

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1856.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*The Bible, the Missal, and the Breviary; or Ritualism Self-illustrated in the Liturgical Books of Rome: Containing the Text of the entire Roman Missal, Rubrics, and Prefaces, translated from the Latin; with Preliminary Dissertations, and Notes from the Breviary, Pontifical, etc.* By the Rev. George Lewis, of Ormiston. Edinburgh, 1853: pp. 809.

MR. LEWIS claims this as the first full English translation of the great Roman Liturgy.* The Missal is not to be found in any other spoken language. One Voisin, in the seventeenth century, who presumed to make a French version, was anathematized for his pains, and the book is not extant. Before the present undertaking, Hussenbeth's was the most complete English translation, and he gives all that is necessary for the information of the unlearned in following the service. The small volumes which are in the hands of the worshippers in these churches, are not missals or mass-books, but guides to the observance of what the priest is performing at the altar,

* The copy followed is "The Roman Missal restored, according to the decree of the most holy Council of Trent; published by order of the holy Pius V., and revised by authority of Pope Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. Augmented with the new Masses granted by the indulgence of the Apostolic See. Mechlin, 1840."

and produces new fruit, without any real discontinuance of its life. The only schismatics in the case are the Romanists, who denounce and excommunicate the Protestants because they profess the truth.

ART. VI.—*Egypt's Place in Universal History: an Historical Investigation, in Five Books.* By Christian C. J. Bunsen, D. Ph. and D. C. L. Translated from the German, by Charles H. Cottrell, Esq., M. A. London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans.

MATERIALS for the history of Egypt have, by the research of scholars and antiquarians, of late years accumulated to a large amount. Especially is the internal life of the nation expounded with great variety of detail and unmistakable certainty. But one thing is lacking, without which the mass can never be history. Amid all their labour and devices to transmit a record of their achievements to future time, the authors of the Egyptian monuments forgot to furnish a system of dates. Consequently, clear as the subjects of many of the monuments are, the periods of time to which they belong have to be determined, if at all, by a criticism, which derives its data from various quarters. This is the one grand difficulty which embarrasses the history of that interesting country. Had their book narratives been preserved, no doubt much of our difficulty would have been prevented. But, unfortunately, nothing of the kind is known to be extant, except a dry list of kings, taken from their historian Manetho, and existing in several partial and undoubtedly corrupt copies, the dates in which are not harmonious with each other.

Greek writers on Egypt also conflict; the dates of Herodotus with those of Eratosthenes, and those of Diodorus Siculus with both, while it is notorious that the Greeks themselves had no certain chronology prior to 776 B. C., and the difficulties in Egyptian history pertain to an earlier time.

The Hebrew Scriptures alone approach to what the historian demands as a basis for his structure. Yet, there are questions

of no little embarrassment even in the carefully recorded chronology of Scripture; and Egyptian history it touches only at distant points. Moreover the Hebrew writers never mention the proper name of an Egyptian king, until a comparatively recent period. Had they recorded the name of the Pharaoh, under whom Abraham visited Egypt, or of him, whom Joseph served, or the king of the Exodus, it might have furnished a key to the reconciliation of much that seems now contradictory. But such is not the case. The first undoubted synchronism between Hebrew and Egyptian royal names belongs to the latter part of the reign of Solomon.

We might have a tolerably fair history of Egypt, could we only determine how the extant materials are to be distributed among the years prior to the tenth century before Christ. The object of Dr. Bunsen's work is to settle this question, from a critical comparison of all the available data, and thereby to assign to Egypt her proper place in the general history of civilization.

The work consists of five books. The first treats of the sources of information concerning Egyptian chronology, in which the ancient history of the country is found to divide itself into three periods, designated the old, the middle, and the new. The second book aims at settling the chronology of the old monarchy, the third that of the middle and the new. In the fourth book, the results of these investigations are submitted to the tests of astronomy and synchronism with the history of other countries. And the fifth consists of a survey of general history, and the relation that ancient Egypt holds to it, and points out the development of strictly Egyptian history, as it appears upon a review of the results.

