

evil in the sight of the Lord according to all that their fathers had done." Then came the crowning disaster. The siege and capture of Jerusalem by the Babylonian monarch. The spoilation of the Temple. The removal of all its treasures, and the carrying away into captivity of the bulk of the population. To the Jews the night seemed at its blackest, but still it was the harbinger of the dawn. When they returned from the Chebar to the Jordan, and proceeded to rear the walls of the second Temple, a new era was commencing; Baal, and Molech, and Ashtoreth had vanished never to return. The overthrow of the Babylonian empire by Cyrus gave the Israelites their liberty, and when Ezra proceeded to Jerusalem, "with the Book of the Law in his hands," his companions, like himself, were the staunch maintainers of that pure monotheism which was then firmly established in Judea, and has continued amongst the Children of Israel uncorrupted to the present day.

BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

JANNES AND JAMBRES WITHSTANDING MOSES.

I HAVE received with great pleasure the statement of your Committee that "they desire that their Journal should become as much as possible a record of all discoveries connected with Biblical Research." Few Biblical names are more interesting than those of Jannes and Jambres, or Kamr(es) as the Select Papyri seem to call him. The two are named by St. Paul to Timothy as agents, in a general way, who "withstood Moses;" and if we find their names connected with that of Moses in pure Egyptian papyri, in other words, if the epoch of Moses is the epoch of Jannes, and the epoch of Jannes is the epoch of Seti II and Bai-n-Ra, then many an old stop-gap theory of a merely Egyptian chronology will have to make way for the chronology of the epoch of Moses, in which the Bible and the papyri are very closely intertwined.

Most unfortunately, the fifth Anastasi Papyrus, which I shall chiefly make use of, has been injured at the name of Kamr(es), and the name only occurs once; but we shall find him engaged with a Jannes in a very important military business; a business the very object of which was to "withstand" a person named Moses. With respect to the reading of the name of Kamr(es) or Kamr, the authority of my lamented friend and former pupil, Charles Goodwin, is so great, that I am much pleased to see that he follows me so far as he goes, and differs from me only in saying nothing about the letter *r*. In the "Cambridge Essays," p. 262, he reads: "Ka Kam (Black Bull)." He agrees that Ka is a title; and therefore that the true name begins with Kam.

The passage to which I would first call your attention is in the fifth Anastasi Papyrus, beginning from plate 18, line 6. It contains a sequence of military orders from this Kamr(es) or Jambres. Happily we can here learn in a few lines a good deal about the man, and, to begin with, it is a great thing to know which side he was fighting for, in the anarchy around

him. On every occasion the scribes connected with him parade the grand titles of Seti II, and, with Jannes and Bek-n-Ptah, the three profess they will sing for Seti eternal songs; and "Oh," say they, "may he make for us myriads of festivals." Now in presence of Jambres who (as we shall soon see) could initiate the moving of troops in Edom, we have of course to ask ourselves was he a lieutenant of the Regent, Bai-n-Ra, or was Bai-n-Ra dead? Unless the latter was the case, I cannot in any degree picture the situation. Mr. Goodwin ("Society of Biblical Archaeology," vol. ii, part 2, p. 359) is astonished at the frantic loyalty shown to Bai-n-Ra (2nd Anastasi, p. 5). An explanation which merely supposes him to have been a king does not sufficiently account for the fact. This was in Goodwin's day the general opinion, which not only leads to nothing, but Miss Corbeaux had already forcibly pointed out the weakness of such a supposition. In fact it rests upon the moral impossibility that the great Rameses II. should have dismembered the empire in his own lifetime. Seti II also and his children would not have dedicated royal statues to Bai-n-Ra had there been even a suspicion of treason resting on such a Bai-n-Ra as the conqueror at Prosopis. The fact that Seti and his children allowed these statues to be erected has doubtless been the chief reason why he has been thought to have been a king. But to this the answer is sufficient that, in gratitude for his great services, the statues were erected *during the lifetime of Rameses II himself*. In fact at Medinet Abou the statue of Bai-n-Ra was actually placed *before* that of his own father. This I should say instead of proving, clearly disproves that he can have been then considered as anything more than a regent. To sum up then, it seems most probable that Bai-n-Ra exercised royal functions for about five years, and that his death took place about this time, which event, coupled with the absence of his half-brother Seti II, in Æthiopia, brought forward Jambres, and was the principal cause of the rising of the Semites, which eventuated the Exodus. While alive, his mere name, and the tribute in corn which he wisely gave the Khita, would suffice to keep things tolerably quiet, but "après lui le deluge." The key of the situation seems to have been at Edom, and a regent friendly to the Semites, and pretending to be so to the Hittites, might do much from Edom which could not be done from Æthiopia.

