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1. THE value of Egyptology, like that of Archaeology in
general, as seen in the Himyaritic, Cuneiform, and
Semitic inscriptions which have come to light, is proved by
the confirmation which it affords to the truth and integrity
of Scripture, and especially to the earlier portions of it,
relating to the history of the Israelites in Egypt. Bishop
Colenso has gone so far in his criticism on the Pentateuch as
to declare that:

"All the details of the story of the Exodus, as recorded in the Pentateuch,
again and again assent to propositions as monstrous and absurd as the
statement in arithmetic would be, that two and two make five. There is
not the slightest reason to suppose that the first writer of the story in the
Pentateuch ever professed to be recording infallible truth, or even actual
historical truth. He wrote certainly a narrative. But what indications are
there that he published it at large, even to the people of his own time, as a
record of matter-of-fact, veracious history?" (The Pentateuch Critically
Examined, etc. Part II., pp. 370, 5.)

2. Hence Bishop Colenso denies the assertion of his
brother critic, Dr. Ewald, who affirms, in his Geschichte des
Volkes Israel, that "the historical existence of Moses is
indubitably proved," and refuses to acquiesce in the sober
conclusion of the late Dean Milman, that "all attempts to
assign a later period for the authorship (of the Pentateuch)
or even for the compilation, though made by scholars of the
highest ability, are so irreconcilable with facts, so self-
destructive, and so mutually destructive, that I acquiesce
without hesitation in their general antiquity."

3. Believing that the history of Israel has received valuable
aid in confirmation of its veracity from the recent interpretation
of the Egyptian monuments, I propose to turn to such an
unexceptionable source of authority in order to show the
harmony between the two. It is not necessary to discuss at
any length the mode by which the hieroglyphic inscriptions...
have been rendered useful to Biblical students. It will be sufficient to mention that the decipherment of the Rosetta stone * in the British Museum was first attempted by our countryman Dr. Young, about sixty years ago; and that the system which he inaugurated has been established by the genius of the two Champollions, De Rouge, Mariette, Chabas, and Daveira, amongst the French; Lepsius† and Brugsch amongst the Germans; and of Englishmen the not less distinguished names of Birch, Renouf, Goodwyn, and others, who have contributed their share to the chief philological triumph of the present day.

4. I would remark, in passing, that Egyptology is valuable for chronology as well as for history. The former is too long a subject to be discussed in this present paper, as it should be treated separately; but I have no hesitation in expressing my belief, after a prolonged investigation of the matter, that the chronology of the Bible as computed from the Hebrew, may be proved to be in complete harmony with that which may be deduced from the monuments and papyri of Egypt.

5. My present object, however, is to confine myself to those incidents recorded in Scripture relating to the children of Israel during their sojourn in Egypt from the time of Abraham downwards. And the first proof I would adduce on this subject, though of the negative order, affords a striking instance of the rashness with which a certain class of critics are apt to impugn the integrity of the Bible.

6. Von Bohlen, a distinguished German writer, considered that the fact of the Pentateuch having represented Abraham as receiving "sheep and asses" from Pharaoh, was sufficient to prove its unhistorical character, as he says in his Die Genesis historisch-critisch erläuter that "sheep were unknown to the Egyptians at that period, and asses were especially odious to them on account of their colour." In reply to this crude objection, without laying any stress upon Manetho’s testimony

---

* This monument, which was originally set up in a temple at Memphis, dedicated to Tomos, “the setting sun,” and built by the Pharaoh-Necho of Scripture, was discovered in the year 1799 by M. Boussard, an officer of Bonaparte’s army in Egypt. The battle of Alexandria placed it in the hands of the British. It bore a trilingual inscription; the upper one in hieroglyphic, the centre in enchorial, and the lower in Greek, from which it appeared that the inscription was in honour of Ptolemy Epiphanes, who reigned B.C. 205-181.

† The recent discovery of another trilingual tablet at San (possibly the same as the Biblical "Zoan"), by Professor Lepsius, greater in its extent, and half a century older than the Rosetta stone, is considered of much value as throwing additional light upon the present state of hieroglyphic literature.
that "the goat" was worshipped at Heliopolis, as early as the time of the second dynasty, i.e. two centuries before Abram’s arrival in Egypt, or that Herodotus, Diodorus, and Plutarch severally mention the existence of sheep in that country, it will be sufficient to point to an inscription on a tomb, discovered by Sir Gardner Wilkinson, bearing the name of Pharaoh Chu-fu of the Great Pyramid, according to the custom of the Egyptians, and therefore proving it to be prior to the time of Abraham, in which the head shepherd of Prince Chephren, the nobleman buried there, is represented as giving an account of the flocks committed to his charge, which are seen following him. First come the oxen, over which is inscribed the number 835; cows, 220; goats, 2,235; asses, 760; and sheep, 974.

7. Notwithstanding such a rebuff, Von Bohlen did not hesitate to declare in his comment upon Genesis xliii. 16, that "The author of that book represents Joseph commanding his servants to prepare flesh for food in most manifest opposition to the sacredness of beasts among the Egyptians; their hatred to foreign shepherds being founded on the inviolable-ness of animals, especially of sheep, which were killed by the shepherds, but accounted sacred by the Egyptians," forgetting that he had just before asserted there were no sheep at all in that country! Such is the inconsistency of those who are opposed to the veracity of Scripture in this age of criticism and progress.

8. In a somewhat similar strain Professor Huxley, in his address to a body of the clergy at Sion College in 1867, endeavoured to prove, if I understand him aright, that "a great interval must have elapsed," much longer than the Bible allows, between the times of Abraham and Joseph, because the latter is represented as riding in a chariot, which implies "horses," whereas in the time of the former, he says, "there existed a people highly civilized, but with whom are no traces of chariots or domestic horses." I do not quite see the force of this argument, nor why we are to suppose "a great interval" between the two periods on that account; but I think we may learn something from the monuments on this very subject, which certainly tends to confirm the historic truth of the Bible more than the contrary. We gather from the tomb inscriptions already mentioned, as well as from the list of the gifts bestowed upon Abraham by Pharaoh, that at the time of his sojourn in Egypt horses were evidently unknown to the Egyptians, or they would doubtless have been enumerated with the other animals comprising the stock of Prince Chephren, the owner of the tomb, as well as in the presents bestowed upon the Patri-
arch of the Hebrews. Two centuries after Abraham's visit to Egypt, Joseph was made to ride in Pharaoh's chariot, from which we conclude that during the interval horses had been introduced into the country. Now the first sign of horses on the monuments, as far as is yet known, appears to be during the reign of Thothmes I., who is said to have reared a particular breed of horses in the meadows of Lower Egypt. And as this Pharaoh was the son of the king "which knew not Joseph," according to the Book of Exodus, we may conclude that at some period between the times of Abraham and Joseph they had been introduced into Egypt; probably by the first of the Shepherd kings.

9. From the fact that the sacred writers always speak of the King of Egypt under the generic term of "Pharaoh," instead of the name of the reigning sovereign, with but two exceptions, and those a thousand years after the exode of Israel, we have an additional difficulty in identifying the various Pharaohs mentioned in the Pentateuch. Nevertheless certain things have been recently brought to light which will assist us in our investigation of the subject.

10. Thus Josephus (Antiq. Jud., I. viii. 6), who lived when the Temple records of Egypt still existed, and who would not have ventured, in the presence of his keen opponents of Alexandria, like Appion and others, to state anything without good grounds for his assertion, relates that "Abraham taught the Egyptians arithmetic and the science of astronomy, as before he went down to Egypt they were unacquainted with that sort of learning." And so Eupolemus (apud Euseb. Præp. Evang., § 9), who flourished three centuries before Josephus, affirms that "Abraham was the inventor of astrology and the Chaldaean magic, and on account of his exalted piety was esteemed a god." Now, how far does this agree with what may be learnt from the monuments?

11. Osburn, in his Monumental History of Egypt (I. ch. vii.), says there is not a single record of any Pharaoh, or subject with a date previous to the time of Amenemes I., whereas tablets belonging to his reign with dates inscribed upon them are not uncommon. In the sepulchral grottos of Bennee Hasan on the banks of the Nile, there are still to be seen some inscriptions belonging to this Pharaoh and his immediate successors. Special mention is there made of the Panegyry, or Festival of the First Year; referring, as it is supposed, to the commencement of the "Tropical Cycle;" i.e., a perfectly exact cycle of the sun, moon, and vague year, which the Astronomer Royal fixes b.c. 2005 (Pool's Horæ Egypt., Pt. I. § 11). Now inasmuch as the Hebrew chrono-
logy places Abraham's visit to Egypt B.C. 2010,* are we not warranted in considering that the inscriptions on the monuments of Bennee Hasan, compared with the statements of Eupolemus and Josephus, prove an important synchronism between the histories of Israel and Egypt?

12. If the monuments afford any testimony to the truth of Scripture respecting the life and times of Abraham, still more clearly do they speak respecting his great grandson Joseph, who was promoted from a prison to be the second ruler in the kingdom of Egypt. Julius Africanus, a writer of the third century, mentions that Joseph went to Egypt, and was raised to power under one of those Pharaohs who belonged to the "Shepherd dynasty." Syncellus, a Byzantine historian of the eighth century, says, "All are agreed that Joseph governed Egypt under Pharaoh Apophis, and commenced in the seventeenth year of his reign." What has hitherto only been supported by tradition is now confirmed by the monuments; so that the assertion of Joseph being Viceroy of Egypt under Pharaoh Apophis is as much an historical fact as that Sejanus was prime minister to Tiberius in ancient, or William Pitt to George III. in modern times.