It is the author's aim, throughout this work, to present his readers with proofs of every doctrine which he maintains. The book is really a history preceded and accompanied by demonstration of its facts. Differently as his critics may estimate the results of his investigations, there can be but one opinion as to their thoroughness and perfect honesty. Great as are the merits of Lepsius, and in the field of original inquiry he has few equals in Egyptology, he is a bold speculator, whose argumentations are liable to be biased by an enthusiastic

pursuit of a foregone conclusion; the caution and laborious erudition of Bunsen spreads out before his readers the data whereupon his structure is built, and furnishes the means of ascertaining the soundness or unsoundness of the whole. To such a length is this carried, that he actually furnishes a grammar and dictionary of hieroglyphic writing, more complete and better digested than are elsewhere to be found. Every known source of Egyptian history passes under review and is put to trial before his searching criticism. Egyptians, Hebrews, Greeks, arts, sciences and statistics, all persons and things professing to hold any testimony on the subject, are brought separately to the stand and interrogated with the closest scrutiny.

The chief sources are, naturally, native Egyptian books and monuments. The former are unfortunately very few and brief, owing to the wholesale neglect to which the literary productions of that nation were long abandoned. Yet the accounts which remain of some of them give us reason to believe that invaluable historical material has perished in their loss. It needed less direct testimony than actually exists to assure us that literature must have flourished in Egypt at a very ancient date. The hieroglyphic sign of the papyrus roll is found upon monuments as early as the twelfth dynasty, a period considerably anterior to that of Abraham; the figure of the inkstand and writing implement, upon those of the fourth dynasty, and the monumental characters can be traced upon contemporary records above a century earlier. Tradition consistently asserted that chronological registers of the kings from Menes down had been kept by the priests, of which tradition Bunsen remarks that none of antiquity admits of being better authenticated. One thing, at least, is certain; that there is not a period in Egyptian history to which we can point as being antecedent to that of books. The earliest extant writing belongs to the same system with the later, and presents characters entirely similar. And if, as Herodotus remarks, no Egyptian omitted to take accurate note of extraordinary or striking events, there can be no doubt that tradition is also correct in representing their books as very numerous.

According to Clement of Alexandria, the Egyptians had, in

his time, forty-two sacred books. These were arranged into six different classes. The first class consisted of two books of sacred poems, one containing hymns in honour of the gods, and the other a description of royal life and its duties. Four astronomical treatises composed the second class, of which the first treated of the fixed stars; the second and third of the sun and moon; and the fourth, of the risings of the heavenly bodies. The third class contained books called, *Of the Hierogrammatist or sacred scribe*. Of these the first taught the hieroglyphic art, including the rudiments of writing. On this subject there was "a royal author of primeval times, the elder Sesostris, in the beginning of the third dynasty." The next book treated of cosmography and geography. The two following were of the sun and moon and the five planets; but wherein they differed from the astronomical books of the second class is not known. The fifth and sixth books were of the topography of Egypt, and the delineation of the course of the Nile, within the limits of the Egyptian territory. The four succeeding books contained a "description or inventory of each temple, of its landed property, (the estates of the priests,) of its weights, measures, and other utensils."

Ten books, devoted principally or entirely to religious worship, constituted the fourth class. Clement quotes, among the contents of the separate books, "regulations concerning sacrifice, first fruits, hymns, prayers, festive processions, and the like." To which, most probably, may be added ceremonies in honour of the dead.

Other ten books, concerning "the laws, the deities, and the entire education of the priests," formed a fifth class, wherein were contained also instructions as to the apportionment of the taxes, one of the sacerdotal privileges, as well as their system of mythology, upon which their laws were based. The civil laws, according to Diodorus, were treated in eight books. "In these was recorded the name of each king, by whose judgment in any particular case a point of law had been finally established, or who was the author of any general enactment." The same author gives also a list of the most celebrated legislators, in their chronological order. "The oldest is Mnevis, probably the third successor of Menes, who received from Hermes his

written laws, the first the Egyptians possessed. Bocchoris, the unfortunate reformer of the eighth century before our era, who lost his throne and life in the war with the Ethiopians, is the first legislator of the new empire. The oldest of those fundamental laws may have been contained in the sacred books of the Prophets, and also have been introduced into the civil code. This code, therefore, was not unlike the digests of Justinian, and perhaps in form had still more resemblance to Colebrooke's Indian Pandects on the rights of inheritance, without, however, being like them confined to one branch of jurisprudence. Such a work must have contributed, doubtless, materially to fix the historical chronology of the kings, and in part also of the history of Egypt."