Again, Jambres and his companions have made it quite clear in these papyri that they worshipped Amen-Ra, the great Theban god, but then it is equally clear that Bai-n-Ra, acting for his father Rameses, built a strong place, avowedly to connect Egypt with the foreign men of Jaha (2nd Anastasi, p. 1). Four deities are mentioned as patrons of the four sides of it. Amen could not of course be well left out, but the other three were Semitic, viz., Sutech, Ashteroth, and Sati. In the face of this solid fact, how can Ægyptologists have been so blinded by the early military successes of Rameses II as to forget what his glories led to, viz., tribute to the Khita in his own lifetime, and a general preparation for the Exodus soon after his death. Wonderful discoveries in this very month of August show us that the mummy of the great

Rameses, at some time not yet known, was inclosed in a plain sycamore case, and dropped into a ditch to hide it from foreigners.*

After Bai-n-Ra's death the unity of Egypt depended upon the powerful and prosperous Khita, and the strategy of Jambres, so far as we know it, was equal to the occasion. The difficulty was first, to reinforce Zoar, the key of the position for defence against the Northerners; secondly, not to offend the Khita; and, thirdly, to keep a hold on his own Semitic troops. The device by which he secured the first and third desideratum was ingenious. He ordered a corps of loyal Midianites to Thuku or Edom, and kept in his own hands, as a pledge, the books containing the genealogies or roll call of the soldiers. This fact neither Goodwin nor Brugsch have perceived. It rests upon the following first part of the order I have been mentioning. (Anastasi 5, xvii, 6.) "Communication. When my letter gets to you, you are to bring the Midianites of the captivity to the plain in face of Tasak(arta), with an intimation given thus, viz., 'Ye (the Midianites) are not to carry away the genealogies of the people.' I will keep them in my hand in a written document. Then do you (viz., my officers) take notes, while you cause the people to pass along before their signaling officers, for the object of arriving at Thuku. I give you command to carry them across (viz., the genealogies) for the people; I who am Captain of Archers, Bull Kamr(es) of Thuku, to Captain of Archers Ani and Captain of Archers Bek-n-Ptah in the Palace."

This translation (in a primitive form) I gave in my *Exodus Papyri*, A.D. 1855. In 1858, Goodwin, reviewing me, did not see his way to giving his own version, as he would have been brought face to face with the problem of Jambres the Bull of Thuku. Brugsch too, in 1879, passes it over in silence. It is, in my opinion, the very key-note which harmonizes all around it.

In passing on to the next part of the paragraph we come to the sign of a stop. In such a case it is not certain that the coming paragraph must be connected with what we have just read. Nevertheless, the context seems to give us a connection, and if it were not for the tantalising gaps at the most important points, we should all probably agree that we have before us what seems to be an order to close in on the south, given to another officer, Amen-mesu, son of Bek-n-Ptah. Even if this part of the papyri were not otherwise interesting, it has achieved such notoriety that I ought not to pass it by without notice. Dr. Brugsch (Vol. II, "History," p. 358) has attributed its preservation to Divine Providence, and calls it the most precious memorial of the epoch. He follows Goodwin in considering that it refers to two runaway slaves. Now considering that a singular pronoun cannot agree with a plural noun, I consider that there was only one slave, who was a slave to two people, viz., Bek-n-Ptah and Amen-mesu, father and son, and that he was not running away, but carrying

* September. They now say that the above mummy was that of Rameses XII.

messages ; and that the order refers to the movement of a large body of troops. The reason Goodwin must have had for what he must have considered an improvement upon my version, was doubtless that the preposition *m-sa* may mean *behind*. No doubt it may ; but then, on the other hand, it no less frequently means *by the side of*. An instance of this may be found at Plate 13, line 1, of this papyrus—"While I hold thy heart *near* me." I am astonished to find in Pierret's dictionary that the sense of behind is given exclusively. "Communication. Seeing that I have given orders in the halls of the Palace on the 9th of Epiphi at time of night by the side of the *servant for two*, and considering that I am about to start for Zoar of Thuku on the 12th, to tell them to pass to the south, and to give orders for the passage on the Epiphi, I arrived at the fortress. They told me they had taken the field to pass Ta-Anab, north of the Migdol of Seti I like Baal. My order is for you to go. I have arranged for everything that could happen." Surely the running away of a couple of servants (even if they were Moses and Aaron) cannot have necessitated the movements of large bodies of troops like this. The order then proceeds, "Dispatch with them the bearer of the roll-call : dispatch ever so many men with them. I have taken care for everything that could happen, and do you give signals for great numbers of people beside them."

