aten, the "heretic king" of the Eighteenth Dynasty. But next, Manetho's lists give the third successor of the aforementioned Achenchres or Acherres the same name and as of the same Eighteenth Dynasty; but this second Acherres of

Manetho appears to be the Divine Father Ay of the monuments. There is considerable confusion in the rest of Manetho's list—as it has come down to us—of the remaining rulers of this Dynasty. The confusion is due partly to the compound names of kings containing some of the same elements; to kings gaining their right to rule through marriage; and partly, no doubt, to copyists' errors.

But of one other difficulty in Manetho's history here we must briefly speak. The first king of the Eighteenth Dynasty he names Amōs (the Aahmes of the monuments), and adds "in whose time Moses went forth from Egypt," meaning, we suppose, to the land of Midian. But it so happens that Josephus, the Jewish historian,¹ has preserved a long and curious extract from Manetho's writings relating to the Exodus, in which it is stated that the "unclean people of Moses" were driven out of Egypt by the Pharaoh and his son Rampses (or Rameses), who pursued the people of Moses—those they did not slay—"to the borders of Syria." There seems to be an odd garbling of the facts of the sacred history in what Manetho here writes; but the point of more importance to our researches now is that Amōs, in whose time he tells us Moses went out of Egypt (to Midian), was the first king of the Eighteenth Dynasty, while Rameses, the son of the reigning Pharaoh, and associated with him in the pursuit of the children of Israel out of Egypt, was the first king of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and the interval between the two, according to Manetho himself, was 260 years! So that, according to this story, Moses must have been some 300 years old when he led the Exodus of the Hebrews!

When we see that Manetho's remains give such impossible and contradictory results, when put to the test, can we wonder that writers who have built their identifications of the Pharaohs upon those remains have come to very different and unsatisfactory conclusions?

In a general sort of way, and occasionally in special details, Manetho is most helpful. Beyond this conclusion, all that we can safely affirm of his writings as they have come down to us and with respect to our present investigation is, that *the Pharaohs of the Oppression and Exodus of Israel must have belonged to the Eighteenth or Nineteenth Egyptian Dynasty.* We have previously learned, it will be remembered, from the Bible history that those same two Pharaohs reigned not fewer than 80 consecutive years, of which many more than 40 belong to the former of them, to the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph."

¹ Not in his "Antiquities," but in his work "Against Apion," Book I., chap. xxvii.

For more light on the subject, and for a successful identification of the kings we seek, we must now turn to what is, after all, the most satisfactory evidence that secular history can give, namely, that applied by the contemporary monuments.

Of the two Egyptian Dynasties which now chiefly concern us—the Eighteenth and Nineteenth—there have, happily, been preserved an enormous number of monuments of different kinds, remarkable for the information they convey and for their beauty both of execution and of preservation. They tell us the names and succession of all the kings of both Dynasties, though hitherto, unfortunately, they have not told us how long some of these Pharaohs reigned. However, the dates that have been preserved to us by the monuments, compared with those of Manetho, and a variety of other evidence which the monuments afford us, do satisfactorily and conclusively meet our present inquiries.

What we still want, it will be remembered, is, in the Eighteenth or Nineteenth Dynasty, two kings reigning in succession not less than 80 years, the former of the two reigning much longer than 40 years, and, of course, both of them of character and circumstances suitable to the Pharaohs of the Oppression and Exodus respectively of the Children of Israel.

And first, as to the Eighteenth Dynasty. Concerning it, we would observe, generally, that this is scarcely the period in which we should expect to find severe domestic tyranny or the escape of a host of Egyptian subjects from their lord. It was the time of Egypt's greatest glory. Its kings, except a few obscure ones at the end of the Dynasty, were active, warlike men, full of foreign conquests and victories, holding their own subjects well in hand, and not imposing on them great building labours (as did the Pharaohs who oppressed Israel), although it was Egypt's Augustan age in literature and science.

Next, and more particularly, there was *only one* king throughout this Dynasty who reigned long enough to be the Pharaoh "who knew not Joseph"; this was Thothmes III., who (first in association with his aunt, Hat-shepsut, then solely) reigned 54 years. He was Egypt's very greatest and most glorious monarch. He made himself suzerain of the whole of Palestine and Syria, throughout their length and breadth, and unto their farthest confines. We cannot, therefore, for our part, look upon him as at all a likely Pharaoh for the tyrannical oppression of Israel. Moreover, other facts have come to light, as we shall presently see, which absolutely forbid us identifying him as such.