The last class of canonical Egyptian books consisted of six on the art of medicine, one of which was attributed to the authorship of Athothis, a son of Menes, their first king. Although we have no evidence that a single section of those books was of such a nature that it could be justly called a history, yet their loss has deprived us of much that might have "imparted fulness and substance to the dry lists of kings," as well as rectified the traditions collected by the curiosity of the Greeks. The records of the kings was a work separate from their sacred canon.

Of the above-mentioned books we are not aware that any are now extant, except the celebrated "Book of the Dead," which Bunsen believes to be one of the fourth class. A copy of it exists in the Museum of Turin, another was found by the French expedition in the tombs of the kings at Thebes, and others, in whole or in part, have been discovered since. No translation of it has yet been completed; but the numerous pictorial illustrations distributed through its whole length, as well as the Phonetic writing which has been read, leave no ground of doubt that the subject of which it treats, is the departure of a human soul from its earthly habitation, together with its trial and various adventures beyond the grave. There can be no dispute of its very great antiquity. The papyrus of Turin must itself belong to the best days of Egyptian graphic art. In the opinion of Lepsius it was written in the 18th or 19th dynasty, and consequently some fifteen hundred years

before the Christian era. It is to be remarked also of this work that, while in all other extant remains of Egyptian literature the hieratic character is used, it is written in the pure monumental hieroglyphics; a feature which very likely distinguished the sacred canon from books of secular production.

Of ancient manuscripts in the hieratic character there are quite a number, but generally more or less mutilated. One of the most important is the Papyrus of Sallier, in which Champollion discovered a "Narrative of the expeditions and campaigns of the great Rameses, written not long after that conqueror's death." This work is now in the British Museum. Several others of a similar nature are preserved at Berlin. "They all offer precisely the same palæographical character common to other records of the 18th and 19th dynasties." As yet, however, the philological branch of hieroglyphic study has not advanced far enough to admit of their translation. There is also extant a papyrus manuscript, of the times of the Rameses, containing a chronological register of the previous dynasties. It was brought to Europe by the French consul-general Drovetti; but is now in the possession of the Turin Museum. It lay neglected as a mere mass of illegible fragments, until discovered by Champollion in 1824. He immediately perceived its value, and undertook to arrange its principal fragments; but did not complete the work. To Professor Seyfarth belongs the merit of reuniting the whole in a durable manner, and "with scrupulous fidelity." It has also been examined with the utmost care by Lepsius, in whose "Records" it is now presented to the public.

In addition to the dynasties of gods, this manuscript presents a list of one hundred and nineteen mortal kings, fifty-four of whom belong to the old monarchy, and sixty-five to the Hyksos period. But not a single name of the eighteenth, or of any succeeding dynasty, occurs in it.

But the most extensive remains of ancient Egyptian records, as well as the best preserved, are those which are inscribed upon the rocks, many of them extending to very great length. They are of various classes, but chiefly designed to commemorate the achievements in war and peace of the kings by whom they were erected, as well as the elaborate ceremonies connected with

their sepulture. Of these monuments two are especially worthy of remark in connection with the last mentioned papyrus. Like it they contain lists of the ancient kings; and the three taken together "mutually illustrate and restore each other in the most satisfactory manner."

One of these monumental records was found by Burton, in a chamber of the temple-palace of Karnak, erected by Tuthmosis III. It consists of a series of sixty-one kings, the predecessors of Tuthmosis, who are represented as receiving offerings at his hands. Over the head of each figure is inscribed his royal title. Here also not a single name as late as the eighteenth dynasty appears, except that of Tuthmosis himself. Consequently these kings belong to the same period which is covered by the Turin manuscript. The other was found upon the walls of a chamber within the temple built or restored by Rameses the Great, in the city of Abydos. It consists of a similar series of fifty Egyptian kings represented as receiving offerings from the hand of "their son, the king Rameses." In this list, the kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, as well as those of the old monarchy, are arranged in regular order down to Rameses himself, while those of the Hyksos period are omitted, without the indication of a blank.

