

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 2.—OCTOBER, 1887.

I. SPURIOUS RELIGIOUS EXCITEMENTS.

It is believed all thoughtful Christians are alive to the fact that religious excitements, which consist of temporary movements of the emotions devoid of any saving operation of the Truth on the reason and conscience, are equally frequent and mischievous in America. This judgment not seldom expresses itself in very queer and inaccurate forms. Thus: good brethren write to the religious journals grateful accounts of a work of grace in their charges, and tell the Editor that "they are happy to say, the work has been purely rational and quiet, and attended by not the slightest excitement." They forget that the efficacious (not possibly, tempestuous) movement of the feelings is just as essential a part of a true religious experience, as the illumination of the intellect by divine truth; for indeed, there is no such thing as the implantation of practical principle, or the right decisions of the will, without feeling. In estimating a work of divine grace as genuine, we should rather ask ourselves whether the right feelings are excited; and excited by divine cause. If so, we need not fear the most intense excitement. This misconception is parallel to the one uttered by public speakers, when they assure hearers that, desiring to show them the respect due to rational beings, and to use the honesty suitable to true patriots, "they shall make no appeal to their feelings, but address themselves only to their understandings." This is virtually impossi-

THE PHARAOKS OF THE BONDAGE, ETC.

THE PHARAOKS OF THE BONDAGE AND THE EXODUS. *Lectures by Charles Robinson, D. D., LL. D., Madison Avenue Church, New York.* The Century Company, New York, 1887, pp. 199.

ABRAHAM, JOSEPH AND MOSES, IN EGYPT, *being a course of Lectures delivered before the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, by Rev. Alfred H. Kellogg, D. D., of Philadelphia.* Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York, 1887, pp. 160.

In the two works named above, we have a summary of the latest results of investigation into the portion of Egypt's history, commencing with the sojourn of Abraham in that land, recorded in Gen. 12:10-20, and closing with the Exodus. Dr. Robinson's lectures, as he tells us in his preface, were "all delivered by a Pastor, in the ordinary course of his pulpit ministrations upon the Sabbath, and are published in the form in which they were first delivered." Dr. Kellogg's lectures were "delivered before the Theological Seminary at Princeton," and naturally present us with a more critical and elaborate examination of the matters treated of than would be appropriate to lectures before an ordinary Sabbath-evening congregation.

New light has been thrown upon this most important portion of Egyptian history, in the last few years, in several ways.

(1.) By the published translation of the "Great Harris Papyrus of Rameses II." "This Papyrus is a large one, measuring some 133 feet in length, and admirably preserved. . . . The historical part of it was first translated and published by Dr. Eisenlohr in 1872," and subsequently by the eminent Egyptologists, M. Chabas and Brugsch. "In the earlier part of the document Rameses recounts his good deeds, and commends to the people the son whom he was at the time associating on the throne. He then tells the story of his own succession, prefacing this portion with a very brief but important statement respecting the period of anarchy that had been brought to an end by Setnekht his predecessor, now generally regarded as the founder of Dynasty XX. (*Kellogg's Lectures*, p. 103, 4.)

(2.) The discovery in 1881, at Deir-el-Bahari, of a tomb, or sepulchral chamber, as it might more properly be called, hewn in the solid mountain-side, in which had been collected, in some strange way, the confined mummies of many of Egypt's greatest sovereigns. These have now all been transferred to the Bulak Museum. "The mummies," writes Robinson, "were carefully identified, and these august personages began to appear like real beings, brought up afresh before the tribunal of human judgment as to their character and acts. . . . In the summer of the last year, 1886, the mummy of Seti I., and that of his extraordinary son, Rameses II., with that of Rameses III., and that of Thotmes III., the obelisk-maker, were divested of the resinous shrouds they were buried in, and the inscriptions were read with skilled knowledge

of the characters the priests had used in the funeral rites and liturgies. So now there is visible in the Museum at Bulak a long row of mummies, whose very names fill our whole imagination with amazement. There is the king who knew not Joseph, there is the father of Pharaoh's daughter, and the founder of the Dynasty that dwelt in Zoan. They are dead as stones, but each 'being dead yet speaketh,' as plainly as did Abel." (*Robinson's Lectures*, p. 28.)