The English of all this seems to be that the commander-in-chief, Jambres, having received information that a body of Semites were escaping, ordered Bek-n-Ptah, who was somewhere south, to allow them to cross his front (just as Marius did with the Teutons), but to take careful notes from his corps in observation.

As had been expected, they were found to be marching north, and Amen-Mesu, son of Bek-n-Ptah, was then consequently ordered to close up south. The "Servant for two" carried the necessary orders to the two corps, while Jambres took one more night's rest, and next day drove on towards Edom.

The next portion of the papyrus is a very curious, and very natural letter from the young Amen-mesu, whom we have seen to be in active service in the field, to his elderly father Bek-n-Ptah, at the depôt apparently of the troops employed. Instead of describing what he heard, and saw about him, he most dutifully, but most annoyingly says, "Prithee, send me word of thy condition." "Yea, not a man of those whom thou hast sent to visit me has told me concerning thy condition." "Moreover, send thou me some good loaves, and 50 small cakes ; the messenger brought 20 of them," etc. This translation is Goodwin's.

We next (Plate 21, line 8) have a letter which according to all rules ought to be of most particular importance, as it is from a royal scribe. Royal scribes were very great personages indeed, especially serving as generals, which this one did. His name was Rameses. He writes to one Avari, whom he orders to proceed to Bubastis, where he is to put the signals to work, and to report himself at the place agreed upon. He was not to go and stand at this place, and that place ; he was to go under command of the priest Rameses, where the military and royal Rameses

would join him at the breakage of the waters. "I am angry with you," he says, "beyond speech, your throwing away your business. I appoint you to work at the breakage, whatever state it is in."

Neither Goodwin nor Brugsch have said a word to this. This breakage of waters, however, cannot have been a small matter, so excited was the royal scribe. Whatever it was, it is probable he would seek to diminish its importance in his letters home. Bubastis was a central position between the fields of Zoan, the city of Rameses, and Tabnet, where so much was taking place, as shown in my last paper. My own view is that there must have been partial concentrations of the Hebrews with the mixed multitudes, previous to the grand march; and that the Egyptian scribes in these papyri give their account of the partial events here and there.

We must remember that the Nile would be at about its lowest on the first day of Abib, on and about B.C. 1291. A body in marching order might, I suppose, cut a dyke so as to cross over safely, while the downward water rushed out in the form of a wall on to the surrounding country. The gap would then tend to get filled up, and the royal scribe may have done no better than our own Duke of York at Walcheren.

In giving this description, the candid reader will remember that I am not professing to describe what did happen, but what the Egyptians said happened. The same caution applies to the name and deeds of Jannes. Six times is he named in these papyri, and the religious public has a right to ask of Egyptologists is this so?

Twenty-five years ago I showed the fact, and not one step of investigation into his history has been made; and now Professor Brugsch gives us the astounding transmodification of the letter *i* into *z*, and calls him Zani! This necessitates some examination into his individuality.

The honest Goodwin, as quoted above, names a Captain of Archers as "Ani." I confess there is a difficulty about this name, for facts are stubborn things. So in the days of Queen Elizabeth, there was a mighty Keltic man, named Shan, and to have called him John, without any explanation, might doubtless have led to some difficulty. Now the name in the papyri is written in four ways.

pp. 113 and 119.	1.	Ⲓ	Ⲓ	ⲓ	Ⲕ	Ⲓ
pp. 117 and 140.	2.	Ⲓ	Ⲓ	ⲓ	Ⲕ	
p. 119.	3.	Ⲓ	Ⲓ	ⲓ	Ⲓ	Ⲓ
p. 78 (back).	4.	Ⲓ	Ⲓ	ⲓ	Ⲕ	Ⲕ

To begin with, I consider that the double mark in 1 and 3 is a sign of reduplication, so that the name which Goodwin wrote above as "Ani," is really "Anni." Another thing to remark is that in page 117, the name