Other monuments present battle scenes, triumphal processions, funeral ceremonies, operations of art, industrial occupations, festivities, and so forth, both by means of pictorial delineation and phonetic description.

Upon movable articles, also, as mummy cases, pieces of furniture, and so forth, the Egyptians contrived to perpetuate some information of themselves, by means of writing.

Materials for the internal history of Egypt are thus very largely supplied; but much has yet to be done before these can be fully turned to historical account. For, after all the wonderful achievements of critical ingenuity, the language of the inscriptions is still but partially mastered. The method of writing—in other words, the alphabet—is now known; but the ancient Egyptian tongue being dead, when the words are spelled correctly, a further inquiry is needed in order to ascertain their meaning. From various sources, about five hundred, chiefly

independent roots, with their grammatical system, have been determined. But many passages of extant Egyptian writing still defy interpretation. Hence the object of Egyptian scholars is now to enlarge their vocabulary. For this purpose they are applying to the further study of the Coptic, a language which holds such a relation to the ancient Egyptian as the Italian or French to the Latin.

The information obtained from the monuments and manuscripts, however, extends considerably beyond the limits of the above mentioned vocabulary; in the first place, because all proper names, hieroglyphically written, can be read with facility; secondly, because a very numerous class of hieroglyphic signs are ideographic, and of meaning ascertainable without a knowledge of the Egyptian words which correspond to them; and, thirdly, because the historical pictures to a great extent tell their own story, independently of written description.

Of history proper, the golden age of Egyptian refinement presents no specimen; nor even a hint that any such work was then in existence. The earliest historian of Egypt was not born until long after the glory of his nation had passed away, and Greek literature had established her dominion in the land of the Pharaohs. Manetho, the priest of Sebennytus, flourished in the days of the first and second Ptolemies, and consequently in the end of the fourth and beginning of the third century before Christ. He wrote in Greek, with the obvious design of making the history of his country accessible to the reading world of his time—a work similar to that which Josephus, at a later period, accomplished for the Jews. “Manetho,” says Eusebius, “not only reduced the whole Egyptian history into a Greek form, but also their entire system of theology, in his treatise entitled ‘The Sacred Book,’ as well as in other works.” Theodoret, in the second quarter of the fifth century, describes him as also the author of a mythological work, or works, “concerning Isis and Osiris, Apis and Serapis, and the other Egyptian Deities.” And through Diogenes Laertius we learn that he had also written a compendium of Natural Philosophy. Other books are also ascribed to him, and quoted by subsequent authors as unquestionable authorities on Egyptian matters. His “Three Books of Egyptian History” were compiled,

according to his own statement, from genuine records, and were held in the highest esteem.

The first book of this work contained the ante-historical or mythological period, together with the first eleven dynasties of mortal kings. The second book began with the twelfth and ended with the nineteenth dynasty; and the third contained the remainder, to the end of the thirtieth. "It is impossible to overlook, in the arrangement of Manetho, the character of a genuine, historical, and artistic plan." Although a purely historical division of the thirty dynasties into three books of ten dynasties each, might seem, on external grounds, the most natural, Manetho had abundant reason for adopting a different method. "The last brilliant epoch of the old empire was the twelfth dynasty. The king, in whom the historian recognized the hero of the Sesostrid legends, belonged to it. The third king of the thirteenth dynasty lost Memphis and his throne by the irruption of the shepherds. Then succeeded a period of national degradation, extending over a long series of ages. Royal Egyptian houses, indeed, continued to reign at Thebes and Choïs, but tributary and powerless. A long and arduous struggle ensued after this period of humiliation and oppression; but the holy city of the empire was not reconquered and the empire restored till the eighteenth dynasty." "From the nineteenth dynasty sprang, finally, Sesostri Rameses, the hero of the new empire, who avenged the shame of Egypt on Asia. As Manetho began his second book with the twelfth dynasty, its narrative opened with the glorious exploits of Sesostri, and closed with those of the king he calls the great Ramesside. The third book opened with the twentieth dynasty, the commencement of which is a comparatively flourishing epoch, and closed with the thirtieth, the last king of which, Nectanebo, is the last indigenous ruler of Egypt."