(3.) In Ex. 1: 11, we read, "And they," *i. e.*, the children of Israel, "built for Pharaoh treasure-cities (store-cities, N. V.), Pithom and Raamses." Pithom, one of these store-cities, has recently been discovered and partially disintombed, "Until recently Egyptologists have been divided as to even the Dynasty of the Exodus Pharaoh; some being strongly in favor of assigning him to Dynasty XVIII, while others, following Dr. Rogue's lead, preferred Dynasty XIX. Happily, the labors of the Egypt Exploration Fund Committee have decided the question as between the two Dynasties. It was M. Naville, the Committee's able explorer, who, while unearthing the mounds at Tel-el-Maskhuta, had the good fortune to discover that they covered the long-sought store-city Pithom, one of the two such towns built for Pharaoh by the Hebrews. And he was able, by the evidence of monuments found upon the spot, to connect the place in a very convincing way with Rameses II, of Dynasty XIX, as its founder, proving beyond appeal that Rameses II was one, at least, of the Pharaohs who oppressed the Hebrews." (*Kellogg's Lectures*, pp. 124, 5.)

In consequence of the new light thrown upon this portion of the history of Egypt, in these several ways, we can now answer, with some degree of certainty, more than one of the questions which have long perplexed the careful student of the Bible.

(1) According to Dr. Kellogg's determination, Abraham's sojourn in Egypt was during the reign of one of the Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings, whilst Joseph was carried thither, some 200 years later, after the Shepherd Kings had been finally expelled, and a native Egyptian Dynasty (the XVIIIth) established instead. The hospitable reception of Abraham, "rich in cattle" as he was, and his subsequent peaceable dismissal, after the famine had passed away, when compared with the public sentiment in Joseph's time, incidentally exhibited in giving a reason for the separate settlement of Joseph's brethren in the land of Goshen—"for every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians," (Gen. 46: 34)—accords well with this idea. Who the Pharaoh of Joseph's day was, cannot be determined with absolute certainty; but the strong probability is that it was Thotmes III, one of the Pharaohs whose embalmed body has recently been found at Dier-el-Bahari, and now adorns the Museum at Bulak. This view of matters is confirmed by the fact that when Isaac purposed to go down into Egypt, because of a famine prevailing in Canaan, some eighty-five years after Abraham's visit, "The Lord appeared unto him, and said, Go not down into Egypt;

dwell in the land which I shall tell thee of." Gen. 26: 2. At this time the protracted contest which resulted in the final expulsion of the Shepherd Kings must have been raging in all its fury; and Isaac, had he carried out his purpose, would, in all probability, have lost his property, if not his life.

(2) Between the date of Joseph's death and the birth of Moses, a change of Dynasty occurred, the XVIIIth Dynasty came to a close, and the XIXth was established. This event seems to be referred to in Moses' words: "And Joseph died, and all his brethren, and all that generation. Now there arose another king in Egypt, which knew not Joseph." Ex. 1: 6-8. This XIXth Dynasty was of comparatively short duration, and numbered among its kings the Pharaohs of the oppression, who "made the lives of the children of Israel bitter with hard bondage in mortar and brick, and in all manner of service in the field." Ex. 1: 14. The recently discovered store-city of Pithom, built at this time, furnishes unquestionable proof that its builder was Rameses II, the third king of this Dynasty, according to Manetho. The ruins of Pithom "show that the several courses of bricks were usually laid with mortar, in regular tiers; and a deeper interest still is awakened by the announcement of the fact that a part of the work was done with bricks having straw in them, and a part with those of an inferior quality, in some instances destitute of straw." (*Robinson's Lectures*, p. 98.) Comparing this fact with the statement in Ex. 1: 14 and 5: 7, one cannot but be struck with the confirmation of the Mosaic narrative thus furnished.

(3) Who the Pharaoh of the Exodus was, and whether or not he perished with his army, when, by God's direction, Moses "stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the waters returned and covered the chariots and horsemen, and all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them," (Ex. 14: 28), are questions which cannot yet be determined with absolute certainty. Mineptah I. has generally been regarded as the Pharaoh in question; and his character, as learned from Egyptian sources, given by Lenormant in the words, "He was neither a soldier nor an administrator; but one whose mind was turned almost exclusively toward the chimeras of sorcery and magic," corresponds well with the character of the Pharaoh of the Exodus as given in Moses' narrative. The Great Harris Papyrus, written by one of the scribes of Rameses III, the second Pharaoh of the XXth Dynasty, states distinctly that the XIXth Dynasty closed in disaster, and this disaster accompanied by an emigration from Egypt, for some reason, so great as to disorganize the government. In the words of Dr. Kellogg: "This emigration was most disastrous in its effects upon the country. In some way, those left behind found themselves without legitimate head, and as a consequence, government not only, but society as well, speedily resolved into confusion and anarchy. Then the document tells how the country was left a prey to its always envious neighbors, and how there resulted, eventually, a foreign despotism, which, in turn, was fol-

lowed by a reaction, of which the Papyrus speaks, in the shape of a national uprising, and how the end came in the re-establishment of a native Dynasty, in the person of one Seti the Victorious, Rameses' predecessor. It can scarcely be denied that such is a fair summary of the teaching of this very brief but suggestive narrative of the royal scribe of Rameses III."