13. Before endeavouring to show how this is the case, it may be right to notice an objection which is frequently brought against this opinion. As we read in the 46th chapter of Genesis, that in the time of Joseph "every shepherd" was considered "an abomination unto the Egyptians," it has been naturally argued that a native Pharaoh would not have promoted Joseph, who was of a shepherd race, to be second ruler in his kingdom, and therefore that Joseph could not have been viceroy during the rule of the shepherds in Egypt. But it is doubtful whether our English version conveys the exact sense of the original; as it is clear that Joseph, before introducing his brethren to Pharaoh, prompted them to avow that they were in reality shepherds, "from our youth even until now, both we and our fathers," in order that Pharaoh might give them "the best of the land (viz., Goshen) to dwell in;" which the king at once consented to do. Now all this can only be explained upon the principle that the shepherd dynasty at that time was reigning in Egypt. The progress of hieroglyphic discovery has not confirmed the common

* Osburn supposes that Abraham's visit to Egypt was during the reign of Pharaoh Acthes, the last king of the eleventh Dynasty; and it is certainly remarkable that the first intimation of the Egyptians practising the rite of circumcision, is found in an inscription as early as the eleventh Dynasty, where the circumcision of the Sun-god is mentioned.
opinion of the "shepherds" having been so odious to the Egyptians as our translation supposes. M. Mariette concludes, from his recent discoveries at Tanis, the Scripture "Zoan," that "the shepherds have been too severely judged;" affirming that "the temple of Sutech, built by Apophis, was ornamented and enriched with images of those Pharaohs of whom the shepherds are accused of destroying all but the remembrance." (Revue Archæol., ii. 104.) The doubt of the correctness of our English version rests upon the word translated "abomination." It is true that toyabah has this meaning; but it is equally certain that of the ninety times in which the word occurs in the Old Testament, it far more frequently signifies "idols," or objects of worship with the heathen, which were necessarily "abomination" to Jehovah; as in 2 Kings xxiii. 13, the idolatry of the children of Ammon is described by the same word, and translated "abomination." Moreover, if we take the unpointed Hebrew as a guide to determine the meaning of the text, the word royah-thon, rendered "shepherd," means likewise "consecrated goat;" so that the passage equally reads, "every consecrated goat is an idol or object of worship with the Egyptians." That such was the case is well known from the testimony of Manetho, who says, that as early as the second dynasty, and centuries before the Israelites were seen in Egypt, "The bulls, Apis in Memphis, and Mnevis in Heliopolis, and the Mendesian goat, were appointed to be gods." (Euseb. Chron. Can., lib. prior, cap. xx.)

14. All this tends to support the truth of the tradition that Joseph was Viceroy of Egypt under Apophis, the most distinguished of the Shepherd kings; and which, I think, is further confirmed by Pharaoh at once recognizing the God of Joseph, as soon as he had interpreted his dream, which the Magi were unable to do. And Pharaoh said to Joseph, "Forasmuch as God has showed thee all this, according unto thy word shall all my people be ruled; only in the throne will I be greater than thou." How can we account for this sudden recognition on the part of Pharaoh, of the one only God, as distinct from the idol-gods of Egypt? A fragment of one of the hieratic papyri in the British Museum, entitled Sallier No. 3, containing contemporary history of the Hyksos, or Shepherd dynasty, throws much light on this subject. The passage reads as follows:

"It came to pass when the land of Egypt was held by the invaders Ra-
skenen was ruling in the South, and Pharaoh Apophis was in his palace at Avaris. The whole land paid tribute to him with their manufactures and all the precious things of the country. Pharaoh Apophis had set up Sutech for
his lord; he worshipped no other God in the whole land. While Apophis
was celebrating the dedication of his temple to Sutech, the ruler of the
South prepared to build a temple in opposition."

15. This noticeable fact of Pharaoh Apophis having been
devoted exclusively to the worship of Sutech has been con­
firmed by Mariette's discovery of a colossal statue at Avaris
with this inscription on the right shoulder:—

Pharaoh Apophis, worshipper of the God Sutech.

Hence, as Dr. Brugsch well observes:—"The mention of
this god in combination with the Shepherd king, proves most
clearly what is stated in the papyrus concerning Apophis
having been specially devoted to the worship of this god to
the exclusion of all the other deities of the whole country."
(Histoire d'Egypt, p. 79.)

16. Who then was this Sutech, the god of the shepherds?
It appears that he was the national god of Syria; and
Pharaoh's recognition of Joseph being enabled to interpret
his dream by the aid of the Syrian god accords with the words
of Moses—"A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he
went down into Egypt and sojourned there with a few, and
became there a nation great, mighty, and populous; and the
Egyptians evil entreated us, and afflicted us, and laid upon us
hard bondage." (Deuteronomy xxvi. 5, 6.) Dr. Birch of the
British Museum, one of the greatest of living authorities in
Egyptology, considers that Sutech denotes "the one only God,
as distinct from all other deities;" which serves to explain an
inscription at Thebes, of the son of Ramessu the Great,
Pharaoh Manepthah, who is represented as worshipping "the
God Sutech of Avaris." As Ewald in his Geschichte des Volkes
Israel, p. 450, asserts that Avaris means philologically nothing
less than "the city of the Hebrews;" and De Rouge gathers
from the Egyptian monuments that Avaris is the same as Tanis,
or the Scripture Zoan, which in Hebrew signifies "motion,"
and is the proper equivalent for Hawar or Avar, "the place of
departure" from which the Israelites went forth at the time
of the Exodus (Revue Arch., 1861, p. 250), we may interpret
the inscription "the God Sutech of Avaris," as signifying in
reality "Jehovah the God of the City of the Hebrews."

17. It is curious to trace the changes which the worship of
Sutech underwent during the four centuries which intervened
between Pharaoh Apophis and Pharaoh Manepthah. On the
expulsion of the shepherds from Egypt, which took place
shortly after the death of Joseph, Sutech assumed another
form and meaning. Considered as an opponent of the gods of the country, his name was destroyed on almost all the monuments. An ass was to the Egyptians the type of their Northern enemies in Syria, so Sutech was represented with the head of an ass; the Egyptian name of which Tao, being the same word as the Greeks employed to designate "the God of the Hebrews." Hence Diodorus relates that when Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 170, entered the Temple on Mount Zion, "he found the figure of a man carved in stone sitting on an ass, whom he took for Moses who built Jerusalem." (Lib. xxxiv. Frag.) Regarding this extraordinary statement as only a gibe of the Greek historian, it is remarkable to see how the early Christians were mocked in a similar way. Amid the ruins of Hadrian's palace at Rome (A.D. 117-138), there has recently been discovered a representation of a human figure crucified with an ass's head, with this inscription beneath—Alexaminos adores his god. And Tertullian writes at the close of the same century—"A new report of our God hath been lately spread in this city (Rome) since a wretch issued a picture with some such title as this—The God of the Christians conceived of an ass." (Apol., ch. xvi.) After a time Sutech came to be regarded by the Egyptians under a different aspect. M. Mariette has discovered a monument in Egypt, showing that Ramessu the Great made use in one instance at least of a chronological era, reckoned from "Noubti," one of the earliest, if not the first of the Shepherd Kings; by which time Sutech had been admitted into the Egyptian Pantheon, just as Tiberius proposed that Christ should be admitted into the Roman. Hence we find the Temple of Abou-Simbel was dedicated by Ramessu the Great to the four principal deities of Egypt at that period of history, viz., Ammon, Pthah, Ra, and Sutech.

18. Although the Himyaritic inscriptions and the Chinese archives bear testimony to the truth of the Mosaic record respecting "the seven years' famine in the time of Joseph, no Egyptian monument has yet been discovered which refers to it. In the life of the late Baron Bunsen, mention is made of the delight with which he received a communication, in 1853, from Dr. Birch, with the decipherment of a hieroglyphic inscription, a portion of which read as follows:—"When in the time of Sesertesen I. the great famine prevailed in all the other districts of Egypt, there was corn in mine." Bunsen hastily pronounced this to be "a certain and incontrovertible proof" of the seven years' famine (Egypt's Place, etc., iii. 334). Dr. Brugsch considers Bunsen's conclusion "impossible for reasons chronological." (Histoire d'Egypte, p. 56.) With this I
cordially agree; for independently of the fact that the reign of Sesertesen I. preceded that of Joseph's Pharaoh by about two centuries, if we note what is said in Scripture respecting the seven years' famine, we shall at once see the distinction between the two. In Genesis xli., 54, it is written "The seven years' dearth was in all lands; but in all the land of Egypt there was bread." It is clear that the two statements cannot record the same event; for whereas the monumental inscription speaks of a great famine extending over all Egypt, save one district, Scripture relates that the seven years' famine was in all lands but Egypt. No two descriptions can be more unlike.

19. Another instance of Bunsen's misapprehension of Scripture has been very decisively contradicted by the monuments of Egypt. The Book of Genesis closes with the assertion that Joseph died at the age of 110. Bunsen declares that "the 110 years of Joseph could not be historical," affirming that his real age was probably not greater than 78. (Egypt's Place, etc., iii. 342.) Now, there is reason to believe, that after the time of Joseph, the limit of longevity was considered by the Egyptians to be just 110 years; and that the desire of attaining that age became quite proverbial amongst them; which may be accounted for by the esteem which they entertained for the memory of Joseph. By the help of the monuments and papyri we can trace through several centuries repeated references to the number "110 years;" which seems to show that such was the case. Thus, in the British Museum, an inscription belonging to a court officer, named Rabaia, of the time of Ramessu the Great (14th cent. B.C.), reads:—

"Adoration to Onnophris, who granted me repose in the tomb after 110 years on earth."

In the Munich Museum, on a statue of Baken-Konsoro, high priest of Ammon, in the time of Pharaoh Seti (15th cent. B.C.), the inscription contains a prayer, that Ammon would grant his servant "the happy life of 110 years." A second inscription in the British Museum, on a black stone, carved in hieratic in place of the usual hieroglyphic characters, dated the 21st year of Amenophis III. (16th cent. B.C.), speaks of certain benefactions which are promised to the objects of the charity—"during the days when they shall repose in the tomb after 110 years."