Thothmes III. was succeeded by two Pharaohs, who reigned

some 35 years between them, then by Amenhotep III., who reigned at least 36 years—long before whose death, therefore, the Children of Israel, if they had made their exodus during the reign of Thothmes III.'s successor, must have settled down in Canaan.

That the Hebrews had *not* settled down in the Promised Land by that time, recent discoveries (among the greatest ever made in Egyptology), shows us conclusively. For Amenhotep III. was succeeded by his son, Amenhotep IV., known as the "heretic king" because he worshipped only the sun's disc, or orb, and sought to enforce that worship on his subjects and allow no other. He changed his own name to Khu-en-Aten—"Glory of Aten" (Aten being the sun's disc, which he worshipped as a god). To make the break with the past more complete, he removed his Court from the ancient capital of Thebes to a new place which he built near Siût—half-way towards the site of modern Cairo—and called by classical writers Alabastron or Alabastro. This new city and capital scarcely outlived his reign, which lasted only 18 years: but the ruined heap representing it has long been known as Tel-el-Amarna.

Now—and this is the remarkable discovery we have just referred to—in the winter of 1887 there were dug up the diplomatic archives of Tel-el-Amarna, the letters, reports and correspondence of governors and tributary kings to Khuenaten.

The first marvellous thing to be noticed about this literature—though we cannot here dwell upon it—is that it is written almost entirely on tablets of clay (afterwards baked) in the *cuneiform* character, and, in the main, the language of Babylon—which language, we may add, would be substantially that of Abraham.

But the second notable thing, and the most important in its bearing on the present subject, is that many of these cuneiform tablets of diplomacy *came* to Khuenaten *from the land of Canaan*—from native kings of Palestinian cities (including Jerusalem), acknowledging Pharaoh's suzerainty over them; and also from *Egyptian governors* of cities in Palestine, reporting to their sovereign Pharaoh. The cities and places named in these despatches include the field of Bashan, land of the Hittites, of the Amorites ("on the north side of Palestine"), and "Canaan," Gaza, Gath, Gezer, Karmel-Judah, Hebron, Lachish, Ashkelon, Mount Seir of Judah (Joshua xv. 10—not that of Edom), Rabbah, the district of the Dead Sea, Jerusalem, Megiddo, Ajalon, Chesulloth, Hazor, Accho, Tyre, Sidon, and many more; so that districts and cities of North, South, East, West and Central Palestine, by their own kings or by resident

Egyptian governors, acknowledged Pharaoh as their sovereign, or, at least, as their feudal lord.

Of this lordship of the land of Canaan by Egypt, Scripture history, from the time that Israel crossed the Jordan onwards, is entirely ignorant.

Whence it follows plainly that *neither Thothmes III. nor any other predecessor* of Amenhotep IV. (Khuenaten) was the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph."

To find that Pharaoh, therefore, we are now confined to the Nineteenth Dynasty. Of that Dynasty our choice is restricted to one of two kings—viz., to Seti I. (the Greek Sethos), or to Rameses II.

In favour of Seti there is to be said that Manetho's epitomists give him 51 years of rule, which, however, Dr. Birch tells us, the monuments do not confirm. I have not been able to find any reference to any monument of his dated later than his *thirtieth* year. It is therefore most probable that Seti did not reign long enough to be the Pharaoh of the Oppression.

It has, however, been further urged in favour of that identification that Moses says (Exod. i. 8) that there "arose up a new king which knew not Joseph," and that this expression signifies the first of a new line of kings; and although Seti was, it is true, the *second* Pharaoh of the new Dynasty (the Nineteenth), yet that his predecessor, the first one (Rameses I.) reigned so short a time, and Seti so long (51 years, according to Manetho), that it was not to be wondered at that the historian of the Exodus should pass over the actual but short-lived introducer of the dynasty.

The answer to this is that, as we have already pointed out, Seti I. did not reign anything like so long as 51 years; that we are agreed that neither he nor Rameses II. was actually the first king of the new line. Moreover, we shall all agree that the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph"—whether Seti I. or Rameses II.—was altogether a different kind of man in relation to the Hebrews (an *heteros*, to use St. Stephen's word) from his predecessors, who had so justly appreciated the Children of Israel.

It will help us, however, to form an opinion as to the likelihood of Seti being the Pharaoh of the Oppression, as well as be in itself interesting, to look a little into the history of his reign, as the monuments reveal it to us.