spelt as No. 2 is ordered to escort some obelisks, and in page 119 progress is reported by No. 3. Surely, therefore, the names 2 and 3 were *meant* to be identical. Which then of these names is nearest to the spoken name of the famous Jannes? Of course it will be said that I am prejudiced, but then St. Paul shows that there really was a man named as in No. 3. I retain then the opinion that I was right in my Exodus Papyri, twenty-five years ago. Dr. Brugsch's present opinion is absolutely incomprehensible. He reads No. 4 as Zani (*see* Vol. II, p. 127). If this were so, Jordan and Joppa should be read Zordan and Zoppa. I may as well mention here that the discoveries here attributed by Dr. Brugsch (II, 127) to Chabas were mine; as also was that of Baal-Zephon, in the 8th Anastasi, line 6. attributed here to Goodwin. The letter concerning the obelisks is valuable, in stating that Jannes and others were "of the king's children," brought up probably as Moses himself was, and I strongly suspect that the obelisks had been made for Rameses II, and were being appropriated by Seti II. Their transportation seems to be dated in the 13th year, and I know of no king but Seti II who could have had a 13th year at this time. If this is correct, it would be the very year of the return of Seti II from Æthiopia, when probably the mummy of Rameses II was lying in the ditch.

The next letter is very curious. It opens with a negotiation between Jannes and "the great man." I am aware that Pi-oeer, which means "the great man," was also a proper name, but the real name appears at the end of the negotiation. The great man had demanded a census, which had evidently been agreed to (by Jambres, I suppose). The real fight was on a point of detail, which was clung to earnestly by each party for reasons which we may guess at, but cannot well know. The question was whether the names were to be called out and answered *vivâ voce*, or written on tickets. An answer was expected that those in the actual custody of Jambres might use tickets, while those who had escaped over to the great man might use their voices. I may as well say at once that the great man was Moses himself. This compromise was to be nominally rejected, but this was to be on the plea that Jannes knew nothing about the foreign names and signals. Moses however was to be considered as on an equality with the nobles (*i.e.*, the Egyptian nobles), and if a few more objections could be slipped in while the enemy listened, it would be held that he (*viz.*, Jannes) had done his best. Thus fruitlessly did Jannes and Jambres withstand Moses.

Here is the letter (plate XXV), "Communication. To wit. Seeing that I have sent the Captain of Archers, Jannes, captain of captains, to consult with the great man, it is because he had said to us, I demand a census of the people; and because (on his statement) we were to call out loud the name of each person who owned the name. Now let it be known to them I am not for the plan of calling out.

"I wish — and Mai of Thuku* to give them tickets in writing.

* Mai held the highly important post of head of those Midianites who remained loyal to Egypt on the defection of the mixed multitudes under Moses.

It is between himself and God if they do not give tickets in due form. Likewise if an answer should arrive to say, 'Let it be that the names should be called out for those in your custody, for you brought them there, then you are not to make a question of the correspondence of the name called out to the ticket written, and brought there. You are to say I am not capable of reckoning with you the signals of the Midianites, with their signal officers. Thou canst repeat them, for thou art among them of a verity. Lo thou art Moses of the Semites. Art thou not a noble? Thou wast brought from another place (viz., Midian, I suppose), to set thyself on an equality with the nobles. Thou hast learnt their words of command, the answering to their names. I give orders that — should be brought, — their language with the language of those who live in Egypt, for thou art of the race of the Midianites.

"In giving our instructions again, a few words. While you listen, do what you can. Yea, are not these things to be reckoned to you. Your kind Excellency will bear the burden."

DUNBAR J. HEATH.

ESHER, SURREY, *September, 5.*

THE PLACE OF STONING.

(Reprinted from the "*Athenæum*," by permission of the Proprietors.)

I.

JERUSALEM, *August 17, 1881.*

THE discovery of an interesting tomb of the Herodian period in the rocky knoll to the west of Jeremiah's Grotto was recently announced in the columns of the *Athenæum*. Lieut. Conder suggests that this tomb may possibly be the "Sepulchre in the Garden" of the Gospel narrative. Whether or not the distinguished explorer is right in his conjecture will probably always remain an open question. I desire simply to call attention to one or two facts which will, I think, throw some light on the name "Place of Stoning," mentioned by Lieut. Conder in connection with the lately discovered "sepulchre."

It is well known that when Jerusalem was in the possession of the Crusaders the northern gate of the city (a predecessor of the present Damascus Gate) was known as the Gate of St. Estiene—St. Etienne—St. Stephen, from its proximity to a church of that name, situated outside the walls on the spot where, according to the traditions of that age, the proto-martyr had been stoned. From the account given in "*La Citez de Jhérusalem*" (*vide* Appendix ii to vol. ii of Robinson's "*Biblical Researches*") it appears that the church of St. Stephen was built on the opposite side of the road to that on which stood the "donkey-house of the Knights Hospitallers," the ruins of which building were discovered by Col. Warren some years ago. Saewulf (p. 43, "*Early Travels in Palestine*," "*Bohn's Antiquarian*