

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE article that will be most read and best remembered in *The Critical Review* for April, is Professor Macalister's estimate of Professor Flinders Petrie's *History of Egypt*. He points out that the book (of which this is the first volume) is 'designed for the student rather than for the general reader,' and that 'the subject is treated with a fulness of detail which would scarcely be appreciated by the latter class.' And so he himself proceeds to meet the needs of 'the latter class,' and gives them a very fair account of the matter within the space of four octavo pages.

He tells the general reader how ancient is the inhabitant of Egypt; that we have abundant evidence of his existence there more than 7000 years ago; and that even when he came into Egypt (which he probably did across the Red Sea from Southern Arabia), he found one, if not two races settled in the land already. He does not happen to record Professor Petrie's date for Menes the first Egyptian monarch; but he puts Seneferu, one of the Pyramid builders, down at *about* 3998 B.C.—which must surely be also about 4000. He disappoints the general reader by recording Professor Petrie's opinion that the Sphinx is, comparatively speaking, 'a new woman,' and a foreign importation even then. And he proceeds to emphasise Koheleth's maxim regarding the antiquity of all novelty, by

quoting the example of an ancient Egyptian woman who was the well-beloved wife of three successive kings, although one of them *reigned* twenty-nine years, another sixty-three, and the third sixty-six. Altogether, he gives a most entertaining bird's-eye view of the History of Early Egypt within his four pages, and even has time to bestow some well-merited praise on the distinguished author of the volume.

And just about the time that Professor Macalister was writing his appreciation of Professor Petrie's book, Professor Petrie himself was writing his famous letter to the *Academy* which announced the discovery of a wholly new race of men in Egypt. The letter may be found in the *Academy* of April 20th. But there is very little of it, and even very little in it. What is in it (together with a little more about Professor Petrie himself) is well stated in the following Note from the *Record*: 'Professor Flinders Petrie must now be acknowledged as the undoubted leader of the younger school of English Egyptologists, and it must also be owned that he has gained this position for himself by dint of hard and continuous work, and by a judicious exercise of his powers of organisation. Mr. Petrie writes books, trains disciples, excavates, superintends the excavations made by others, and organises exhibitions and meetings in furtherance of the science to

which he has devoted himself. His works already nearly fill a column in the catalogue of the British Museum. He is at present engaged in writing a *History of Egypt*, which will tell us all that is known of the land and its people from the earliest times. We know the interest he took in the unearthing of that wonderful ancient library which is now known by the name of the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, and his recent little book, entitled, *Egyptian Tales, Translated from the Papyri*, has also been read with a considerable amount of interest by many.

‘But all his past exploits have suddenly been eclipsed by the announcement just made by him that an entirely new race has been discovered in Egypt by the joint researches of himself and of Mr. Quibell, who works under the auspices of the “Egyptian Research Account.” There is absolutely no doubt about the main facts of the discovery. The newly-unearthed remains and implements differ entirely from all that is known of the Egyptians themselves. “Their pottery,” to use Mr. Petrie’s own words, “their statuettes, their beads, their mode of burial, are all unlike any other in Egypt; and not a single usual Egyptian scarab, or hieroglyph, or carving, or amulet, or bead, or vase has been found in the whole of the remains in question.” It is at present supposed that these newly-found archæological treasures belong to about the year 3000 B.C., but no one is as yet able to tell who these people were. Is it a Semitic race we are suddenly called upon to deal with, or were they of an Aryan stock? Did they enter Egypt from some other part of Africa, or did they come across the sea? We shall, no doubt, ere long have a handsome volume in our hands, adorned with numerous illustrations, which will, at anyrate, try to answer these as well as various other questions that might be asked.’

To the ‘Gentile’ reader the things of most interest in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for the current quarter are the Critical Notices. There

are three of them—(1) a criticism of Mr. Charles’ *Ethiopic Version of the Book of Jubilees* (Clarendon Press), by Professor Margoliouth; (2) a longer estimate of Dr. James Drummond’s *Hibbert Lecture* (Williams & Norgate), by Mr. Joseph Jacobs; and (3) a still longer notice of Friedländer’s *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christentums*, by Mr. F. C. Conybeare.