20. Similar references to this limit of longevity amongst the Egyptians are frequently found in the papyri which have come to light; the most interesting of them being in a papy-
rus brought by M. Prisse d'Avennes from Egypt about thirty years ago, and now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, at Paris. An extract from it reads as follows:—

"Verily, a son, who obeys his father and does what is right, is pleasing unto God. So shalt thou have health and long life, and the royal approbation in all things. Thou shalt attain the age of 110 years in the King's court among the nobles of the land."

As this papyrus appears to have been written during the reign of Pharaoh Assa (18th cent. B.C.), the last of the Shepherd Dynasty, which was ruling at the time of Joseph's death, and is the earliest instance, as far as is known, of any reference to "the age of 110 years" as being proverbial amongst the Egyptians, we are warranted in regarding it as a clear testimony to the truth of the Scripture statement respecting the age of Joseph at the time of his death.*

21. The Book of Exodus opens with the statement that after the death of Joseph and his brethren, "there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph," and who commenced the affliction of the Israelites, by compelling them to build the treasure cities Pithom and Raamses. I believe it to be as certain an historical fact that the "king which knew not Joseph" was Amosis, the head of the 18th Dynasty, and conqueror of the shepherds, as that our William I. was the hero of the Norman conquest. Chronology and history alike point to this conclusion with an amount of evidence that is simply overwhelming. Hence we may expect to find on the monuments the names of "Pithom" and "Raamses" at that period of Egyptian history. Nor are we disappointed. The name "Pithom" has been identified by Dr. Brugsch with the Pâ-chtoum en zâlou, i.e., "the treasure city or fortress of Thom, built by foreign captives." The name occurs in the 6th Tableau of the grand Hall in the Temple of Ammon at Karnac, in the time of Pharaoh Seti (Brugsch, Hist. d'Eqyp., p. 129); and also two centuries earlier, in the annals of Thothmes III., grandson of the Amosis referred to before (Brugsch, Geograph. Inscript., iii. 21); and there can be little doubt but that it is the identical treasure city Pithom built by the children of Israel.

* From a further consideration of what Mariette and Chabas have written on this subject, I am led to think the evidence conclusive that the Pharaoh referred to in the Papyrus Prisse belongs to the fourth Dynasty, and not to the last of the Shepherd kings. But this does not affect the argument respecting the age of Joseph; for the son who is of the age of 110 appears to have a father living at the time.—March, 1872.
22. Respecting the name of "Raamses" or "Ramesses," as it is generally written, M. Chabas, a distinguished French Egyptologist, regards it as a proof that the "king who knew not Joseph" must refer to Ramesses I. or his grandson, Ramessu the Great; when the name of Ramessu is first met with amongst the Pharaohs of Egypt. But this is a mistake. If we regard the Hebrew mode of spelling the name we find it written $RHMSS$, and pronounced probably $Ramess$. So on the monuments, we find a name exactly like it at this very period of history, and in a position which would naturally account for one of the "treasure cities" being called after him. The name of one of the sons of the "king who knew not Joseph" reads $Ra-MSS$, whereas the Pharaohs of the house of Ramesses, which reigned two centuries later, have the final $u$ generally speaking at the end of their name; so that the exact way of rendering it in English would be rather Ramessu than Raamses, or Ramesses. And thus it appears that the Hebrew name as it is written in Exodus i. 11, is more like the son of Amosis, which is thus inscribed on his cartouche, "The king's son Ra-MSS ever living," than that of the subsequent line of Pharaohs, (Königsbuch der Alten Ägypter, von C. Lepsius, Tafeln xxii. xxx.-xxxiii.)

23. Before entering upon the next step in detecting the harmony between the monuments and Scripture, it may not be amiss to insert a brief genealogical sketch of the different Pharaohs during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, as the monuments have yielded more information respecting these kings than all the other Pharaohs, with the exception of Ramessu the Great, put together,

**Shepherd Dynasty.**

Pharaoh Apophis (Joseph’s Patron).

Pharaoh Assa (Last of the Shepherd Kings).

1706 B.C. Amosis (Conqueror of the Shepherds),

Queen Hat-asu = Thothmes II.

("Pharaoh’s daughter,"

who preserved Moses.)

Amenophis I. ob. s.p. Thothmes I.

Amenophis II.

Thothmes III.

Thothmes IV. (drowned in the Red Sea B.C. 1580).

**Manetho’s xviii. Dynasty.**

Pharaohs Assa (Last of the Shepherd Kings).

1706 B.C. Amosis (Conqueror of the Shepherds),

Queen Hat-asu = Thothmes II.

("Pharaoh’s daughter,"

who preserved Moses.)

Amenophis I. ob. s.p. Thothmes I.

Amenophis II.

Thothmes III.

Thothmes IV. (drowned in the Red Sea B.C. 1580).

24. With reference to what is stated in Scripture respecting the preservation of Moses, it may be safely assumed from
Exodus i. 10, Acts vii. 22, and Hebrews xi. 24, that he was reared as the adopted son of "Pharaoh's daughter," who must have been a Queen Regnant in her own right, as none but such could have compelled so jealous a priesthood to train her adopted child "in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." Now it can be satisfactorily shown from the monuments, that in the whole line of Pharaohs there was only one Queen Regnant, whose name appears as such during that long period of time. Her name is read on the monuments in full as Hat-asu Numpt-amun, and she appears exactly in the place we should have expected to find her from the account in Exodus, being, as is seen in the above pedigree, the granddaughter of the "king which knew not Joseph." She reigned many years in Egypt, first in the name of her father, then conjointly with her husband, and subsequently in the name of her younger brother Thothmes III., who latterly sought to erase every sign of his sister's rule, either through revenge at her having offered the succession to Moses, or from some other cause unknown.

25. Queen Hat-asu is invariably represented on her monuments with a beard to denote that she was a sovereign in her own right, like our own Queen Victoria. She erected two obelisks at Thebes in memory of her father, one of which is still standing, and the fragments of the other are scattered all around. The standing one, the second largest and certainly the most beautiful obelisk in the world, is formed of a single block of red granite, highly polished, with reliefs and hieroglyphs of matchless beauty. The inscription on the plinth states that it was commenced in the 15th year of Queen Hat-asu's reign, and completed in the seventeenth. On each side of the obelisk it is stated that she reigned "in the name of her father;" and amongst other titles which she bears,—such as "royal wife," "Queen of Upper and Lower Egypt,"—is found the significant and well-known name of "Pharaoh's daughter."

26. The temple of Dier-el-Bahari, at Thebes, is another monument due to the magnificence of Queen Hat-asu, on the walls of which are sculptured with great skill the details of a campaign against the Ethiopians. They represent the Egyptian general receiving the enemy's commander-in-chief, who presents himself as a suppliant before him, accompanied by his wife and daughter. And it is just possible that the representation of Hat-asu's general may refer to her adopted child Moses; for Scripture shows that he was "mighty in words and deeds," before he "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter." And Josephus (Antiq., II. x. § 2) and
Irenæus (Frag. de Perdit. Iren. Tract., p. 347) alike relate the
fame which Moses gained as general of the Egyptian army in
a war with Ethiopia, which, though encumbered with a good
deal of romance, still serves to explain the statement in
Numbers xii. 1, that Moses married a woman of that
country.

27. Perhaps the most positive proof from the monuments of
the existence of the Israelites in Egypt at this period of
history, is seen in the well-known picture of the brickmakers
at the village of Gournou, near Thebes, there still exists the
remains of a magnificent tomb belonging to an Egyptian noble
named Ros-she-ra. He appears to have been overseer of all
the public buildings in Egypt during the reign of Thothmes III.
The paintings on this tomb, which are given with great effect
in Lepsius, Denkmäler (Abth. iii., Bl. 40), afford clear proof not
only of the Israelites being in Egypt at the very time that
Moses was compelled to flee to Midian, but of their being
forcibly engaged in the occupation of brickmaking. There
are several inscriptions on this remarkable monument, portions
of which read as follow:

The centre inscription—

"Captives brought by his Majesty Thothmes III.
To carry on the works at the Temple of Ammon."

On the left—

"Moulding bricks for making a treasure city in Thebes."

On the right—

"The chief task-master says to the builders: 'Work
Actively with the hands. Be not idle. Let there be no giving in.'"

28. Some of these captives employed in making bricks bear
the unmistakable features of the Hebrew race; and among them
four Egyptian task-maskers are represented as described in
the Book of Exodus, so as to leave no reason for doubt but
that the picture represents a striking commentary on the
oppression of the children of Israel. Sir Gardner Wilkinson
remarks "that more bricks bearing the name of Thothmes III.
have been discovered than of any other period." And
Rosellini adds that "the bricks which are now found in
Egypt, belonging to this reign, always have straw mingled with
them, although in some of those that are most carefully made
it is found in very small quantities."

29. The world was startled a few years ago by M. Chabas's
discovery in the Leyden papyrus of a set of captives who are
described as being employed in drawing stone for the Temple of the Sun, built by Ramessu the Great, which he reads as belonging to the tribe of the Aperi-u, identifying them with the "Hebrews," and confidently challenging disproof of this theory. But independently of the fact that the same tribe are spoken of as possessing a Lower and an Upper Kingdom when the bondage of the Israelites was at its height in the reign of Thothmes III., and also as "captives" during the time of Ramessu IV., i.e. centuries after the exode, making it thereby impossible to identify them with the Jewish race, we are compelled to reject M. Chabas's theory on philological grounds likewise: e.g., the exact mode of rendering the word "Hebrews" in Roman characters would be Haberim; the hieroglyphic characters read literally Apu-ri-aa-a, by which it will be at once seen that these letters do not approximate sufficiently near to the Hebrew word Haberim to warrant our identification of them as the same people.

