

to read and to use. But he knows what he writes about. He has lived and seen and even suffered with yogins till he knows the very thoughts that sustain them.

The new volumes of Messrs. Watts' sixpenny

reprints are Paine's *Age of Reason*, Haeckel's *Wonders of Life*, and Comte's *Fundamental Principles of the Positive Philosophy*. The same very advanced publishers have sent out a cheap edition (2s. 6d. net) of *Supernatural Religion*.

The Latest Discoveries in Egypt.

A REVIEW OF FLINDERS PETRIE'S NEW VOLUME.

BY THE REV. JAMES BAIKIE, ANCRUM.

THE third volume of Professor Petrie's History¹ has been long waited for, and latterly with some impatience. The second volume, carrying the narrative down to the end of the eighteenth dynasty, appeared in 1896—the fourth, on the Ptolemaic dynasty, in 1899. Now at last, in 1905, the gap between the two has been bridged.

The delay, however, has not been without its compensations. It has, for one thing, enabled Professor Petrie to embody in his work the very latest results of exploration; and it may be said at once that the volume is well worth the waiting for.

It is, indeed, one of the most interesting productions that have appeared within recent years on the subject of Egypt; but its interest is of its own kind, and that kind is not one which is likely to appeal to the general reader. There is here none of the flowing narrative, enlivened with vivid sketches of the state of religion and art, which one finds in Maspero's *Histoire Ancienne*; nor is there even so much attention paid to the construction of a continuous narrative of each reign as in Budge's History. In fact, the work is, as the author himself says in his preface, 'only a skeleton of facts,' and its interest, apart from the intrinsic quality of the facts themselves is that it constitutes a storehouse in which is gathered together practically everything that is known up to the present of the period which it covers.

This is essentially a book for the serious student of Egypt, not for the casual reader.

The amount of labour involved in its production must have been enormous, and out of all propor-

tion to the resulting quantity of letterpress. Not only are the facts of each reign told, with references to all the original sources, and either translations or abstracts of all documents or inscriptions of importance given, but representative lists are also given of the chief monuments and papyri, public and private, of each reign, with notes indicating where these are to be found, and what are the best available reproductions or translations. In the case of a reign like that of Ramessu II. the list of personal relics of the king covers something like twelve pages, while that of the private monuments of the same reign covers sixteen. Work such as this makes no great show in a volume, but it is of inestimable value as a guide to the student; and while other histories have their own advantages, none provides so good a basis for the commencement of a thorough study of the subject.

The period which is embraced by this volume is in itself one of the most interesting periods of Egyptian History. It begins with the accession of Ramessu I., the first king of the nineteenth dynasty, and carries the narrative on to the downfall of Nektnebf, or Nectanebo, the last of the native kings. While, therefore, the period is that of the decadence of Egypt,—and its story is one of a steady decline alike in warlike power and in art from the great days of such sovereigns as Tahutmes III. and Amenhotep III., of the eighteenth dynasty,—it is also one of special importance to the biblical student, from the fact that within its limits are comprised practically all the points of contact with the history of Israel.

The attention of the reader will, of course, be immediately directed to the account given of the two outstanding kings of the nineteenth dynasty,

¹ *A History of Egypt from the XIXth to the XXXth Dynasties*. By W. M. Flinders Petrie, D.C.L. London: Methuen, 1905.

Ramessu II. and Meren-ptah, in whose reigns the almost universal consent of historical writers has placed the period of the Israelite Oppression and Exodus. So far as regards the reign of Ramessu II., it cannot be said that anything novel comes to light in this fresh telling of the story. The general impression left is merely confirmatory of that tendency which has been growing for long to regard the greatness of Ramessu as somewhat of an imposture, carefully fostered by the overweening conceit of the monarch himself. Formerly the type king of Egypt's greatness was the great Sesostris, but nowadays it has come to be recognized that the real culmination of the nation's greatness was in the reigns of Tahutmes III. and Amenhotep III.; and Ramessu II. appears more and more in the somewhat unenviable light of a man who strove to appear great by usurpation of the works of better men, and by a diligent attempt to make much of small successes. Thus Professor Petrie agrees with most modern historians of the reign in suggesting that the much vaunted victory of Ramessu at Qadesh was after all only an indecisive battle, from which the Egyptian king was lucky to escape as well as he did, and that no real or lasting success was gained against the Hittite power—a view which would appear to be confirmed by the terms of the treaty of peace between Ramessu and the Hittite chief, Kheta-sar, in which the contracting parties speak as equals, not as victor and vanquished. Of this interesting treaty a pretty full summary is given. Even of the works of art of the reign Professor Petrie has no very high opinion. Speaking of the great Hypostyle Hall at Karnak, which, though mainly the work of Sety, was completed by Ramessu, and on which such floods of laudation have been poured forth, he says: 'The only special feature of this hall is its great defect . . . The size that strikes us is not the grandeur of strength, but the bulkiness of disease.' With the successor of Ramessu, Meren-ptah, we touch the point at which the history of Israel as an independent nation is supposed to have begun. The progress of opinion with regard to this king has been the opposite of that experienced by Ramessu. As late as 1887, Rawlinson could picture Meren-ptah as a sort of cowardly *fainéant*, who made a great boast of achievements in which he had no share, and whose reign was utterly disastrous to Egypt. It may be suspected that biblical prepossessions had something to do