This great work of Manetho has been suffered to perish. But epitomized lists of the dynasties have been preserved in the chronological treatises of Africanus and Eusebius, the former a writer of the third century of the Christian era, and the latter the eminent ecclesiastical historian of the days of Constantine. The list of Eusebius has come to us through two channels, the Armenian Latin version of his chronicle,

and the comparative Manethonian dynasties in Syncellus. These three copies present a number of discrepancies; and yet, after all, they constitute the principal clue to the chronology of ancient Egypt. As compared with the other more partial lists they form a guide to the general arrangement, while receiving occasional correction of their errors.

Other Egyptians of later time followed the example of Manetho; but still fewer fragments bear testimony to their labours. The earliest of these writers was Ptolemy of Mendes, who composed three books on chronology, in which he endeavoured to harmonize the history of the kings of Egypt with the primitive Greek annals, and also, in some points at least, with the Hebrew. The antiquarian Apion occupies a prominent place among them, but is treated by Bunsen with scanty reverence. He lived in the first century of the Christian era. Somewhat earlier, Chaeremon had also written a history of Egypt, from which a few fragments are preserved by Josephus and Eusebius. None of them, however, seem to have commanded such general respect as Manetho.

In addition to the native authorities we have also some valuable material for Egyptian history, woven in with that of the Hebrews. The synchronisms, which have been settled therewith, furnish the earliest secure footing for the Egyptian chronologist. The king Shishak, who was reigning in the latter part of the life of Solomon, has been identified both in the lists and upon contemporaneous monuments. The antiquities of those two nations mutually throw light upon each other. While the manners and arts of the Egyptians illustrate the life of the Hebrews, the clearer history of the latter must be adopted as a valuable guide to the chronology of the former.

To the Greek, Egypt was, of all countries, except his own, the most interesting, the land of mysterious antiquity, the discoverer of the sciences and mother of the arts he loved. But that Egyptian custom, whereby the principles of the arts were carefully shut up as secrets within the respective fraternities that practised them, opposed an insurmountable barrier to all investigations from abroad. The most ancient traditions connected the early days of Athens and of Argos with colonies from Egypt; Homer wove the country of the Nile into his

beautiful romance of Helen; productions of Egyptian art had kindled up the superior genius of Greece; and many of the elements of Egyptian social order had been planted among the mountains of Hellas, to grow and ripen into a fuller and more liberal existence; but direct information concerning Egyptian life and history was not to be obtained in Greece, until the older nation had reached its decline. The most ancient Greek, who presented his countrymen with any historical knowledge of Egypt was Herodotus. The mass of the material which he collected on this subject he digested into the second book of his history. Defective as his information necessarily was, the fidelity with which his report is made confers upon it a most honourable distinction. His information was, however, obtained at second hand, not from the national records immediately; but from the reports of the priests concerning them, and the chronological discrepancies, which these involved, he had not the means of reconciling.

A few scattered remarks upon Egyptian affairs are to be found among the writings of Plato, and of Aristotle; to which may be added some fragments of Theophrastus and Dicæarchus. The Alexandrian scholars, under the Ptolemies, first, second, and third, naturally devoted much attention to the subject; but there are "few more bitter sources of regret to the modern student, than that the profound historical and critical labours of those remarkable men should—to a few trifling fragments—have utterly perished." One of the most valuable of those fragments is the list of Theban kings from the works of Eratosthenes. Beginning with Menes, it covers a period of 1076 years, embracing thirty-eight royal names, with their Greek translations and the number of years attached to each reign.

It is in this fragment that Bunsen finds what he believes to be the true series of the old monarchy. The preservation of it is due to George Syncellus of Byzantium, a writer of the eighth century, who has introduced it into his Introductory notice of Egyptian Chronology. It is to be observed, however, that he did not receive the passage directly from Eratosthenes; but as a quotation found by him in a work of Apollodorus, a writer from whom we have also a brief but valuable fragment pertaining to this subject.