30. A variety of incidents combine to show that the grandson of Thothmes III., and bearing the same name, was the individual Pharaoh who appears from Scripture to have been overthrown in the Red Sea, notwithstanding that Sir Gardner Wilkinson, who regards Thothmes III., as the Pharaoh of the exode, contends "there is no authority in the writings of Moses for supposing that Pharaoh was drowned in the Red Sea." (Ancient Egyptians, i. 54.) It is certain from the monuments that his reign was a short one, which agrees with what Scripture records of this infatuated king. A tablet between the paws of the Great Sphinx at Ghizeh is one of the few monuments remaining of this Pharaoh. Another inscription discovered on a granite rock opposite the island of Philae, on the Nile, has this singular circumstance connected with it. After the usual boasting titles, it stops suddenly short with the disjunctive particle "then,"—evidently pointing to defeat and disaster, which were the characteristics of this Pharaoh's reign. And the inference that he was the Pharaoh lost in the Red Sea appears to be confirmed by the fact that after all the careful researches of modern explorers, no trace has been found of this king's tomb in the royal burial-place near Thebes, where the sovereigns of the 18th Dynasty lie; though that of his successor, Amenophis III. has been discovered in a valley adjoining the cemetery of the other kings. (Wilkinson's Thebes, pp. 122, 3.)

31. It is not quite clear that Amenophis III. immediately succeeded his reputed father Thothmes IV., though he is so represented in the two tablets of Abydos, which if true would serve to confirm the opinion of the latter being the Pharaoh
of the exode. Wilkinson says that "though Amenophis III. calls himself the son of Thothmes IV., there is reason to believe that he was not of pure Egyptian race. His features differ very much from those of other Pharaohs, and the respect paid to him by some of the 'stranger kings' seems to confirm this, and to argue that he was partly of the same race as those kings who afterwards usurped the throne and made their name and rule so odious to the Egyptians" (Rawlinson's Herod., Appendix, II. viii. § 2). If this surmise be correct, and several other incidents, such as the change in the national religion which commenced in the reign of Amenophis III., seem to confirm it, it is noteworthy to see how far it agrees with the statement in Exodus, that the eldest son of the Pharaoh of the exode did not succeed his father on the throne, as it is written: "At midnight the Lord smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne, unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon."

32. Such is a brief sketch of the history of Israel in Egypt as confirmed by the monuments of that country. Dr. Thompson has well observed that "the illustration and confirmation which the Egyptian monuments bring to the sacred narrative is capable of much ampler treatment than it has yet received. Every incident in the pastoral and agricultural life of the Israelites in Egypt, and in the exactions of their servitude, every art employed in the fabrication of the Tabernacle in the Wilderness, every allusion to Egyptian rites, customs, and laws find some counterpart or illustration in the picture history of Egypt; and whenever the Theban cemetery shall be fully explored, we shall have a commentary of unrivalled interest and value upon the Books of Exodus and Leviticus, as well as the later historical books of the Hebrew Scriptures." (Smith's (Dictionary of the Bible, art. Thebes.)

The Chairman.—I have now to move that the thanks of this meeting be given to the author of this paper, who, I am sorry to say, is absent this evening on account of illness. Had he been present, I should have asked him many questions, but I hope we have some one else here who is acquainted with Egyptology, because we want much more information on the subject than is contained in this paper. I shall now be glad to hear any observations which those present may have to offer on the subject before us, and may I express a hope that some reference will be made to the newly-discovered stone of which we have all heard.

Rev. J. H. Titcomb.—While fully acknowledging the research and industry manifested in the compilation of Mr. Savile's paper, I feel bound to say, that I regard it as the work of an enthusiast to one idea rather than that...
of a patient and large-minded investigator into a sphere which is almost boundless in its capacity for illustration. If I understand Mr. Savile's argument rightly, it stands or falls with the chronological synchronism of Moses and Tuthmosis, or, as Mr. Savile calls him, Thothmes III., and of Joseph and Pharaoh Apophis. Assuming, of course, that that synchronism is correct, I am ready to grant that Mr. Savile brings several points which fairly illustrate his position; but the question is, has Mr. Savile fair grounds for being so confident as he is upon this particular point? I think he speaks with too much confidence when he says, in his 12th section,—

"The assertion of Joseph being Viceroy of Egypt under Pharaoh Apophis is as much an historical fact as that Sejanus was prime minister to Tiberius in ancient, or William Pitt to George III. in modern times."

And in another sentence, in his 21st section, he is still more confident, for he says:—

"I believe it to be as certain an historical fact that the 'king which knew not Joseph' was Amosis, the head of the 18th dynasty, and conqueror of the Shepherds, as that our William I. was the hero of the Norman conquest."

Now, it will be my object to show that that theory is not correct, and first by pointing out what I consider to be some of the weak points of the paper. In the 13th section Mr. Savile tries to show that Joseph told his brethren to tell Pharaoh that they were shepherds, as a recommendation to Pharaoh, because Pharaoh himself was one of the shepherd kings. That is Mr. Savile's argument; but it might be equally well put just the opposite way. Assuming that Pharaoh was not a shepherd king, and that ordinarily shepherds were held in abomination in Egypt,* then Joseph might have told his brethren to declare that they were shepherds, in order to be kept as far away as possible, in the land of Goshen, out of the reach of danger and insult. That, I maintain, is quite as natural a supposition as the other. (Hear, hear.) Then, in his 16th section, Mr. Savile maintains that the city Avaris was "the city of the Hebrews," and that that is its real meaning; but I venture to criticise that point. Assuming it to be the case that Avaris was "the city of the Hebrews," and was known by that title, and had its origin because it was given to the Hebrews when they settled there in the time of Apophis, I can show by a quotation from Manetho that the whole of that theory may be entirely upset. Manetho says:—

"Salatis found a city lying to the east of the Bubasrite arm of the Nile, called Avaris, which he repaired and fortified with strong walls. . . . He

* See Canon Cook On the Bearings of Egyptian History upon the Pentateuch, Speaker's Commentary, vol. i. p. 443, et seq. Bishop Harold Browne says the monuments of the Egyptians indicate their contempt for shepherds and goatherds, by the mean appearance always given to them.—Ed.
died after a reign of 19 years, and was succeeded by another king, Beon, who reigned 44 years. After him, Apachus reigned 36 years. Then Apophis."

So that the city was actually known by the name of Avaris 99 years before the time of Apophis; and if that be correct, it altogether breaks down the argument of Mr. Savile that it was named Avaris because possessed by the Hebrews in the time of Apophis. Then in the 18th section of the paper, while I quite agree with Mr. Savile in maintaining that the famine chronicled as having taken place in the reign of Sesertesen I. was not the famine spoken of by Moses in Genesis, I cannot but call attention to Mr. Savile’s strange mistake in arguing from Scripture that the famine was not in Egypt. So far from the statement being correct that Moses declared that there was famine in all lands but Egypt, the very opposite is the case. In the 41st chapter of Genesis, verses 30 and 31, we are told:—

“And there shall arise after them seven years of famine; and all the plenty shall be forgotten in the land of Egypt; and the famine shall consume the land; and the plenty shall not be known in the land by reason of that famine following; for it shall be very grievous.”

It is true that there was plenty of corn in Egypt, but it does not at all follow that there were plenty of crops, and that harvesting was going on. The famine was in Egypt just as much as anywhere else, but that does not bear on the main argument; it is simply an error of reasoning on the part of Mr. Savile. Then, in the 27th section of the paper, there is another weak point connected with the interesting picture of brickmaking referred to by Mr. Savile. His argument is, that one of the most positive proofs of the existence of Israel in Egypt in the reign of Thothmes III. is that some of the captives in that picture bear the unmistakable features of the Hebrew race. But there are two replies to that argument. The first is, that if the picture had been one of the Hebrews working in bondage, I apprehend that all the captives would have borne that ethnological portrait; and the second is, that the captives so represented might as well have been intended for Chaldeans as for Hebrews. Having shown these weak points in Mr. Savile’s paper, I will now endeavour to raise some independent arguments of my own against the view propounded in it, that Joseph fell in with the shepherd kings. If he did, he must have fallen in with the Semitic race; but I think that all the Scripture testimony that we have goes to show that the Pharaoh with whom Joseph had to do was not of the Semitic, but of the pure Egyptian or Hamitic race. In the first place, all the names mentioned in the narrative are pure Egyptian, and not Semitic. Potiphar, or Petphra, is not a Semitic but a pure Egyptian name, bearing no analogy to the names that most probably would have existed about the court during the time of the shepherd kings. Then, in the 41st chapter of Genesis, verse 45, there is this strong argument:—

“And Pharaoh called Joseph’s name Zaphnath-paaneah; and he gave him to wife Asenath, the daughter of Poti-pherah, priest of On.”
Here is an assemblage, not of Semitic, but of pure Egyptian names; and, to my mind, if Pharaoh had been a shepherd king, hating the native Egyptians as we know the shepherd kings did, it would have been inconceivable that he should have given Joseph, as a mark of special honour, an Egyptian rather than a Semitic name, and still less is it conceivable that the worship of the Egyptians in the temple of On (which is the ancient Heliopolis)—being a purely Egyptian form of worship—should have been carried on by the shepherd kings, who overthrew all the idols of Egypt and established a different form of worship in their place. Again, this theory is to my mind incompatible with the genealogy of the Scriptures. By Mr. Savile's calculation, the Pharaoh drowned in the Red Sea was Thothmes IV., whom he supposes to have died 1580 years before Christ. How he gets the date I do not quite know, for Archbishop Usher's chronology makes it 1491 B.C.; but, be that as it may, if Mr. Savile is right, the interval between the Exodus and Solomon's prime of life was exactly 580 years. I may be asked, How do I get this? Because it is an undisputed fact that there is an historical date to be assigned to the time of Solomon, and that date is B.C. 1000. Nobody questions this, however much we may differ as students of Egyptology or of Scripture up to that time. Every student of chronology, from a comparison with Greek and other profane histories, accepts the fact as established and true, that Solomon was on the throne 1000 B.C. If, then, the Exodus took place in the reign of Thothmes IV., 1580 B.C., there was an interval of 580 years between the Exodus and the time when Solomon was on the throne. Now turn to the fourth chapter of the book of Ruth, and at the end of it you will find the generations of Pharez. In the 20th verse you have the birth of Nahshon, and the genealogy is continued thence down to David. Nahshon was a prince of the tribe of Judah at the time of the Exodus, as the book of Numbers tells us; but from Nahshon there are only six generations down to Solomon. Nahshon begat Salmon, Salmon begat Boaz, Boaz begat Obed, Obed begat Jesse, Jesse begat David, and David begat Solomon, making six generations in all, to cover a period of 580 years. That gives an average of 96 years for each generation, and I ask whether this is not evidently unhistorical, and whether a theory which demands such a belief can be accepted in a critical age such as this is? Is it probable that men lived 96 years each for six generations in order to hand down the stream of life?