Professor Margoliouth’s short notice has all the surprise and pleasure of the most finished literary work. To Mr Charles it must be peculiarly grateful to have his scholarship thus commended by one who knows so well, and says so well what he knows. But to us it is gratifying also, even to all of us. For Ethiopic is, as Professor Margoliouth says, ‘a somewhat out-of-the-way field of learning.’ Its students must always be few; its able editors fewer. And after ‘the strange mortality that raged among Ethiopic scholars last year,’ it cannot but be pleasing to know that there is one in our midst whose scholarship is so reliable. For even Ethiopic is necessary to the fullest study of the Bible. But in respect of it most of us will always have to acknowledge that

We have but faith, we cannot know.

But Professor Margoliouth does more than praise; he also blames. He does more than commend Mr. Charles’ scholarship; he also corrects it. ‘Most readers,’ he says, ‘will regret the depreciatory tone which Mr. Charles has adopted towards the work of his predecessor Dillmann. This tone is both impolitic and unjust. Impolitic, because there is no name more highly revered among Orientalists than Dillmann’s, and most of those who know any Ethiopic owe it to his writings; and, moreover, the world has not yet had a year to lament his loss. Unjust, because more cannot be expected from a book than it professes to give. When a text of real value is to be published for the first time, the most important matter is that it should be done quickly. Dillmann employed for this purpose the MSS. that were at his disposal, which he used with faithfulness and skill.’

Moreover, Professor Margoliouth will not allow that between Dillmann's recension of the Book of Jubilees and that which Mr. Charles has now given us, the difference is vital: 'It is natural that Mr. Charles should overrate the improvement, for the collation of Ethiopic MSS. is ordinarily so fruitless in results that new readings of consequence are hailed with very peculiar delight.' And besides, as Bishop Earle somewhere says, a scholar who has filled up from conjecture a small *lacuna* in a text, thinks the words he has introduced the most important in the book. Mr. Charles has introduced not a few better readings, and some quite felicitous emendations. But the difference between the two recensions is not thoroughgoing. For Mr. Charles's text is still an *eclectic* one. He also has to select first from one source and then from another, just as Dillmann had to do before him.

Thus Professor Margoliouth blames. He also corrects. Mr. Charles had two texts before him: the one in Latin, the other in Ethiopic. And as he went on with his work (which was the production of the best possible Ethiopic text) the question kept ever coming up, What is to be done when the Latin text and the already existent Ethiopic text differ from one another? Being different, they cannot both be right. Is either right? And which is it? And, especially, should the one be corrected to make it agree with the other? To the last question (after he had settled the others) Mr. Charles sometimes said Yes, and sometimes No. Professor Margoliouth believes it had been better if he had said No oftener; Yes not so often. But he holds that there is little excuse for him when he leaves both his texts and alters in accordance with the Bible, as in vii. 10, where 'Noah woke from his sleep' is changed into 'Noah woke from his wine,' because that is the Bible reading; and no excuse for him at all when, on the contrary, he would alter the Bible to suit the Book of Jubilees.

Mr. Jacobs' view of Dr. Drummond's *Hibbert Lecture* is different. It differs both in scholarship and in form. It is 'superior' rather than dignified;

and it seems bent on making a point more than on increasing knowledge. But it is full of interest, though the interest gathers round Mr. Jacobs more than round Dr. Drummond.

For Mr. Jacobs is one of that most attractive band of English-speaking Jews who have taken to the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament and the study of the New. We are fairly familiar with their features now. They have dared much. They have even done something, as is made manifest by the bitter opposition of the orthodox within their own communion. But it has been growing manifest that they have come to the end of their daring and of their deed. Weighed by the single searching question: What think ye of the Christ? even Mr. Montefiore is found wanting, and Mr. Jacobs falls quite deplorably below him.

Mr. Montefiore is proud to know that Jesus was a Jew, and gladly acknowledges Him to be the greatest of the sons of Abraham. But the best that Mr. Jacobs can allow Him is the skill to put things cleverly. He has no originality. All His morality and all His religion was in the world before Him. He did not even found the religion which is called after Him. Jesus was a mere Jew. It was Paul and John that were the makers of Christianity. It was they that separated it from Judaism; it was they that created 'the ideal figure of the Christ' which after ages attached to 'the Jewish peasant of Galilee,' and which is 'the real differentia of Christianity from other religions.' Nay, if St. John is to be believed, Jesus was capable of 'grandiose sayings.' Witness the very words which Dr. Drummond has chosen for the title of his lectures. *Via, Veritas, Vita*, he calls them, 'The Way, the Truth, and the Life.' These words, applied by Jesus to Himself, give Him 'an air of arrogance which repels a Jewish reader.' And if it is defended that they were not used of Himself but of His teaching, then, says Mr. Jacobs (not knowing how 'superior' he is in saying it), Jesus ought to have said, not *I* am the Way and the Truth and the Life, but *My teaching* is.