The only Greek author who ventured to grapple with the whole "subject of Egypt, in its integrity," was Diodorus Siculus, who visited the country about 58 years before Christ. The first book of his Historical Library is devoted to Egyptian affairs. Unfortunately he brought to the task a "mere acquaintance with books, without either sound judgment, critical spirit, or comprehensive views." His simple honesty alone recommends him, and renders his collection of facts and legends, uncritical as it is, a valuable addition to the sources of Egyptian history.

Diodorus is the last of the ancients who conducted systematic inquiry into the subject. The remarks of Tacitus and Pliny, in respect to it, are of but little value.

A new life was given to the study of Egyptian antiquity by the spread of Christianity. To Tatian, who flourished about A. D. 180, we are indebted for some valuable extracts, and still more to Clement of Alexandria, the fifth book of whose work called *Stromata*, contains a description of the hieroglyphical manner of writing.

"As early as the beginning of the third century, Julius, the African priest or bishop of Emmaus-Nicopolis in Judea, and founder of the Library of Cæsarea, which was enlarged by Eusebius, compiled a chronological work in five books," of which some scanty fragments remain. These fragments awaken the greater regret for the loss of the complete work, inasmuch as they "exhibit throughout the man of judgment, integrity, and information, zealous in collecting and examining the oldest Chaldee and Egyptian records, those especially of Berosus and Manetho. His object was not the arrangement of a system of annals with regular notation of synchronisms—an attempt fraught in other cases with so much perversity and fraud. He gave the traditions unadulterated, just as he found them, contenting himself with proving from their own internal evidence the extravagance of those myriads of years admitted in the computation of his pagan opponents." His edition of the lists of Manetho is justly regarded as the most reliable of those now extant. This remark must, however, be qualified by the probability that he did not copy immediately from the original work, but from some previous epitome.

The next, as far as we know, who gave any attention to this

subject, was the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, in the earlier part of the fourth century. "He had undertaken a comprehensive scheme of adjustment between the Scripture dates and those of all the other ancient nations." This plan was executed upon the basis of the chronology of Africanus, in the work, still extant, called the *Chronicon*. For a long time it was known to exist only in a fragmentary state; but was discovered entire in an Armenian version at Constantinople, and published at Milan in A. D. 1820. There is also a Latin translation of the work by Jerome. It contains a copy of Manetho's lists, which, in addition to the royal names and dates, gives brief annotations appended here and there to the different reigns.

Succeeding writers added nothing to the stores of information on the subject, if they did not impair their value by injudicious criticism, until the time of Syncellus, who, about the year 800, prepared a new and really valuable work on chronology. Syncellus constructed his *Chronographia* upon the *Chronicon* of Eusebius; but criticised his predecessor without mercy. The compilations relating to Egypt are the most valuable additions he made. To him are we indebted for the extracts from Eratosthenes and Apollodorus. At the same time he added no little to the embarrassment of later scholars by the introduction of passages which have recently been detected as spurious. Among these are to be enumerated extracts from the "Book of Sothis," or the Dog Star, a forgery upon Manetho, and the so-called Old Egyptian Chronicle. He also embodied in his synchronistic tables an anonymous list of Egyptian kings, which is now regarded with equal distrust.

Such are the materials out of which the historian has to reconstruct the narrative of Ancient Egypt. And when we consider their fragmentary character, their chaotic disorder, scattered about and inwoven in so many different works, subjected to so many causes of corruption, and their manifold contradictions, it is cause of astonishment that so much reliable fact should have been obtained from them as recent scholarship has elicited.

The Egyptologers of modern times belong to two different series: the earlier consisting of those who preceded the disco-

very of the hieroglyphic alphabet, while the later have been formed by it. The former began with the illustrious Joseph Scaliger, who, in the end of the sixteenth century, published his great work upon general chronology. In respect to Egypt, he had not the means of going much beyond a mere re-editing of the chronological lists. Notwithstanding the labours of Petavius, Goar, and Marsham, Scaliger cannot be said to have had any worthy successor in this field, until the end of the seventeenth century, when Zoega published his learned work on the Obelisks, which may be regarded as an anticipation of a more recent style of scholarship. In 1711, Jacob Perizonius published his *Origines Egyptiacæ*, one of the most profound and ingenious productions of that century in the department of historical research, and which Bunsen describes as the "last critical analysis of Egyptian chronology, before the late discoveries in hieroglyphics. From that period, the inquiry passed from the province of the philologist into that of the general historian." In this light it was ably pursued in the end of last century by Heyne and Heeren, whose example and principles laid the foundation of a new and superior school of historical criticism, constituting the transition period to that which was ushered in by the discovery of the hieroglyphic system.