The CHAIRMAN.—I understand you to mean that if Mr. Savile's theory be correct, each must have had his eldest son at 96 years of age?

Mr. TITCOMB.—Yes. I think it is incompatible with fact, and the whole argument, therefore, in my opinion, falls to the ground. Now, before I close, allow me to advance my own view in the shape of a counter synchronism between Israel in Egypt and the Egyptian kings. I will not speak confidently about my view, but I will bring a few arguments to show that it is at least probable. One whom I see present (the Rev. D. I. Heath) may possibly dispute my position, as I am now disputing Mr. Savile's, but that only forms one of the interesting intellectual exercises to be met with in
a philosophical institution. My view is that of Lepsius—that Ramesses II. was the Pharaoh whose daughter reared Moses and who began the persecution of the Israelites, and that Manepthah, the son of Ramesses II., was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Now on what grounds do I hold this view? First, on chronological evidence, and then on the evidence of the Egyptian monuments. First, as to chronological evidence, I have drawn up and have here a list of the Egyptian kings. It is the result of a close and painstaking collation of the records of the Egyptian dynasties as given by Manetho and as explored by Lepsius and other students of Egyptology. Bunsen has most carefully and methodically compared the works of Erastothanes and Manetho, and Julius Africanus with Lepsius, and has come to the conclusion, that this Manepthah lived 1313 years before Christ. I know that that date differs from the chronology of the Bible, but that chronology is only a deduction made by a modern writer, Archbishop Usher; and then again we have other Biblical chronologies, such as the chronology of Hale, &c.; and we have, therefore, a perfect right to dispute the dates given, on the margins of our Bible, as they are entirely a matter of human investigation. I may therefore say, at once, that I do not think 1491 B.C. is the right date to affix to the Exodus; and I have two reasons for saying so. In the fourth century there was a system of chronology discovered or rather laid down by a certain Rabbi, which has since gone by the name of Rabbinical chronology. It was compiled by comparing the most ancient Hebrew texts extant, and it is a very remarkable fact that the date B.C. which that Rabbinical chronology assigns to the Exodus is the very year 1313, which, from the monuments submitted to the critical faculty of Bunsen, centuries after, has been pronounced to be the time of Manepthah. You may say this is a coincidence, and that you prefer the chronology of Usher, but now I come back to that chronology of Ruth as my second reason, and as a Scriptural reason for my view. The four generations from Pharez to Hezron and to Nahshon will not cover the interval between Jacob's descent into Egypt and the Exodus of Moses, and I therefore come to this, which I must ask you to take for granted. It is generally allowed that the sojourn in Egypt covered 215 years. Mr. Birks, in his book on the Exodus, speaks with confidence, as of a thing almost settled, that 215 years is the right number to allow for it, being the half of the 430 mentioned in the New Testament, and Josephus says:—“They left Egypt 215 years after Jacob came into it.” Now, taking the chronology of Ruth, you have four generations to cover this period, which gives an average of 53 years to each generation; that is quite credible—although perhaps it is not what we might have anticipated—it is not unhistorical, and it is quite conceivable. Assuming that, then, what is the result you obtain? Between the Exodus and Solomon there are six generations; which, multiplied by 53, brings you to the date 318, and then add the date of Solomon, 1000, and you get the date 1318 by a purely Biblical criticism; which date is so very near 1313 that the two may be practically taken as synchronous. This is my argument for supposing that Manepthah represents the Pharaoh of the Exodus rather than Thothmes IV.
I have only one more branch of argument, which is drawn from the evidence of Egyptology itself. What took place in the reign of Manepthah, or of Amenophis, as Manetho calls him? A very singular event—the expulsion of the lepers. Manetho says:

"Amenophis, having a great desire to behold the gods, was told that he could not do so until he rid the country of lepers, who were an abomination. On this account he ordered 80,000 to the stone quarries, there to work in hard labour. After the poor wretches had suffered, he gave them up the city of Avaris. There they chose a leader,—a priest Osarsiph, who ordered that they should worship none of the Egyptian gods, and they commenced a revolt against Egypt. Against these rebels Amenophis went out to fight, but he fled from them for fear of the gods."

And Manetho adds:

"It is said that Osarsiph, who, upon joining them, drew up a constitution and a code of laws for them, changed his name and was called Moses."

This is the record of Manetho, who lived centuries before Christ, and fragments of whose arguments are preserved by Josephus. Now this was a singular circumstance, and, as falling in with that period, it is a fair argument for supposing that it represents the "driving out" of Israel, from the Egyptian point of view, or as we call it, the glorious exodus of the Israelites. Again, the king who pursued them is represented as flying from them, which falls in with the fact that he was not able to conquer them. Now let us go back to Ramesses II., or the Great. In the second chapter of Exodus we are told:

"And it came to pass in process of time that the king of Egypt died, and the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage";

and then comes the exodus. Egyptology itself shows that the predecessor of Manepthah began the persecution of the Israelites, and the Bible shows that it was in his reign that the city Raamses was built. We may expect to find that that city was built by the Jews, and we do find it; and the name of the city falls in exactly with the name of the king under whom they lived. Then Tuthmosis IV. would be the Pharaoh living when Joseph and his brethren came into Egypt with their father. In the nature of things there would be new religious influences introduced by the splendour of the achievements of Joseph's wisdom. The king honoured the God of Joseph, and felt that the God of the Hebrews was a great God. Have we nothing to show that in that reign there was the importation of a new religion? We have just the very thing that is wanted. We learn that under the successor of Ramesses, Amenophis III., a new worship was introduced, called the worship of the sun's disc, or the worship of Aten. Dr. Birch is my authority for this; and it falls in with the state of things you might expect, that after the Pharaoh in whose reign Joseph had become so illustrious had died, there would be a great accession of influence in the cause of the true religion of Joseph, which must be expected to tell upon society and to be made visible. The word "Aten" must be read "Adn," which it seems amounted to just.
the same as Adonai, Lord,—one of the Hebrew words for God. The truth is that the Egyptian monuments do confirm the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, but I think Mr. Savile is in error in being so confident of particular synchronisms. The monuments of Egypt are full of illustrations which would give everything we want without any attempt at synchronism at all. I have attempted synchronisms because Mr. Savile has done so; but I do not think that it is the right way of dealing with this question. The proper method would be to give these points as illustrations of the harmony of other evidence with the Old Testament, and there to leave it. (Cheers.)

Rev. C. GRAHAM.—I think we have reason to feel greatly obliged to Mr. Savile for introducing this subject to us. It is profoundly interesting, and one which must throw a great deal of light upon Holy Scripture, as the observations of Mr. Titcomb have sufficiently proved. Mr. Titcomb began his remarks on the destructive, and then entered upon the constructive principle, and for a few moments I will endeavour to follow him in the first of these two branches. I do not at all agree with Mr. Savile's criticisms. In the 13th section, he says:—

"Before endeavouring to show how this is the case, it may be right to notice an objection which is frequently brought against this opinion. As we read in the 46th chapter of Genesis, that in the time of Joseph 'every shepherd' was considered 'an abomination unto the Egyptians,' it has been naturally argued that a native Pharaoh would not have promoted Joseph, who was of a shepherd race, to be second ruler in his kingdom, and therefore that Joseph could not have been viceroy during the rule of the shepherds in Egypt. But it is doubtful whether our English version conveys the exact sense of the original; as it is clear that Joseph, before introducing his brethren to Pharaoh, prompted them to avow that they were in reality shepherds, 'from our youth even until now, both we and our fathers,' in order that Pharaoh might give them 'the best of the land (viz. Goshen) to dwell in,' which the king at once consented to do. Now all this can only be explained upon the principle that the Shepherd dynasty at that time was reigning in Egypt."

A little further down Mr. Savile gives us the Hebrew word, which he renders "idol" or "consecrated object of worship"—toyabah. But that word radically and primarily means just what our translators have rendered it—"abomination." Its tropical meaning no doubt is an idol, and it is often used tropically for an idol, but its primary meaning is just what we have in our version. Gesenius gives us that same word from the 43rd chapter as an example of the rendering "abomination." Now, if we alter the translation in the 46th chapter, we are obliged to alter it in the 43rd also, where the Egyptians would not consent to eat at the same table with Joseph's brethren, because to eat bread with the Hebrews was an abomination to the Egyptians. Gesenius introduces both passages; in both the word is the same, but in the second it is inconstruct, and the Septuagint renders it "abomination" in both places. I have taken the trouble to consult some of our best commentators and translators on the subject, and they are all agreed that the simple meaning of the word, in these instances, is "abomination." Then Mr. Savile
makes another alteration. He takes the words *roch teon*, used for shepherd, and offers a criticism which I do not find in any other critic, taking Dr. Tregelles along with the rest; and therefore I think it must be clearly and distinctly rejected, and all that is built upon it must fall to the ground. But there is another point which, while upon this destructive principle, I must refer to. Mr. Savile says in his 26th section:—

“It is just possible that the representation of Hat-asu's general may refer to her adopted child Moses; for Scripture shows that he was 'mighty in words and deeds,' before he 'refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter.' And Josephus and Irenaeus alike relate the fame which Moses gained as general of the Egyptian army in a war with Ethiopia, which, though encumbered with a good deal of romance, still serves to explain the statement in Numbers xii. 1, that Moses married a woman of that country.”