with this unfavourable estimate; at least later research has done nothing to confirm it. Petrie's conclusions from the incidents which led Rawlinson to question even Meren-ptah's courage is that they 'show Meren-ptah to have been a true general, who could adapt his methods, and organize a victory.' The great event of Meren-ptah's reign, so far as the Egyptian record is concerned, was the invasion of the country by the Libyans and their allies, and the victory gained over them at Pa-ari-sheps (Prosopis). In his discussion of this event, Professor Petrie pointedly disagrees with the common identification (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.* ii. 432; Birch, *R.P.* iv. 38; Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, vi. 36) of the tribe called Aqay-uasha with the Achæans. In his view it is much more likely that the alliance which Meren-ptah had to face was simply one of the tribes of the north coast of Africa, and he would connect the Aqay-uasha with Agbia, near Carthage. The suggestion seems intrinsically more probable than that the Achæans should be found in alliance with a North African tribe.

Of the Exodus itself there is of course no trace in the Egyptian records of Meren-ptah's time, unless the statement on the well-known Meren-ptah stele be regarded as an exception to this statement. This stele was discovered by Petrie in 1896, and in the present volume he gives the reference as follows:—'Ynuāmam is brought to nought, the people of Israel is laid waste—their crops are not, Kharu (Palestine) has become as a widow by Egypt.' In the nine years which have elapsed since the inscription was discovered, Professor Petrie has apparently seen no reason to change the view which he suggested at the time of the discovery (*Six Temples in Thebes*, p. 30), namely, that the reference is neither to the oppression in Egypt nor to an overthrow of the Israelites in Palestine after the Exodus, but to a branch of the race who either did not enter Egypt with the rest of Jacob's family, or who returned to Palestine immediately after the famine. No discussion of the Exodus itself, either as to its historicity or the details of its route, is attempted. The date which Petrie suggests for the event, 1213 B.C., would fall, according to his reckoning, towards the end of Meren-ptah's reign. He points out, however, the somewhat strange fact that the report of a frontier official dated in year 8 of Meren-ptah records the bringing in of a Semitic tribe to the lakes of Pa-tum

(Pithom), in the land of Succoth. 'It would seem, then, that the Egyptians were welcoming more Semitic tribes into Succoth only a few years before the Exodus.'

The whole question is obviously one on which it is impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion in the present state of the evidence from the Egyptian records.

The finding of Meren-ptah's mummy by M. Loret in the tomb of Amenhotep II. (1898) has not excited the interest one would have expected from that which arose over the earlier discovery of the mummies of Sety and Ramessu II., probably owing to the fact that no official account of the details of the find has yet been issued. Petrie, however, agrees with almost all competent authorities in the conclusion that the mummy found in the coffin of Set-nekht is that of Meren-ptah, and not that of Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV.), as M. Loret at first supposed. The find, of course, disposes of the current idea (which has no basis in the Exodus narrative) that Meren-ptah personally shared in the disaster which overwhelmed his troops. During the reigns of the later Ramesside kings the decadence of Egypt continues, and is only arrested for a brief space by the vigorous rule of Ramessu III. whose victories over the Libyan confederacy (twice), and over the Hittites and their allies, are here briefly discussed. The Hittite alliance which was defeated both by land and sea included, among other tribes, the Pulosathu and 'the Daanona in their isles.' These are identified with the Philistines and the Danai, or Argives. The most important relic of this Syrian campaign is the pavilion which Ramessu, with curious taste, erected as a gateway to his great temple at Medinet Habu, and which is copied from a Syrian Migdol. A good view of this curious structure is given in this volume.

It is not till the time of Sheshenq I., the first king of the twenty-second dynasty, that we again come into touch with the O.T. historical narrative. The great event of Sheshenq's reign was the Syrian campaign, the record of which is engraved on the south outside wall of the great temple at Karnak. It agrees with the narrative in 1 Ki 14 and 2 Ch 12. The identification has been questioned within late years, but Professor Petrie dismisses the matter with the brusque remark that 'when an encyclopædic critic states that "it is difficult to doubt that Shishak and Shushakim

are corruptions of Cush and Cushim, and they belong to well-ascertained types of textual corruption," it is evident that this form of historical criticism belongs to a well-ascertained type of critical aberration.' While the subject is before us, it may be noticed that the author returns to the charge in the discussion of the reign of Shabaka and his identification with the 'So king of Mizraim' of 2 Ki 17⁴, and maintains that there is no evidence whatsoever for supposing the Mizraim, or Muzri, of the O.T. narrative to refer to a kingdom of Muzri in Sinai, coterminous with Egypt. His treatment of the case is short, but his conclusions demand consideration, more particularly as they agree with those of Dr. Budge (*Hist. Eg.* vi, preface). Professor Petrie's controversial methods are vigorous, if brief, as the example already given will indicate. Another sample of them may be given in the present instance. 'Facts are what we alone consider in this History, without giving weight to the opinions that may have been based on these facts. But if any may hesitate at setting aside the bold assertions of the Jerahmeelite writers of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, they may refer in that work to the conjectural emendations on Shishak, where the contemporary records are entirely ignored, and the treatment is uncritical and unhistorical.'