In his very first year Seti had to chastise Shashu or Beduin depredators on the frontiers of Egypt, who had become audacious enough to attack the important fortified city of Zal. He easily routed them, and drove them back into the desert. This event may have caused a stricter watch to have

been kept on affairs in the eastern part of the delta, but the description of the event itself is not to be taken as a euphemistic way—from an Egyptian point of view—of describing the Exodus of the Children of Israel, because the Hebrews were not Shashu, nor roving robbers or Beduin.

Furthermore, Seti was a great and warlike king—at least, during his earlier years, whose events are recorded on the monuments. He recovered most of the conquests of the great Thothmes; reconquered Syria, dragging some Syrian chiefs in chains after his triumphal chariot; attacked and made a treaty of peace with the Khita or Hittites (now become a really formidable power in Palestine); received tribute of the Amorites, who were vassals of the Hittite king, from the Ionians or Greeks, and from the Troglodytes of North Africa; and re-established the Egyptian fleet on the Red Sea. He also built the famous Hall of Columns at Karnak (Thebes), and began public works in the east of the Delta, constructing, apparently, the Canal from the Nile to the Red Sea, passing Lake Timsah (Crocodile Lake). For these public works, doubtless, he would employ forced labour, in which in the Delta the Israelites may have had to share. But we must remember that it was of tasks of building work, and not excavating, that the Israelites chiefly complained, and Seti does not appear to have done much building here. Rameses II., his son and successor, did a very great deal.

So far, then, the evidence is very far from convicting Seti of the guilt, or of favouring any presumption that Seti was guilty, of that special and long-continued oppression of the Children of Israel, of which the Pharaoh we are seeking to identify was guilty, though it is quite possible—indeed, probable—that before his reign was over the Israelites did find that they had got “another king,” and harder times than their forefathers had known.

There is one other argument which, if we could trust to it, would absolutely forbid us identifying Seti I. with the Pharaoh “which knew not Joseph.” It is this: If the words of Psalm cxxxvi. 15, which tell us that the Lord “overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea,” are to be taken literally, as meaning that the king himself, in his own person, was thus and there destroyed, then, if Seti were the king “who knew not Joseph,” Rameses II., his son and successor, would be the Pharaoh of the Exodus. But this he could not be if the verse of the Psalm is to be thus literally interpreted; for Rameses II. reigned an exceedingly long time. He was filling the valley of the Nile with his boastful inscriptions long after, had he been the Pharaoh of the Exodus, his bones must have been entombed in the depths of the Red Sea.

We are left, therefore, with Rameses II.—the Greek Sesostris¹—as the great oppressor of Israel, “the king which knew not Joseph.”

We have now to inquire whether the character of Rameses II. and the circumstances of his reign support the identification of this king as the great oppressor of the children of Israel in Egypt.

1. And first, as to the length of his reign. His father, Seti I., gave him high honours and titles which have been interpreted as meaning that he associated his son with him on his throne, even as a child. It seems unlikely, however, that he should really have made even a much-favoured child co-regent. At all events, Rameses' own monuments count only the years that he ruled alone (after Seti's decease). And they note his sixty-seventh year of rule—the longest reign the Egyptian annals can boast (with the solitary exception of Phiops—Pepi II.—of the Sixth Dynasty, which is far too remote for our present consideration). How appropriate, then, to Rameses II. are the words of Exodus ii. 23: “And it came to pass *in process of time* that the King of Egypt died”!

2. Secondly, as to the agreement of the years of Moses (born in Rameses' reign) with the years that Rameses ruled after Moses' birth *plus* the years of Rameses' successor at the Exodus.

According to Exodus vii. 7, Moses was eighty years old when he had his interviews with the reigning Pharaoh (him of the Exodus), after the Pharaoh of the Oppression was dead. Now, according to Manetho, Menephtah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, and the son and successor of Rameses II., reigned 20 years. If we may depend upon this date, then—as Rameses himself reigned fully 66 years—if Moses was born in, say, the sixth year of the reign of Rameses II., he would be *exactly* eighty years old in the last year of Menephtah's reign, which would be the year of the Exodus, when Pharaoh's host (and perhaps the Pharaoh himself) was drowned in the depths of the Red Sea.

Thus, all the *chronological* requirements of the sacred history are met with full and most remarkable exactitude. The whole course of the Pharaonic chronology shows nothing to meet the required conditions as those of Rameses II. and Menephtah meet them.

3. Thirdly, Rameses II. was also—as is required of the Pharaoh of the Oppression—a great builder. An inscription on one of his colossal statues at Tanis (Zoan) states this in so many words, reading thus—“Rameses, the great builder.”

¹ An extant papyrus shows us that Rameses II. was called also, during his own lifetime, *Sesura* or *Sustra*—hence the Greek form *Sesostris*.