This brilliant triumph of ingenious scholarship was first announced by Champollion in 1822. It had been suggested to him, and, even at an earlier date, to Dr. Young of England, by a study of the Rosetta stone. This celebrated monument had been found by the French soldiers when in Egypt, and afterwards captured by the English and deposited in the British Museum. It consists of a slab of basalt, having its length divided into three portions, each containing an inscription in a different character. One of these was in Greek, from which it appeared that the other two were of the same meaning, in the hieroglyphic and demotic, or common writing of the country. For, being a decree connected with the coronation of Ptolemy Epiphanes, it closed with the following order, "And that it may be known why in Egypt, he is glorified and honoured, as is just, the God Epiphanes, most gracious sovereign, the present decree shall be engraved on a stela of hard stone, in sacred characters (that is, hieroglyphics,) in writing of the

country, and in Greek letters: and this stela shall be placed in each of the temples of the first, second, and third class existing in all the kingdom."

It was immediately perceived that this inscription might be of great value, and fac similes of it were distributed to the learned throughout Europe. De Sacy, Akerblad, and Dr. Young early made observations upon the Demotic; but it was not until 1819 that any step was taken towards deciphering the hieroglyphic portion. In that year, Dr. Young, in an article contributed by him to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, announced his discovery that some of the hieroglyphic signs were also used alphabetically. He did not, however, prosecute the subject farther than to the spelling of a few proper names. And when, three years later, Champollion came forward with his paper on the subject, it was to present the same view, most likely originating also with himself, but unfolding a much more complete and comprehensive system. The truth of his method was soon admitted by the ablest minds, that bent to the labour of examining his evidence. A new life was thus given to Egyptian studies, and many rivals, of the highest learning and talents, entered the field. In a few years, England, Germany, and Italy, as well as France, could boast their hieroglyphic scholars. But the ardour and genius of Champollion not only led the way, but outstripped all competition in subsequent attainment. In 1828, he went at the expense of the French government to Egypt, accompanied by professor Rosellini of Pisa, who was sent out by the government of Tuscany. Four artists attended each.

These two expeditions proceeded jointly and harmoniously with their investigations, which resulted in an almost complete exposition and extensive illustration of the hieroglyphic system.

At the very time of Champollion's visit to Egypt, several eminent Englishmen, who had learned his method, were at work in the same country in a similar manner. Some of those have, since, obtained great distinction, among whom may be mentioned Burton, Wilkinson, Prudhoe, and Felix.

The materials brought to Europe by Champollion and Rosellini were designed for two immense works, to be published,

the one in Paris, under the care of Champollion, and the other in Florence by Rosellini, the former consisting of the historical monuments and the grammar of the hieroglyphic system; the latter the civil monuments and a hieroglyphical dictionary. Champollion lived only to finish his grammar. He died in 1832, in the forty-second year of his age. By his death the whole task of publication was thrown upon Rosellini, who also died before it was completed. The plates, amounting to four hundred in folio, were issued during his lifetime; the text of the historical monuments, amounting to five volumes, in octavo, appeared from 1832 to 1841, that of the civil monuments, in three volumes, from 1834 to 1836, while two other volumes, one on the religious monuments, and another, containing general indices to the whole, remained to be published at his death.

To the distinguished names already mentioned must now be added those of Bunsen and Lepsius of Prussia, and Birch of England, and several others, who equal if they do not excel their predecessors in Egyptian learning.