It may be noticed also in passing that Professor Petrie sees no reason for questioning the accuracy of 2 Ch 14⁹ 16⁸, and supposes the 'Zerah the Ethiopian' of that narrative to have been Uasarkon I. of the twenty-second dynasty. Budge regards the Chronicles narrative as legendary, but Petrie appears to doubt neither its historicity nor the fact that it refers to an Egyptian defeat.

The history of Egypt does not again come into contact with that of Israel until 701 B.C., the year of Sennacherib's Judæan campaign. In the biblical account of that event (2 Ki 19⁹, Is 37⁹), Tirhakah is spoken of as king of Ethiopia. As a matter of fact, Taharqa, who was of the twenty-fifth or Ethiopian dynasty, did not become sole king until 693 B.C. But a stele at Tanis records the fact of his being sent north, *i.e.* from Napata, the Ethiopian capital, to Egypt, at the age of 20, probably as viceroy, in which case the description of 2 Ki would be sufficiently accurate. Taharqa's end proves that the Assyrian estimate of his power, 'this bruised reed,' was correct. In 670 B.C. he was defeated by Esarhaddon. An attempt to regain his sovereignty led

to a new invasion in 668 B.C. under Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, the latter of whom, after Esarhaddon's death, drove Taharqa into Ethiopia, and divided his kingdom among twenty petty rulers. And a further revolt met with no better success. Taharqa was again driven into Ethiopia, and disappears from history.

There remain only two points to be noted. The first is the raid to the Euphrates by Nekau II., twenty-sixth dynasty, in which Josiah perished at Megiddo. It appears that Nekau kept some hold on Syria after this event, for four years later, 605 B.C., he was again at Carchemish, where he was defeated by Nebuchadrezzar. Of this campaign, as is natural, there are no Egyptian records.

One more king, Ha-ab-ra, the Hophra of Jer 44³⁰, attempted to intervene in Palestinian affairs, but the only result of his intervention was the downfall of the Jewish monarchy. The party under Johanan, who fled into Egypt on the final overthrow of Judah, found sanctuary at the great frontier fort of Daphnal, which had been built by Psamtek I. for his Ionian and Karian mercenaries.

The site of this fort, the Tahpanhes of Jeremiah, was investigated by Petrie in 1886. He found that the mound of ruins still goes locally by the name of Kasr Bint el Yehudi ('the palace of the Jew's daughter'); and on clearing the doorway of the old fort, he discovered in front of it a platform or pavement of brickwork, which may well have

been 'the brickwork which is at the entry of Pharaoh's house in Tahpanhes,' upon which Jeremiah prophesied that Nebuchadrezzar should spread his tent.

These are the chief points of interest for biblical students in this important volume. The main impression left upon the mind of them will probably be that of how astonishingly little archæology has to say, in this instance at least, upon scriptural subjects. One reference to the Israel of the Exodus time, doubtful in meaning; two identifications, neither of them absolutely certain; one reasonable explanation of a doubtful title (the Taharqa stele); and one rather happy illustration of an incident recorded in Jeremiah—this is practically the sum of what the most indefatigable research on a period of nearly one thousand years has yielded. Professor Petrie would probably reply that his business is not to provide biblical illustrations, which are merely a by-product, but to ascertain accurately the facts of Egyptian history. And he would be right; for thus he avoids the pitfalls into which earlier Egyptologists have repeatedly fallen, to the joy of the unsympathetic.

It only remains to add that the volume is amply and admirably illustrated, some of the reproductions, such as those of the Ramessu II. pectoral, and the portrait of Banutanta (pp. 86, 87), giving a very high idea of Egyptian art even in a period of decadence.

Contributions and Comments.

The Seventh Zionist Congress.

THE seventh Zionist Congress met at Bâle on 27th July last. It met in the shadow cast by the death of the great founder of the movement, the late Dr. Theodor Herzl; it arose from its deliberations in the shadow of a grave crisis as to the future policy of the organization. It was at the previous Congress in 1903 that the offer of the British Government of certain territory in the East African Protectorate to the Zionist body was announced, and it was then resolved to adjourn the matter of the acceptance or rejection pending the report of the Commission which was to be sent out to examine and prospect. That report had been issued some weeks before the seventh Con-

gress met, and the Actions Committee, as was already well known, had recommended the rejection of the offer on account of the unfavourable nature of the Commissioners' conclusions. Thus two grave issues were to be determined by the seventh Congress, namely, what was to be done with the offer, and, secondly, if it was rejected, was it to be rejected on the score of inadequacy only, or as being opposed in principle to the Bâle programme—'the acquisition of a legally assured, publicly recognized home in Palestine'?

During the two years previous to the seventh Congress, then, these issues had been violently agitating the Zionist world. Two parties had formed—the Territorialists, who declare that the general condition of the Jewish people is so pitiable