He was such particularly in the part of Egypt that our history appears to require—viz., in the Eastern Delta. "This part of Egypt seems, in fact," writes M. Naville in his memoir on "Goshen," "to have been the favourite residence of the great Pharaoh. . . . His cartouche is found in most parts of the Eastern Delta—Tanis, Pithom, Sopt, Bubastis, Heliopolis, and the sites now occupied by the Tells of Kantir, Khataanah, Fakoos, Horbeit and Rotab." (The cartouche or seal of the king, sculptured on remains of edifices, signifies that he built more or less of the cities thus signed.)

4. Furthermore, we are not only told generally (Exod. i. 13, 14) that "the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour: and they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, *in mortar and in brick*, and in all manner of service in the field," but we are also told particularly (Exod. i. 11) that "*they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses.*"

(a) The site of "Raamses" has not yet been certainly identified by modern discovery, but there is no doubt that the city received its name from the Pharaoh in connection with whom it was built, *i.e.*, Rameses.¹ From the first and second chapters of the Book of Exodus (*cf.* i. 11, 12, 15, 22; ii. 1, 2) we gather that the city began to be built before Moses was born, and it so happens that a tablet is preserved at Abu Simbel, in Upper Egypt, referring to this very place, and speaking of it as then "built." The words, which are represented as being spoken to Rameses II. are these: "Thou hast built a great residence to fortify the boundary of the land, *the city of Rameses.*" The date of the tablet is the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Rameses II.

The name of the city, "Raamses" or "Rameses," is in itself of considerable importance in giving a clue to the time of its erection. "The name of Rameses," says one who spake with the greatest authority on all subjects of Egyptian philology,² "points to a particular date. It is as significant of a celebrated historical personage as those of Alexandria, Ptolemais, Seleucia, Petersburg or Washington." That historical personage is Rameses the Great. "The name itself," continues M. Renouf, "did not exist before the Nineteenth Dynasty. It is not formed like those of Thoth-mes, Hor-mes, Chonsu-mes, or

¹ We say "in connection with whom" rather than absolutely *by* whom, for the city might have been founded by him, but completed by his successor, and still have borne the name of Rameses (see below, p. 428). The particular Rameses, as we shall shortly see yet more evidently, was Rameses II., "Rameses the Great."

² M. P. le Page Renouf, in the "Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology," December, 1892, p. 61.

Ra-mes.¹ A reduplicated form of the last of these names was assumed by the first Rameses and by his descendants," of whom Rameses II. is by far the greatest.

Hence the city "Raamses" or Rameses built by the Children of Israel must have been built for one of the Pharaohs of that name of either the Nineteenth or the Twentieth Dynasties. The only possible Pharaoh of the Twentieth Dynasty was Rameses III., but as many weighty considerations quite exclude him, the only name—and that absolutely the most probable—is Rameses II.; and that he was the builder of it his own tablet at Abu Simbel tells us plainly.

(b) The foregoing considerations had long been considered by many Egyptologists as making Rameses II. the Pharaoh who oppressed the Hebrews. And the discovery of the second city which we are told the Children of Israel built in the bondage—the city of Pithom—has satisfactorily confirmed their conclusion. The site and ruins of *Pithom* were found and identified by M. Naville in his searches for the Egypt Exploration Fund in the spring of 1883. It lies on the south side of the sweet-water canal which runs from Cairo to Suez, twelve miles from Ismâïlia, on the railway line, and is marked by the disused railway-station to which the French gave the name of *Ramsès*. The Arabs call the site Tell el Maskhutah—"mound of the statue"—from a great granite monolithic figure of Rameses II., seated between the gods Ra and Tum, which lay there. On excavating, many monuments were discovered dedicated to the old Egyptian god *Tum*. It scarcely needed, therefore—what, however, were soon and repeatedly forthcoming—inscriptions to tell us that the name of the place was *Pi-Tum* (Pithom), "the abode of Tum."

That was its sacred name, but, in Egyptian fashion, it had also a secular or common name, which was Thuku, the Hebrew form of which is *Succoth*, a word which in Hebrew happens to mean "tabernacles." "Succoth, or Thuku," writes M. Naville in his memoir, "was first a region, a district, then it became the name of the chief city or capital of the district. . . . We have in the Papyri Anastasi [which were written during the reign of Menephtah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus] a good deal of information concerning the region of

¹ Hence, the argument of Canon Cook (in his valuable "Essay on Egyptian Words in the Pentateuch," appended to vol. i. of the "Speaker's Commentary," p. 487) that "Ra-mes" was the name borne by a son of Aahmes, the first king of the Eighteenth Dynasty, loses its force. It would scarcely surprise us if we met with Ra-mes, "child of Ra," even in the very earliest dynasties; but Rameses, with the double ending, is significant of a particular historical period in Egyptian history—that is, of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties.