Thus Mr. Jacobs says things which give *him* an air of arrogance which repels a Christian reader. And it is hard to see the gain. He does not deny the power of Jesus' personality. He does not deny its unique influence in the world. But he says it is the creation of Paul and of John. So the fact remains; it is only the names that are changed. We always must worship the Highest when we see it. At present the Jesus of the Gospels is the Highest that we know. Mr. Jacobs would have it that He is only an ideal, and that He is the creation of Paul and of John. Then either Paul or John is the Highest; for a man is always greater than the greatest of his products. It is not likely that Mr. Jacobs is going to persuade us to worship either John or Paul, and still less both of them together. But if he did, what better would he be?

Nor need Mr. Jacobs be so nervously anxious to deprive Jesus of all claim to originality. It is long since we have seen that the kind of originality Mr. Jacobs means is lightly esteemed even by men. Genius despises it. And Jesus would have been less the Christ if He had been more original. Yet to what length Mr. Jacobs will go in his depreciation is seen by the two most elaborate efforts he makes to take our Lord's originality away.

The first is this. Jesus is asked on one occasion which is the greatest commandment of the Law, and He answers by quoting the twofold Law of Love. No one contends that He invented His answer. It is even related that on another occasion, a scribe, when appealed to, made the very same quotation, and secured our Lord's approval. But Mr. Jacobs fears that Jesus may receive some credit here which is not due to Him, and he sees a way of preventing it. Dr. Taylor has suggested, and Professor Harnack has carried out the suggestion, that the *Didaché* is 'merely a Christianised expansion of a Jewish catechism on "The Two Ways" of life and death. Professor Harnack has gone further, and from the various redactions of the *Didaché* has restored the earlier portions, at

least, of the Jewish original. Now in the opening passage of this is contained the scribe's answer in the form in which it is given in Luke x. 27. It is clear from the context that some written authority is referred to, since Jesus asks the scribe: "How readest thou?" If my interpretation of this passage is correct, "The Two Ways" was known to Jesus.' Thus Mr. Jacobs ignores the suggestion that 'How readest thou?' refers to the Law and the Prophets, and goes all the way round to prove that Jesus knew a problematical Jewish document called 'The Two Ways,' and all to let us see how little originality He had.

But the other example is more surprising still. For it seems that Mr. Jacobs will not grant Jesus the originality even of His parables. There is one of these which we have come to know as the Good Samaritan. But the name is all a mistake, for there never was a Samaritan in it. It is true that in all our texts the three persons who 'passed that way' are given as a Priest, a Levite, and a Samaritan. But in New Testament times, and down to the present day, the Jews have been divided into three hereditary classes, Priests, Levites, and *Israelites*. The division is referred to in the later Psalms, as cxxxv. 19, 20. And Derenbourg supposes that the great Sanhedrim of seventy-one members was composed of three smaller ones, each of twenty-three, with a president and vice-president to make up the number. Well, since Jesus had so little originality, it is evident to Mr. Jacobs that M. Halévy is right when he argues 'with great ingenuity and plausibility' in the *Revue des Études Juives*, iv. 289, that the good Samaritan was not a Samaritan at all. For Jesus begins with the Cohen or Priest, goes on to the Levite, 'and we cannot help seeing, with M. Halévy, that he finished with the typical specimen of the third class, the Israelite.' If further proof is needed, 'M. Halévy adds that the frequent journeys of a Samaritan between Jerusalem and Jericho would be impossible.' And thus even the claim of Jesus to any greater Universalism than the Jews possessed around Him is easily swept away.

The only real objection to the entrance of women into the high places of scholarship is the difficulty of criticising their work. There is a criticism in the *Contemporary* for May of a novel of Mr. Grant Allen's, by Mrs. Fawcett, and there is a criticism in a recent *Academy* (May 4th) of Dr. Budge's Translation of the Papyrus of Ani, by M. le Page Renouf. The one should be read to learn the language which a virtuous woman is capable of using when virtue is at stake; the other should be read to perceive that an indignant scholar will not lag behind when scholarship is in danger. But the object of censure in both cases is a man.