"Do we then strain out of this document, in any illegitimate or forcible way, a covert allusion to the Hebrew migration and its results? Beyond question, the Hebrew tradition adequately explains the story of Rameses. (1) The Exodus of the Hebrew population of Egypt," with the mixed multitude "that went out with them, was surely large enough to leave the northeastern part of the Delta comparatively empty. (2) The destruction of Pharaoh and of his chosen captains and horsemen would sufficiently account for the land of Egypt being left 'without a head,' rendering it needful, in the first instance, that each home should look out for itself, just as the Papyrus states,—a condition of things that would inevitably lead to the jealousies and ambitions of which the Papyrus also speaks. (3) History would simply repeat itself in the invasion story. No better opportunity for foreign intervention could be furnished than intestine struggles would afford. (4) And history would also simply repeat itself in the re-establishment of the native line by a shrewd chief, ready to take advantage of his opportunities." (*Kellogg, pp. 110-11.*)

(4) In his third lecture, Dr. Kellogg gives an interesting discussion of a matter which has hitherto received but little attention from Egyptologists, viz: the connection of Joseph with the rise and progress of the religious revolution which, according to the monuments, occurred during the existence of the XVIIIth Dynasty. Moses tells us: "And Pharaoh . . . gave Joseph to wife Asenath, the daughter of Poti-phera, priest of On," or Heliapolis. Gen. 41 : 45. Such an association as this with the Egyptian priesthood on Joseph's part, would suggest, at the least, some influence exerted by him on the religion of Egypt. On this point Dr. Kellogg writes: "Is there anything in the further monumental history of the Dynasty that may be explained on the hypothesis of Joseph's presence and influence? We think there is. We refer to the rise and progress of that remarkable religious revolution that culminated, in the reign of Amenophis IV., in the establishment of a quasi-monotheism as the religion of the state. It was Lenormant who suggested that 'the form of religion established by Amenophis IV stood in a close relation to that professed at the time by the Israelite portion of his subjects.' Lenormant saw in the very name of the God so exclusively honored by Amenophis IV., "*Aten,*" a reference to the Semitic "*Adonai,*" and asks the question and answered it: 'Had the Hebrews part in this foreign and very imperfect attempt at monotheism? I believe they had.' He even finds some analogies between the cult

of the Hebrews, as finally established by Moses, and that shown on the monuments of Amenophis IV." (*Kellogg's lectures*, pp. 60, 61.)

(5) In our day, when all this portion of sacred history, under the operation of the Higher Criticism, seems, in the estimation of some at least, to be losing its substantial character of matter-of-fact story, and becoming little better than airy myth, when a Harvard Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature can write: "We may probably look upon it as an historical fact that the Israelitish tribes at a certain time (perhaps about B. C. 1330) left the frontiers of Egypt, and made their way towards Canaan, but we know little of the particulars of the movement. The story of Exodus (Chapters II-XIV) tells us of the event as pious Israelites long afterwards thought of it, but we cannot be sure that their recollections were correct. Many of the particulars given in the narrative are improbable. . . There are many reasons why we cannot think that this narrative gives a veritable history of the events," (*Dr. Toy's History of the Religion of Israel*, pp. 18, 19,) it is re-assuring to old-fashioned believers in the Scriptures as "the Word of God," to have the very store-cities built by the Israelites during the oppression, partly of bricks without straw, disentombed by the hand of the explorer, to recover a manuscript history of the disastrous consequences to Egypt of the Hebrew exodus, written by a royal Egyptian scribe, and to have the old mummied Pharaohs, whose very existence has been questioned, to rise from their graves, and "rebuke the madness of" the Critics.

Geo. D. ARMSTRONG.

CREATION OR EVOLUTION.

"CREATION OR EVOLUTION?" A Philosophical Inquiry, *by George Ticknor Curtis*. D. Appleton & Co., N. Y., 1887.

The name of George Ticknor Curtis has long been familiar to American readers. His works, especially his "History of the Constitution of the United States," and his "Life of Daniel Webster," have won for him, deservedly, a place among the foremost writers and jurists of the day. In undertaking a philosophical inquiry into the claims to acceptance of the competing theories of creation and evolution, he may be thought to be stepping out of the ordinary course of thought and study of men of his calling. Yet his course in so doing is not without precedent, and not without reason. The Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone, late Premier of Great Britain, has recently taken part in a discussion of the cosmogony of Moses; and two of the standard works in the department of Christian apologetics, works which form a part of every complete theological library, were written by lawyers, and owe much of their peculiar excellence to the legal training of their authors, and to their application of the principles and rules of judgment established in our courts, to the decision of the cases discussed: I refer to "Lyttleton on