As to the triumphs of Moses in Africa, as a general of the Egyptian army, we may accept Mr. Savile's view that there is no evidence to sustain them; but what about Moses having married a woman of that country? We have only the account of one marriage of Moses. When he forsook Egypt, fearing the wrath of Pharaoh, he went to the land of Midian, where he was received by Jethro the priest, whose daughter, Zipporah, he married, and by her he had two sons. After he had brought Israel through the Red Sea and the wilderness, Jethro, or Reuel—for he has both names in the Pentateuch—brought Zipporah and her two sons to Mount Sinai to Moses. Zipporah had before accompanied Moses, but she was sent back after what had transpired at the inn; but as soon as Moses triumphed, Jethro brought Zipporah and her two sons to him. Now who was Zipporah? She was a Cushite, for I need not say that that Hebrew word which is always rendered Ethiopian is Cushite. Now what was that? Go back to the 2nd chapter of Genesis and you will see that one of the four rivers that branched from the Garden of Eden compassed the whole land of Ethiopia, or of Cush. It is assuredly not Ethiopia in Africa, but Ethiopia in Asia. Now Zipporah dwelt in the land of Cush, who was the son of Ham, and who peopled that part of Asia. Cush in the first instance is applied to Arabia and to that land of Midian which seems to have been in the peninsula of Sinai. Zipporah is called a Cushite, and would naturally be so called by Aaron and Miriam in their factious dispute with Moses. Probably they were jealous of Zipporah's influence, and that dispute very likely arose when Jethro returned to his own home. In this I consider there is no argument whatever to sustain the teaching of Mr. Savile's 26th section.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think it is universally admitted that that passage from Josephus alluding to the marriage of the queen's daughter is a simple fiction. It has all the appearance of fiction.

Mr. GRAHAM.—Well, I take what is indisputable,—Scripture history and the geography we gather from it,—and I submit that there is no ground whatever for Mr. Savile's argument. And now let me add a little that is constructive, or more properly perhaps, auxiliary, to the subject of this paper. I think that in the book of Genesis we find much that coincides
with statements in profane history in relation to Israel in Egypt, and to Israel and Egypt. There is no question, according to the statements of historians, that at the period when Abram went down into Egypt, that country was in a high state of civilization; and that coincides with the statement in Genesis that Abram was hospitably received by Pharaoh and entertained by him, and that he received from him large presents, and among them were sheep and asses and camels and slaves. Mr. Savile has dealt very properly here with the asses and sheep, but another objection has been raised to the presentation to Abram by Pharaoh of camels, on the ground that at that time the camel was not known in Egypt. Now apart from the fact that Egypt was surrounded by deserts, and that the camel is exceedingly useful for desert travelling, and has obtained the name of "the ship of the desert," so that it is not at all probable that the Egyptians would know nothing of camels, it is a fact that the head and neck of the camel have been traced on the monuments of Egypt in many instances. Then as to the fact of Abram receiving slaves from Pharaoh. We know that slavery was a state of the most cruel bondage in almost every case where it existed during the early period, but it was not a state of the most cruel bondage in Egypt. We find, according to the statement of Diodorus in a quotation given from that author in Dr. Kitto's fragments of Egyptian laws, that it was punishable by death for any man to put to death his slave. Compare that with the simple fact that when Joseph falls under the displeasure of Potiphar, he is not at once put to death, but is sent to prison; and that even the king himself, when he suspects two of his servants, the chief butler and the chief baker, does not deal with them in a summary way and order them to execution, but sends them to prison; and it seems that there was some sort of trial before even the king could put them to death, and that that investigation led to the release of Joseph. Here is a striking coincidence between the statements of Diodorus and the facts recorded in Genesis. Now we come to Joseph as viceroy, and we are told that the priests did not sell their land to him when the people did. They had no necessity to sell their land, because they had a portion allowed them by the king of Egypt. Now take up Herodotus, and you will find that the priests were entirely saved from all domestic cares and concerns, and they had not merely the consecrated bread but a daily allowance from the king and an abundance of geese. There is distinct harmony between Herodotus and Genesis. Then take the fact of the idolatry instituted by the Israelites after their delivery from Egypt. They set up a calf or steer, which is what the Hebrew word means, at Sinai, and they worshipped it. That was evidently an imitation of Apis, the Ox-god of the Egyptians. Look at the feast which follows the worship. There is eating and drinking and dancing, and, what has often perplexed commentators, the people were stripped naked. In the Egyptian festivals the people cast away their garments, and in this case there is the distinct fact mentioned that the people were naked, and Moses deals with them as having cast away their clothes. It does not mean that they were literally naked, but, according to the Egyp-
tian custom, they cast away their outer garments. Further on we are told that Jeroboam came from Egypt, and in order to prevent the ten tribes from going up to Jerusalem to worship, he set up two calves,—one in Dan in the north, and one in Bethel in the south-east of the kingdom: and there is another simple fact quite in accordance with the facts of the Scriptures: in the book of Amos we have the passage quoted by Stephen; they took up the tabernacle of Moloch, the "star of their god Remphon," the images which they made to worship. In Amos we have Chiu mentioned as one of these images, and according to the monumental records we have these gods worshipped in Egypt,—the very worship that was practised in the wilderness by Israel. They had idols something like the Roman Lares and Penates, or like the shrines made by Demetrius and the craftsmen with him, for Diana; and these are matters that strictly corroborate the statements of Sacred Scripture. There is another fact noticed by Herodotus, that Egypt had a standing army, and that I believe is corroborated by the Greek historians generally. Herodotus enters into details, and tells us that every soldier had twelve acres of land, and that 2,000 of them formed the guard of Pharaoh. Now compare that with the Biblical narrative. As soon as Pharaoh finds that the Israelites do not cross the isthmus and go directly to Canaan, but go down the western shore of the Red Sea, he at once musters a large force of infantry and cavalry, and 600 chosen chariots, and pursues them. There we have a fact that strongly corroborates the statements of the Divine penman, and I believe we shall also find in the Greek historians this fact, that no nation except Egypt had a standing army. But, in truth, we are constantly coming across important facts which add continually to the accumulation of evidence which substantiates and corroborates strongly and decisively the great statements of the Inspired record. (Cheers.)

The Chairman.—Perhaps Mr. Heath, who has long studied Egyptology, may have some interesting matter to lay before us.

The Rev. Dunbar I. Heath.—I have only come to hear the paper and the discussion. It is fifteen years since I brought out a volume on this branch of learning, Exodus Papyri, but I am bound to confess that that volume has not yet set the world on fire, and as for myself, my memory has suffered so much that three-fourths of what I did know has now entirely gone from me. I am, however, glad to say that, in my opinion, Mr. Titcomb's chronology is substantially correct, and I will just add one more argument to his, based upon the history of the time. You will remember that when Joshua, forty or fifty years after the Exodus, invades South Palestine, he fights no battle with the great nations we had before heard of, the Suzims, the Anakims, and the Elims,—the great Giants of our translation; but he fights a nation hardly mentioned before, the Amorites, who must have come forward at a time when these great Shepherd nations had disappeared. And here I may mention, that the Shepherd nations have been spoken of as if they were veritable shepherds. They were really the Suzims, or Shasu in Egyptian, having nothing whatever to do, so far as I can make
out, with our word "shepherd." Joshua came in to fight the Amorites after the Shepherds had disappeared, and by one battle he won the south of Judea. Now, it is allowed on all hands that Ramesses II. was the great conqueror who destroyed these Shasu. We have full documentary evidence of this, and I have reproduced his campaign in this *Exodus Papyri*. Indeed, we know a great deal of his time, and we know from the races which he conquered that the Exodus must have been after his time. We say the Jews dwelt in Egypt, and we talk of Egypt as being a word of very wide significance. If we speak of the land of Ham, we may be right, but if we talk of Mizraim, which in nineteen cases out of twenty we do talk of as the place where the Jews dwelt, that is a very different matter.* In the same way, when we talk of the well-known city of Tyre, we often forget that there were two more cities of Tyre, one in the Persian Gulf and the other in the Mediterranean Sea. I do not profess that the five papyri translated in my book are all as accurately rendered as would be the case if one were doing a bit of Herodotus or Thucydides, but there is a vast amount in my translation which no Egyptian scholar would at all deny. The main difficulty in translating is found in the fragmentary nature of the documents. In these papyri we have a Jannes mentioned five times. He was governor of Heliopolis. We also meet with Balak, the son of Zippor, and none of these names have been met with anywhere but in these *Anastasi papyri*. But a most remarkable coincidence, which tends greatly to strengthen the proof of this chronology, and which is a distinct point of great interest in itself, is that Manepthah II., the monarch of the Exodus, was the son of a man who was the brother of a person whose sarcophagus we have in the British Museum, and who was the governor of Palestine, which belonged then to Egypt. And what do you think his name was? We have all heard of Phineas, the son of Eleazer, the son of Aaron the priest. Phineas is not a Hebrew name, but it is the name of that governor of Palestine whose sarcophagus we have in the British Museum. It is a pure Egyptian name. There are a vast number of other interesting points in this work. These papyri are in many places in a very dilapidated condition, and when you come to one particular and perhaps vitally important word, you may feel very well satisfied if you find that only half has been torn out of the middle. In one place the name of Jannes occurs; and there is another name with it, but several letters are wanting. There is a J and an M, and then a gap; but it is the right length for being Jambres; and when you find those names together in any document, you may assume them to be the names of the magicians mentioned in the Scriptures. The Egyptians had a peculiar style, and were fond of giving people complimentary names, as a "Bull" for instance; and we read in the papyrus "the capital of the Bull Jambres in the land of Dag." Now