It is not possible to write in that way of a woman, or a woman's work. And the anonymous author of an able article in the current *Church Quarterly* feels it. His subject is the *Codex Ludovicus*, as he happily names that Syriac MS. which Mrs. Lewis found at Mount Sinai. He has nothing to say against the Codex itself. But against its editing and its translating, and especially against the criticism and commentary which accompany its translation, he evidently does desire to say some severe things. But his pen is under restraint. He finds fault gently. He chooses surprisingly mild adjectives for a critic. And before he utters one word of disparagement, he is careful to pay some very pretty compliments. For the author is a woman.

And yet it may be well that his hand has thus been stayed. For he does not seem to have many serious criticisms to make, and to have made them with severity would not have increased either their number or their seriousness. He dislikes the title that has been chosen for the MS. And there is no doubt that it is unfortunate to speak of it as the Sinaitic, since that name is now universally given to Tischendorf's great discovery (✕). His suggestion to call it 'Codex Ludovicus' is both sensible, and courteous. Again, in the translation he detects a confusion between the Syriac for *and* and the Syriac for *but*; and an inconsistency in the rendering of proper names, Peter being sometimes given as

Cepha, Thomas as Thoma, and Iscariot as Scariota.

But the head and front of the offending is found in the Introduction which Mrs. Lewis has written to her translation. There she claims that her new MS. represents a text similar to the Curetonian, and therefore older than the Peshitto. For she accepts the judgment of Tregelles and Dr. Hort, that the Peshitto is a kind of Vulgate, or critic's version of an older text represented by the fragments which Cureton found. The Quarterly Reviewer will have neither of these opinions. He does not believe that the new Codex is so closely akin to the Curetonian as Mrs. Lewis asserts. And especially he denies the priority of either it or the Curetonian to the Peshitto. The Peshitto is the Old Syriac he says, and these other texts are of latter date and more corrupt contents.

'During the last few years it has frequently been asserted that the climate of Palestine is undergoing a change; that the "latter rains" are being "restored," prophecies relating to them being fulfilled, and, in consequence, a new era of fruitfulness and prosperity dawning upon the land.' But Dr. Thomas Chaplin does not believe it. And in the quarterly magazine which goes by the name of *Jews and Christians* (Nisbet), he gives reasons for his doubt. A restoration of the 'latter rain' is surely impossible, if it has never been taken away.

The Jewish civil year, which begins in September or October, is divided by the weather into two parts. There is first a long rainy season, which covers about seven months, and then there is a long dry season, which lasts for about five months. So that when the late Dean of Canterbury asserts in *The Speaker's Commentary* on Jer. v. 24 that there are only two rainy seasons in Palestine, Dr. Chaplin says he is wrong, for there is only one. But the Dean's note has more mistakes than this, and had better be quoted for instruction. He says: 'There is a difficulty in the text, from Jeremiah seeming to speak of three kinds of rain (*gashem* and *yôreh*

and *malkôsh*), whereas, as is well known, there are only two rainy seasons in Palestine. For this reason the Masorites, supported by the Targ. and ancient versions, omit the first *and*. More correctly, the A.V. takes the two *ands* as correlatives—rain, both *yôreh* and *malkôsh*.’

Now, in the first place, there are not two rainy seasons, but only one. No doubt, if you count the year as beginning with January you get two, for January cuts the rainy season in the middle. It is not likely, however, that Dean Payne Smith was guilty of that. But, in the second place, as the rainy season lasts for some seven months, three different ‘rains’ come down in the course of it.

First, there is the early rain, which moistens the land and fits it for the reception of the seed, and is consequently the signal for the commencement of ploughing. Second, there is the copious winter rain, which saturates the earth, fills the cisterns and pools, and replenishes the springs. And third, there is the ‘latter’ or spring rain, without which the harvest would be a failure, for it enlarges the ears of corn and enables the wheat and barley to support the dry heat of the summer. The early rains begin in October or November, and run on to the middle of December. The heavy winter rains commence about the middle of December and continue well into March, or even to the end of that month, whereupon the latter or spring rains begin and last till April or May.