Thuku. We hear that it was a border-land near the foreign region of Atuma, which was occupied by nomads . . . also that it contained the city of Pithom, near which were lakes and large pastures."

M. Naville unearthed the ruins and foundations of the city, and found them quite unlike those of other Egyptian cities. The south-west angle contained a small temple dedicated to Tum (the god of the setting sun). A much larger portion, probably *nearly the whole of the city, consisted*, not of public edifices, private houses and streets, but of *chambers*, well built of crude bricks, joined by thin layers of mortar. The walls of the chambers were two or three yards thick. The chambers did not communicate with each other, but were entered only from the top. They were, in reality, an enormous collection of granary and store-rooms. Pithom was therefore, just as the Bible describes it, a "treasure-," or, as the Revised Version translates the word, a "store-city"—a great warehouse of stores for the armies of the Pharaohs starting out on their expeditions north-eastwards. Enormously thick walls enclosed the city; hence the ancient Greek translation of the Bible; the Septuagint, describes these great depots as "strong cities."¹

The Pharaoh who built Pithom was certainly Rameses II. M. Naville "did not find anything more ancient than his monuments,"² and his were numerous and on a great scale.

Here, then, we claim to have reached the point we have been searching for, and our conclusion may be formally stated thus: the Pharaoh who chiefly oppressed Israel made them build the treasure-city Pithom. But it was for Rameses II. that Pithom was built. Therefore, *Rameses II. was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, i.e., "the King which knew not Joseph."*

And glancing back over the evidence that has been forthcoming, we may ask whether it is possible for monuments and chronology to witness more plainly for an identification (short of an express declaration, such as in this case it is idle to hope for) than they witness for the identification of Rameses II. as the oppressor of Israel?

In character Rameses II. was the proud, voluptuous and boastful despot we might expect. To his boastfulness we have already alluded. It will be sufficient to add another illustration of it from his own monuments, in one of which he declares that "the whole world has made way before the strength of my arm"³

As to the oppressiveness of his reign: at the conclusion of

¹ Πόλεις ὄχυράς.

² "Pithom," p. 11.

³ Lenormant's "Manual of the Ancient History of the East," vol. i., p. 252 of the English translation.

his wars, when he had subjugated more or less completely the Hittites, Syria and Asia Minor, then (again we quote M. Lenormant¹) "captives were wanting for the works. Then man-hunting expeditions among the unfortunate negroes of Soudan were organized on a monstrous scale, unknown in former times. . . . Nearly every year grand *razzias* were made into Ethiopia, returning with thousands of captives of every age, and of both sexes, loaded with chains." Again, "all the foreign tribes of Semitic race, attracted by the policy of the predecessors of Rameses into the Delta to colonize the land reclaimed from the water (*i.e.*, from the marshes of the Delta), were subjected to the same oppression, to the same routine of forced labour, as the Hebrews. Even the indigenous rural population, Egyptian by birth, did not escape."

We may add, as a further and marked characteristic of the man, that he was exceedingly voluptuous. He had an enormous *harim*. "During the 67 years of his reign," says Lenormant,² "he had 170 children, 59 of them sons. Considering himself superior to all moral laws, he even went so far (if the monuments are to be taken literally) as to marry one of his own daughters, the princess Bent-Anat."

So then, in character, as in the circumstances and chronology of his reign, Rameses II. was the great oppressor of Israel, the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph."

W. T. PILTER.

(*To be continued.*)



ART. IV.—NATIONAL REPENTANCE.

I. REPENTANCE AND THANKSGIVING.

WHAT an inestimable comfort it is, when any great and signal mercy befalls us, to be encouraged to believe that it has not happened by chance, but that the Eternal Being, on whom we depend for life and breath and all things, has permitted our ardent wishes to harmonize with His omnipotent and omnipresent providence. To Him, at such a time, our minds turn, as the hearts of children to their father, with a gratitude deeply tempered with reverence and awe, and with all our soul we thank Him for His great goodness.

The delight of London on the good news from South Africa on March 1st was unprecedented, and it was only the type of the transports of happiness which thrilled through the whole

¹ Lenormant's "Manual of the Ancient History of the East," vol. i., p. 257 of the English translation.

² *Ibid.*, p. 256.