* The word Mizraim is analogous to the words Michmash and Minnith; Michmash is Mi-Chemosh, the place of Chemosh; Minnith is Mi-Neith, the place of Neith; and Mizraim is simply Mi-Zuraim, the place of the two Zurs, or two cities named Tyre, in the Delta.
all this is very curious indeed. The fact that there was always a colony of Jews in Mizraim south of Judea in later times is very clear, and there is no reason that I know of for doubting the account of their original advent into Mizraim, which was held for five hundred years by the Shepherds, a Semitic people; and it is satisfactory to find Jannes and Jambres spoken of together in connection with the Semitic land of Dag. In one of the papyri the name of Moses actually occurs in a sort of narrative kept by an Egyptian ruler about his slave people. But the whole thing is very curious, and deserves the attention of those who are interested in such matters. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—In summing up this discussion, I must express the opinion that an examination and discussion of the question as to what is the genuine Biblical chronology would be very desirable; one might then come to some agreement as to where the gaps are to be found. That there are gaps in it seems unquestionable. Our existing chronologies are unsatisfactory, and it is very important that we should ascertain the gaps, even if we cannot ascertain the precise chronology. For instance, in the chronology of the Old Testament, it is questionable whether there are not several omissions, such as we know to be the case in the genealogies of Matthew. Indeed, some hold that we are hardly in a position to ascertain for certain the precise period which elapsed during the sojourn of Israel in Egypt. The best way to illustrate the history of Genesis is by bringing forward an amount of illustration from the habits, customs, and daily life of the Egyptians, which are unquestionably to be seen on the Egyptian monuments. Of course the more the monuments of Egypt are thoroughly examined, the more interesting it will be to find the points where they agree with the Bible, prove its credibility, and show that it was written by men well acquainted with Egyptian matters. There are some parts of Mr. Savile's paper the evidence for which I should greatly desire to see. Much of it does not rest upon certain evidence. In looking it over very rapidly, I have observed that the author has quoted as authorities persons who lived, one in the third century, and another in the eighth century of the Christian era. Now authorities of that kind are not the best, and if Mr. Savile has pursued the same course in other parts of the paper where I am unable to follow him, such authorities must not have too much reliance placed upon them. What is the use of my testimony as evidence of what occurred 1,500 years ago! Traditions, after such an interval of time, are absolutely valueless. We must have better evidence than that for matters which happened at so remote a period. As to the fact of shepherds being an abomination to the Egyptians, it is not necessary to understand that the sacred writer meant that shepherds were an abomination to every race of the Egyptians, because we know that in different parts of Egypt one animal was the subject of supreme reverence, while in other parts the same animal was the subject of

* That all do not concur in Mr. Dunbar Heath's statements is well known.
equal dislike. It is sufficient, then, to know that in one part of Egypt shepherds were disliked. Herodotus mentions that although in one part of Egypt the goat was the subject of adoration, in another part it was the subject of detestation. That is quite sufficient to support the language of the sacred writer; and to a large number of the Egyptians the sheep and the work of the shepherd might have been held in equal abomination. Mr. Savile sometimes uses stronger expressions than I think the facts justify; as for instance, when he tells us that it is as certain that the king "who knew not Joseph" was Amosis, as that William I. was the hero of the Norman conquest. Any one who has examined the mode in which dates in Egyptology are arrived at, must be aware that many of them rest on an uncertain basis, and sometimes we get nothing more than a long list of names, and we are uncertain whether some dynasties were or were not contemporaneous. I am quite sure that we must wait for some time before we can be accurate as to the dates of these Egyptian kings, for at present there is a great deal of it founded on supposition,—more, I think, than the evidence often justifies. That, at all events, has been my impression on reading Bunsen. We are safe in reading the monuments of Egypt as affording evidence of the existence of certain kings; but as to identifying these dates as matters of absolute certainty, although I do not say that we never shall be able to do so, I most positively assert that we have not done so yet. (Cheers.)

The Meeting was then adjourned.

MR. SAVILE’S REPLY.

I have carefully read through the remarks which have been made on my paper, and beg leave to offer the following reply; mentioning at the same time that a complete answer to the criticisms would demand a larger space than can be spared.

I quite agree with the Chairman’s remark that “an examination and discussion of the question as to what is the genuine Biblical chronology would be very desirable,” and trust that the Institute will one day take it up.

In reply to his regret that he has not been able to obtain any information respecting “that new stone which we have all heard of,” I would commend to his attention a pamphlet On the Trilingual Inscription at San (Decree of Canopus) by my friend Dr. Birch, and which is also found in vol. ix., New Series, of the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, as giving the desired information.

In reply to the Chairman’s remark, that I have used “stronger expressions than the facts justify,” especially in relation to the king “who knew not Joseph,” to which Mr. Titcomb also objects, I would ask leave to correct my previous expression, and would wish the sentence should run thus:—“It appears to me as conclusive, from the evidence which has been adduced, that
the 'king which knew not Joseph' was Amosis, the head of the 18th Dynasty, as that our William I. was the hero of the Norman Conquest; and if any one wishes to see this subject fully discussed, I would direct attention to the very able Essays of Canon Cook On the Bearings of Egyptian History upon the Pentateuch, Speaker's Commentary, vol. i. pp. 443-492. I may mention that Canon Cook did me the honour to ask my opinion on those essays some years before the Commentary was published; and though there are some points on which I was then, and still am, unable to agree with that learned writer, yet I cordially appreciate their immense value in confirming the truth of the Pentateuch. They are an honour to the small body of Egyptian scholars in this country; and they prove, as it appears to me incontestably, that on the disputed point respecting the king who knew not Joseph it could be none other than the famous conqueror of the shepherds, the head of the 18th Dynasty.

In reply to Mr. Titcomb, who objects, as does Mr. Graham, to the probability of Joseph's patron being one of the Shepherd kings, this alone would require many pages to answer adequately. I would confine myself, therefore, to pointing out, partly in reply to an objection made by Mr. Row, as to the little value of authorities who lived "one in the third century and another in the eighth century of the Christian era," that I was compelled to such a course simply through the paucity of authorities at my disposal. And if I adduced the testimony of George Syncellus, a Byzantine monk of the eighth century, that "all are agreed that Joseph governed Egypt under Pharaoh Apophis," it was merely to show that at such a period such was the current tradition, which must have been handed down from generation to generation, respecting the true name of Joseph's patron; and that there was no reason to doubt either its genuineness or its historical truth. Moreover, when in our own age, through the discovery of the Rosetta stone, invaluable inscriptions on the monuments of ancient Egypt have been interpreted, and I thereby find the strongest confirmation of the above tradition, I am compelled to accept it in support of the truth of the story of the Exodus; and in proof of this I would direct attention to the papers of Mariette-Bey, in vol. iii. of the Revue Archéologique, 1861, who has adduced very important evidence on this subject. Mariette-Bey was for many years Director or Curator of the Boulaque Museum, near Cairo, formed by the Pasha of Egypt for the express purpose of preserving the priceless monuments of that country, and probably he would be accepted by Egyptian scholars as the first living authority on such a subject. It may be interesting to mention that the Louvre now contains a large statue of a Pharaoh, brought by Mariette-Bey from the ruins of San (the Biblical Zoan), which he believes to be a veritable representation of Joseph's patron.

Mr. Titcomb objects to my calling Avaris "the city of the Hebrews," which I have done on the authority of two such distinguished scholars as De Rouge and Ewald, because Manetho says it was founded by Salatis, the first of the Shepherd kings, before the Hebrews came into Egypt. But surely this implies no more than that Manetho, who wrote in the third century
before Christ, speaks of a certain place known by a certain name at the time he was writing; just as Moses (Gen. xlvi. 11) calls Goshen "the land of Rameses," which Pharaoh had given to Jacob and his sons, though it could not have borne that name until the time when another king arose, who knew not Joseph, and which must have been at least a century later.

Mr. Titcomb considers I have made a "strange mistake" in asserting that the famine in Joseph's time was not in Egypt; but he has mis apprehended my meaning. What I wished to show was this—that the inscription on the tomb of Amenj Amenemha, governor of the nome or district of Sah, in Upper Egypt, respecting the great famine in all other parts of Egypt save his own district during the reign of Sesertesen I., differed so much from the Scripture narrative respecting the seven years' famine that it completely disproved Bunsen's rash assertion of their being a record of the same event; and I am unable to see wherein lies my "mistake."

With regard to Mr. Titcomb's objection respecting a "Semitic race" ruling in Egypt during the time of Joseph, I would refer him to Mariette's papers in the Revue Archéologique, in which he will find the subject discussed with great learning, and I hope as convincingly to him as to myself.

Mr. Titcomb asks how I get my date for the Exode as b.c. 1580, in opposition to Archbishop Usher, who dates it b.c. 1491. A proper answer to this very natural question would involve the whole subject of Biblical chronology. It will be sufficient if I point out—1st, that the famous passage in 1 Kings vi. 1, "in the four hundred and eightieth year after the Children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt," is probably an interpolation; 2nd, that it may be proved by secular records, independent of both Scripture and Egyptian chronology, that Solomon built the Temple b.c. 1014, and that the Exodus of the Israelites had taken place 566 years previously,* which brings the date of that event to b.c. 1580; and 3rd, that this synchronizes with the chronology of Manetho's dynasties of the kings of Egypt, and also with other "fixed dates," determined by M. Biot and others.