So Dr. Chaplin believes that the three words which Jeremiah uses refer to three different rains. *Geshem* is the heavy rain of midwinter; *yôreh* is the early or former rain, which falls in the beginning of the Jewish year; and *malkôsh* is the latter rain, which comes in spring and ends the rainy season. There is therefore no necessity for suggesting a mistake on the part of Jeremiah, or even a corruption of his text. And although Dean Payne Smith, in his curious manipulation of the conjunctions, has the support not only of the Authorized Version, but now of the Revised also, it

seems that the most straightforward translation is also the most accurate: ‘Let us now fear the Lord our God, that giveth *geshem* and *yôreh* and *malkôsh* in its season.’

For this is not the only place in which the three rains are named. The three words occur together in Hos. vi. 3. No doubt it is possible that the third word there is not the name of the latter rain. *Yôreh* is a participle, the participle of a verb meaning to sprinkle, and it may be that there it should be literally rendered. Dr. Cheyne renders it so: ‘As the heavy rain, as the latter rain, *which watereth* the earth’; and the Revisers follow him. But there is no ambiguity about Joel ii. 23, 24, where it is said: ‘He will cause to come down for you the *geshem*, the *môreh* (a variation of *yôreh*), and the *malkôsh* in the first (month). And the floors shall be full of wheat, and the fats shall overflow with wine and oil.’

If, then, we recognise three different rains, we shall find that *geshem* is the heavy rain of winter, and that even when it is found alone it must be always rendered so. There is one passage in Job (xxxvii. 6) where the Authorized Version has missed its meaning and spoken of ‘the *small* rain’; but the Revisers have turned that into ‘the shower of rain,’ though they might have done better still. Elsewhere the translation is fairly accurate. But the meaning is sometimes missed. A striking instance is the familiar and beautiful passage in the Song of Sol. ii. 11, 12—

For, lo, the winter is past,
The rain is over and gone;
The flowers appear on the earth;
The time of the singing of birds is come,
And the voice of the turtle is heard in our land.

Thus the Revised Version gives it, following the Authorized word for word, and printing the passage as poetry. But it is not true. ‘In our land’ the flowers appear on the earth, and the birds begin to sing six weeks before the rain is over and gone. It is *geshem*, the heavy rain of winter, that the poet speaks of. When *geshem* ceases, the warm spring weather sets in. Then the flowers begin to appear

and the birds to sing. But *malkôsh*, the latter rain, has still to fall. All the warm spring it continues to fall at intervals, no hindrance to the springing flowers or the music of the birds, but an almost indispensable blessing to both.

Geshem is as much dreaded by the Palestinian traveller as by the flowers and the birds. And it was not without reason that our Lord said to His followers: 'Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter' (Matt. xxiv. 20). In itself there is no more delightful time for travel in Palestine than winter. 'The sky is clear and bright, the air is crisp and bracing, and the cold is usually not excessive, while the animals are lively and spirited.' But it is in winter that the heavy rain and winds set in. Then 'the streams become swollen and dangerous, the roads heavy, and in places turned into perilous swamps, and the miseries of the traveller begin.'

There seems then to be abundance of evidence that from the earliest times there was one long rainy season in Palestine, which was broken up by three different falls of rain, just as it is to-day. Can it also be shown that the average rainfall has remained the same?

This is a more difficult matter. There were no rain-gauges in ancient times, and we are ignorant of the amount of rain which fell. What we do know is that then, as now, Palestine was a country which drank water of the rain of heaven; that then, as now, it was a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths springing out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig trees, and pomegranates; a land of oil, olive, and honey. We know also that then, as now, the rains were uncertain; sometimes deficient, irregular, and not falling in due season, when scarcity and even famine was the result, sometimes violent and overwhelming, causing houses to fall (Matt. vii. 27), and giving rise to dangerous inundations (Ps. lxxix. 2, 14, 15; Job xxviii. 11). In all these particulars there is the closest correspondence between the past and the present. Even the

fruits of the earth are the same, with the addition in modern times of some which have been introduced from abroad, as the prickly pear, and probably the orange and the tomato.

There is therefore no indication that a change has come over the climate of Palestine. Dr. Chaplin has carefully examined the statements of innumerable travellers in the Holy Land, from St. Eucherius of Lyons, who travelled in the fifth century, down to the present day. And if they had eyes to see anything, he finds that they all saw practically the same. How is it then that the notion has become so prevalent that Palestine is changing its climate, and that from that cause alone great things may be expected in the future?