An expedition to Egypt under the direction of Dr. Lepsius was in 1842 sent out by the king of Prussia, to "investigate and collect, with an historical and antiquarian view, the ancient monuments in the Nile valley, and upon the peninsula of Sinai." It consisted, besides Lepsius, of seven artists and a dragoman, together with a large number of servants. The government of the country favoured their enterprise; and for three years it was prosecuted with most cheering success. The result is a magnificent work, "surpassing everything that has hitherto appeared on the subject, not only in the truthfulness and accuracy of the drawings and inscriptions, but also in its systematic historical arrangement. The same may be said as to the completeness of its contents, although it gives no monuments previously published, except in cases where the inscriptions were so inaccurate that the corrections could not be marked in any other way." It consists of more than eight hundred lithographed plates in imperial folio, accompanied by descriptive letter press.

Thus, by the industry of recent scholars a vast mass of material has been collected among the ruins of ancient cities and temples, in tombs, and from hitherto illegible manuscripts,

hidden in various European collections. The chief object of Egyptology is now to complete the work of deciphering, and to determine the system of dates according to which the materials are to be arranged. Dr. Bunsen conceives that he has found the key to the chronological problem of the old monarchy, in a critical comparison of the lists of Eratosthenes with existing monuments, in a similar treatment of the fragment of Apollodorus and of Manetho for the middle, and of Manetho for the new. The value of this method and of the conclusions thereby reached, it is not our purpose at present to discuss. Whatever they may amount to, the persevering toil and honest purpose which have attended ingenuity in the effort to attain a true result, merit unqualified approbation.

The student of Biblical history, especially, owes a debt of gratitude to Egyptologers, for the amount of material thus laid to his hands. It remains for him, not superciliously to reject the gift, as is too often done, but with docility to bend to the work of discriminating investigation of its contents. Truth is truth wherever found, and there are eternal principles, whereby it can be distinguished from error, and whereby the certain can also be separated from the doubtful. No mind, properly prepared for the study of Scripture history in other lights, will find, in these recently collected stores, anything to dread which he has not encountered in other secular sources, unless it be some additional toil. And, whether they admit of chronological arrangement or not, the isolated facts are themselves of incalculable value for the elucidation of a phase of ancient life and manners, with which Hebrew civilization was most intimately connected. Erroneous interpretations have undoubtedly been given to some of them; but empty declamation will not afford the corrective. It is to be expected that in matters so much and so long entangled, some mistakes will be made in the earlier efforts to unravel them; but when so many points have been already satisfactorily cleared up, surely the effort to accomplish more is deserving of approbation and encouragement. At all events, works of the gravity, learning, ingenuity, and patient research of those of Rosellini, Wilkinson, Burton, Lepsius, and Bunsen, not only claim, but have a right to demand a serious examination at the hand of every

one who pretends to offer a judgment upon the subject of which they treat; and, though they may embrace more that is still matter of doubt, can no more be set aside by a sneer than can the works of Newton or Laplace.

ART. VII.—1. *The Old Testament, translated into Arabic*, by Eli Smith. Beirut. 8vo. pp. 160.

2. *The New Testament, translated into Arabic*, by Eli Smith. Beirut. 8vo. pp. 16.

THE Arabic language is one of the most interesting and important in existence. It claims the honour due to venerable age; for though its extant literature is comparatively recent, its use as a vernacular dialect runs back to a remote antiquity. We have little reason to doubt that the language of Arabia has been as permanent and uniform as her population and her manners. It is also interesting from its affinities to other tongues, belonging to the great Semitic family, and holding a distinguished place between its Hebrew and its Aramaic branches. Its internal structure is marked by a rare combination of simplicity and richness. Though destitute of compounds, and of that variety of moods and tenses, to which the Greek owes so much of its exquisite expressiveness and flexibility, the Arabic possesses a surprising variety of what grammarians call *conjugations*, but what might have been more accurately designated *voices*, in which, by a slight change of vowels, or the simplest consonantal addition, the most delicate distinctions, of a certain kind, may be expressed with all precision. This, with the almost fabulous extent of its vocabulary, entitles it to a conspicuous position in the foremost rank of dead or living languages. But over and above this venerable age and these intrinsic qualities, the Arabic possesses an historical interest, not only as the instrument by which invaluable stores of ancient learning were preserved, when Europe was involved in