With regard to the remarks of both the Chairman and Mr. Titcomb respecting the "generations" mentioned in the Old Testament, much must depend upon the context and the sense in which each passage where the word occurs is to be understood; e.g., in the disputed passage of Gen. xv. 16, "in the fourth generation," some of the best interpreters (e.g., Cornelius a Lapide, Calvin, Gesenius, Ewald, &c.) have held that the Hebrew word dom means seculum, "age," or a hundred years; and that the words refer to the four hundred years mentioned previously in ver. 13, and which is the sense required by the context. Or if the word "generation" is to be understood of the period between father and son, we may lawfully suppose, as Mr. Row

* It is important to note that this agrees with the computation of both the Old and the New Testament alike.
remarked, that there may be "several omissions, such as we know to be the case in the genealogies of Matthew"; and as we know is frequently done in our Peerages, which record the pedigrees of our nobility, who can trace as far back as the Norman Conquest. Or on the supposition that every generation is actually specified in Scripture, it would not be difficult to show that in two different lines, tracing from a common ancestor, the same period may embrace two generations in the one instance, and double that number in the other. I will mention a case with which I am well acquainted in proof of this:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Edward III.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philippa=Earl of March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Earl of March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Anne=Earl of Cambridge. Anne=W.Bourchier, Earl of Ewe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anne=Sir Thomas St. Leger. F. Bourchier, Lord Fitzwarine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Anne=Lord de Ros. J. Bourchier, Earl of Bath, I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eleanor de Ros=John Bourchier, Earl of Bath, II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now it will be seen that of these two lines, proceeding from the same stock and coming together again in the ninth generation, there are eight generations in one line, while there are only six in the other; i.e., the third generation in the one was contemporaneous with the fifth of the other; which might have occurred at a similar ratio in the succeeding generations, and would have proved still more clearly the impossibility of drawing any argument from the number of generations recorded in a single genealogy.

I have only further to point out the historical error which Mr. Titcomb has fallen into by asserting—

"That under the successor of Ramesses, Amenophis III., a new worship was introduced, called the worship of the sun's disc, or the worship of Aten. Dr. Birch is my authority for this, and it falls in with the state of things you might expect," &c.

That the worship of the sun's disc began in the reign of Amenophis III. is certainly true, and we know that it lasted for a period of something under a century, as it was put an end to by Seti I., the father of the Pharaoh who is commonly known as "Ramesses the Great." I had drawn an argument from this, to which I still adhere, that the introduction of the worship of the sun's disc was probably caused by the inability of the Egyptian priests to withstand the power of Jehovah, as manifested by the hands of Moses and Aaron, at the time of the Exode, when the predecessor of Amenophis III. was on the
thronethrone. But to speak of Amenophis III. as “the successor of Ramesses” is as great a mistake as it would be if an historian were to assume that William III., the hero of our Revolution, and not William IV., was the successor of George IV., and to draw his conclusions therefrom. If Mr. Titcomb will again refer to Dr. Birch, I think he will be convinced that such is the case, though, in respect to this point, it is easy to misunderstand Josephus, who, in his quotation of Manetho, couples Amenophis and “his son Rhampses” together in a very singular manner. (See Josephus, Contr. Apion, i. § 27.) It is not very clear who these Pharaohs are that are thus named, but it is certain, that directly after Josephus gives this quotation from Manetho he adds—"These and the like accounts are written by Manetho. But I will show that he trifles and tells arrant lies." I would call the attention of Mr. Titcomb to this, and at the same time remark on the impossibility of understanding the few fragments of Manetho's history which have been handed down to us by Josephus, save by comparing them with the monuments, which are so great in number at that period of Egyptian history, the inscriptions of which have been rendered so accessible to the student by the unwearied labours of Egyptian scholars in our own age.

With reference to Mr. Graham's objection to my reading of Genesis xlvi. 34, I admit that it may be fairly disputed. Dr. Birch called my attention to the fact of some Hebraists rendering the word translated “abomination” in A.V., in the way I have done, and which, in its root, according to Gesenius and other lexicographers, has the double meaning of “to desire” as well as “to abominate” or “abhor”; and I still think that the first meaning is the true one of the word as used in the passage in dispute. But it is rather to the previous verses to which I would ask attention; and, in as much as it is clear from the context that Joseph sought the favour of Pharaoh on behalf of his brethren because they were “shepherds,” it appears a strong argument in support of the belief that the patron of Joseph was a Shepherd king. Moreover, when we know that the ancient tradition named Apophis the last, or the last but one, of the Shepherd kings as Joseph's patron, and coupling it with all that the monuments have brought to light relating to this Pharaoh, the accumulated proofs that such was the case seem to assume the form of a mathematical demonstration. If Mr. Graham will remember that Herodotus, as Mr. Row justly reminded the meeting, mentions that, although in one part of Egypt the goat was the subject of adoration, and in another part was the subject of detestation, it may help to modify his objection to my interpretation of the passage in dispute.

I have had occasion to modify my own opinion respecting Moses's "Ethiopian" wife alluded to in Numbers xii. 1, since my paper was written, on which Mr. Graham very properly raises the question, whether Zipporah

* The newly-discovered Seti tablet has proved beyond dispute the exact succession of the kings of the 18th Dynasty, and of those of the 19th down to the time of Ramesses the Great, as clearly as the succession of the kings of England may be shown from the windows of the House of Lords.
the Midianite and the Ethiopian woman were not one and the same, which seems to be supported by the juxtaposition of the two countries in Habakkuk iii. 7. But this does not touch the real point at issue, viz., as to the possibility of Moses being the general of the “Pharaoh's daughter” who had preserved him as an infant, had adopted him as her son, and who subsequently became the only queen regnant of the long line of the Pharaohs mentioned in history. It is certain from Mariette's discovery of the palace walls of that celebrated queen, with their beautiful pictures of the campaign against the Ethiopians, that a war between Egypt and Ethiopia was one of the marked incidents in her reign. And since Josephus and Irenaeus both mention as an historical fact that Moses conducted the campaign against Ethiopia before he fled to Midian when he was forty years old, I think we may fairly assume that the picture of the general of the Egyptian army may be none other than he who subsequently became far more celebrated both as a general and a lawgiver during his forty years’ rule of the Israelites in their march to the promised land.

As Mr. Graham alludes to an objection that has been brought against the truth of the Mosaic record of Pharaoh having given “camels” to Abraham, “on the ground that at that time the camel was not known in Egypt,” though he very justly points out the weakness of such an argument, I would wish to mention that Osburn has detected this animal in an inscription on the Temple of Karnac, belonging to the reign of Thothmes III., the contemporary of Moses, as it reads, “Three camels’ loads were brought to the king this year;”* but I have not been able to discover any earlier authority for the camel being known to the Egyptians save the statement in the book of Genesis, and which is amply sufficient for any candid and unbiased mind.

It only remains for me to notice what was said by Mr. Dunbar Heath, not because he specified any objection to my paper, but because he affirmed that “Mr. Titcomb's chronology was substantially correct;” and he added:— “a most remarkable coincidence which tends greatly to strengthen the proof of this chronology, and which is a distinct point of great interest in itself, is that Manepthah II., the monarch of the Exodus, was the son of a man who was the brother of a person whose sarcophagus we have in the British Museum, and who was governor of Palestine, which belonged then to Egypt.” In reply to this singular chronological conclusion I would mention that M. Lieblein, a great authority with those who disregard all Biblical chronology, has fixed the date of Ramesses II. (the father of Manepthah II.) at 1134 B.C. See Zeitschrift, 1869, p. 122. This would bring the date of Manepthah's reign (the British Museum possesses an inscription of the 66th year of his father's reign, showing that it was a very long one) down to the middle of the 11th century, just when David was ascending the throne; and thus, according to this strange chronological scheme, Moses and David

* The Papyrus Anastase I., of the time of Ramesses II., commonly called “the Great,” likewise has mention of the “Camel.”
are made contemporaries, which must rejoice the hearts of all who are opposed to accepting the simple narrative recorded in Scripture!

Although Mr. Dunbar Heath spoke of his "Exodus Papyri with considerable difidence, yet he mentioned so many extraordinary things in the few words which he addressed to the meeting that I will reply to him in the words of Canon Cook, a most competent judge, in his Essay On the Bearings of Egyptian History upon the Pentateuch:--

"It was quite natural to expect that, if the Israelites were settled in Goshen, or had been very lately expelled, when those documents were written, some notices of them would be found,—some allusions at least to the events preceding the Exodus. Accordingly, a writer (Mr. Dunbar Heath, Papyri of the Exodus), to whose industry and ingenuity we are indebted for some of the first attempts to decipher and explain the select papyri, believed, and for a time persuaded others, that he found abundance of such notices. He speaks of a true, original, and varied picture of many of the very actors in the Exodus; a Jannes mentioned five times, a Moses twice, a Balaam, son of Zippor, and the sudden and mysterious death of a prince-royal, &c. Since his work was written, all the passages adduced by him have been carefully investigated, and every indication of the presence of the Israelites has disappeared. The absence of such indications supplies, if not conclusive, yet a very strong argument against the hypothesis which they were adduced to support."—See Speaker's Commentary, vol. i. pp. 468-9.

THE MOABITE STONE.

A short statement relating to this stone will not be out of place here, more especially as none of those who took part in the discussion on Mr. Savile's paper replied to the question put by the Chairman in his introductory remarks (page 107).

On the 19th of August, 1868, the Rev. F. A. Klein, attached to the Jerusalem Mission Society, was travelling through the country of Moab; and on arriving at Dibān (Dibon), heard of an inscribed stone never yet seen by a European; on examination, he found it to be "in a perfect state of preservation, and it was only from great age and exposure to the rain and sun that certain parts, especially the upper and lower lines, had somewhat suffered." The size of the stone was about 44 inches by 28 by 14. Mr. Klein took no drawing of the stone, but mentioned the matter to the Prussian Consul at Jerusalem, and various fruitless negotiations—in which Captain Warren very judiciously abstained from taking a part—were entered into with the Arabs with a view to getting possession of the stone, and sending it to Berlin. In 1869, however, the Prussian Consul obtained a firman for its removal, but in the meanwhile the protracted negotiations had aroused the jealousy and cupidity of the Arabs, and in November, when M. Ganneau sent a messenger with squeeze-paper to obtain an impression of the inscription, "whilst the paper was still wet, a quarrel arose amongst the Arabs, and the messenger, tearing off the wet impression, had only time to spring upon his horse and escape by flight, bringing with him the squeeze, imperfect, and