It is probably due to Dr. Chaplin himself. He was the first to measure the rainfall of Palestine with accuracy. He went to Jerusalem in 1860. Observations on the rainfall had already been made there for some years, and reports published. But he discovered that the rain-gauge employed, not a very accurate instrument at the best, had regularly been misread. Each division on the scale represented one-twentieth of an inch. It had been taken to represent one-fifth. Thus the reports of the rainfall at Jerusalem gave it as four times greater than it actually was. Yet so hard do errors die, that in a well-known and valuable work on Palestine, published as late as 1877, the rainfall of Jerusalem was solemnly stated to be 'from 85 to 44 inches, the mean being 61.6 inches, or considerably more than double that of London.'

Dr. Chaplin detected the error, and from 1861 accurate observations have been taken. In 1883 he made a full report of the amount of rain that had fallen in Jerusalem in the twenty-two previous years, and sent it to the *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Then in the January number of 1894 the veteran meteorologist, Dr. James Glaisher, who is also the Chairman of the Fund, published a fuller report, embodying the

results of observations during the thirty-two years from 1861 to 1892. Whereupon this remarkable fact came out: the average rainfall in the first sixteen years, that is, from 1861 to 1876, is 22.26 inches; the average of the last sixteen is 28.20. That is to say, the average fall of rain in Jerusalem during the last sixteen years is 5.94 greater than during the sixteen years before. And when Dr. Glaisher ended his report with the remark, 'it is not possible to infer whether the years ending 1873 were the lowest in a cycle of years or whether the climate is changing,' a large number of persons at once decided that the climate is changing, and rushed to their Bibles to find the prophecies that were about to be fulfilled.

But Dr. Chaplin does not think the prophecies are about to be fulfilled, at least in that way. He agrees with St. Jerome, that some of these prophecies do not refer to the land of Palestine, but to a better country, even a heavenly. And he thinks that 'it is to an increase of population, to an improved system and a wide extension of agriculture, to better means of communication, and to the establishment of industrial and commercial enterprises, which can be initiated and maintained only by a liberal investment of capital, rather than to climatic changes, that we must look for an improvement in the material prosperity and productiveness of the country.' And he dares to say so in the pages of *Jews and Christians*.

Egyptian Eschatology.

BY W. ST. CHAD BOSCAWEN, F.R.H.S.

I.

AMONG the nations of antiquity, Egypt has always been the one which, by her monuments and inscriptions, has most clearly proclaimed her belief in a future life—after death. Indeed, it is to the influence of this inherent belief that we are indebted for our very detailed knowledge of the Egypt of the most remote past. Our knowledge of the living Egypt of ancient times is derived from the study of the dead Egypt. Pyramids and magnificent rock-cut tombs, decorated with sculptured hieroglyphics or painted scenes, bring before us with vivid detail, not only the life of the mighty dead, but also reveal to us the hopes he held as to the future. The Egyptians of the ancient empire were an essentially simple people—they may almost be accused of being apathetic, in having no great hopes or ambitions. As a nation, they were absolutely void of aggressive policy; as individuals, each did his best, and thanked God for the reward it brought him; but, above all, they had no fear of death. The Egyptian of the ancient empire kept death ever before him; and his entrance into the 'eternal house,' as he picturesquely termed the tomb, was but an incident in life, and undertaken with a childlike faith that, in due course, purified by

many trials, he would once more see life. In the maxims of Ani, a learned scribe, we see this belief clearly enunciated. 'Thou knowest not when thou wilt die: death cometh to meet the babe at his mother's breast, even as he meeteth the old man who hath finished his course.' In the pyramid tomb of Unas, a Pharaoh of the Vth Dynasty, and therefore about B.C. 3500 in date, we read: 'Hail, Unas! thou hast gone not as one dead—thou hast gone as one living, to sit upon the throne of Osiris.' With a belief thus so deeply engrained in their nature, it is but natural that the Egyptians produced a large amount of eschatological literature. Indeed, Egypt was, from the earliest times until long after the advent of Christianity, the home of eschatologic and apocalyptic literature. The greater portion of this literature was embraced in a great collection of writings known to Egyptologists as the *Book of the Dead*, but having the Egyptian title of *Per-em-hru*,—'Coming forth by Day.' This work consisted of a series of religious compositions of various dates,—gathered together at different periods,—and receiving its final and canonical redaction at the hands of the priests of the temple of Neith, at Sais, about B.C. 600. This last version continued