

“For my own part, I plead not for liberty of proposing, though I would be very glad not to be imposed upon; for I understand our Saviour, ‘Cast not your pearls [before swine] lest they [turn again and] rend you,’ as granting a dispensation for reservation and secrecy in case persons will be mischievous” (p. 53). In Dr. Tuckney’s Third Letter, he replies to this insinuation in a manner which will surprise those who know his interest in the Westminster Assembly (see p. 769 above): “For matter of imposing upon, I am not guilty. In the Assembly I gave my vote with others that the Confession of Faith, put out by authority, should not be required to be either sworn or subscribed to (we having been burned in the hand in that kind before), but so as not to be publicly preached or written against; which, indeed, is contrary to that ‘liberty of prophesying’ which some so call for, but you say you plead not for; though your second advice in your sermon seemed in mine and other men’s eyes to look fully that way. But I believe what you now write, and only add that, as you plead not for that liberty, so what hath been said by others hath not been to impose on you, but only as freely to assert what they think is truth, as what you did assert was so in your judgment, and therefore were not culpable of maintaining, *rixas et lites*, as hath been charged. Though I heartily and humbly desire of God that we may either so inwardly agree, or outwardly not express disagreement, that we may not give occasion of advantage to more sorts of men than one that watch for our halting” (pp. 76, 77).

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTES ON EGYPTOLOGY.

BY REV. JOSEPH P. THOMPSON, D.D., LL.D., BERLIN, GERMANY.

THE science of Egyptology has sustained a severe loss in the death of M. le Vicomte Emmanuel de Rougé, Member of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, Curator of the Egyptian Museum in the Louvre, Professor of Archaeology in the College of France, and a principal editor of the *Revue Archéologique*. For a quarter of a century M. de Rougé had stood at the head of French Egyptologists, and he had contributed as much as any scholar of his time to the elucidation of Egyptian antiquities. The following list of his principal publications will witness to the activity of his mind, and the fertility of his pen; many other essays are scattered through Reviews, and the Journals of Scientific Academies and Societies.

1846: L’examen de l’ouvrage de M. Bunsen. 1848; Sur les éléments de l’écriture démotique des Egyptiens; published in the form of a letter to M. de Saulcy. 1849: Mémoire sur l’inscription du tombeau d’Ahmes.

This memoir was read before the Academy, and attracted much attention in England and Germany, as well as in France. In the same year he published his *Notice Sommaire des Monuments Egyptiens exposés dans les galeries du Musée du Louvre*; a work which is not only a guide to the treasures of that collection, but a condensed treatise upon the history, the art, and the religion of Egypt. 1851: *Mémoire sur la statuette naophore du Vatican*; this treats particularly of the reign of Cambyses in Egypt. In the same year appeared his valuable *Rapport sur l'exploration scientifique des principales collections Egyptiennes renfermées dans les divers Musées publics*. Also a curious theological monograph, entitled *explication d'une inscription Egyptienne prouvant que les anciens Egyptiens ont connu la génération éternelle du Fils de Dieu*. 1856: *Note sur les noms Egyptiens des Planètes*. To this year belong also two of the most valuable of Count de Rougé's publications: *Le Poeme de Pen-ta-Our*, and *Le Roman des Deux Frères*. The Poem celebrates the campaigns of Rameses the Great in a style which Renan has likened to the *Moniteur's* adulation of Napoleon III. (an improved translation was published in 1870, "*Recueil de Travaux*"); the Romance has some striking resemblances to the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, and its appearance in Rougé's translation produced quite a stir in religious circles, as well as in the world of science. 1858: *Etude sur une stèle Egyptienne*. 1860: *Etudes sur le Rituel funéraire des anciens Egyptiens* — a prelude to his great edition of the *Rituel* itself, which was begun a year or two later in folio numbers. To the same year belong his *Notice de quelques fragments de l'inscription de Karnak*; this was a discussion of the historical value of the *Annals of Thotmes III.* brought to light by M. Mariette. It was followed by a comprehensive essay upon the advance of Egyptology since Champollion: *Notice sur la Découverte, les Progrès et l'Etat actuel des Etudes Egyptiennes*.

In April 1860, also, he gave a résumé of the science, at the opening of his course of lectures; this was published under the title *Discours à l'ouverture du cours d'Archéologie Egyptienne au Collège de France*. 1861: *Monuments du Règne de Toutmès III.* This historical study was based upon recent discoveries of M. Mariette. It was followed in the same year by his *Note sur les principaux Résultats des fouilles exécutées en Egypte, par les ordres de S. A. le Vice-Roi*. 1863: *Inscription Historique du roi Pianchi-Mériamoun*. In this year M. de Rougé was sent to Egypt by the French government, upon a scientific mission, and spent several months in the study of monuments, assisted by his son Mons. Jacques de Rougé, who has already won an honorable reputation in his father's favorite science; and in 1864 he published a *Rapport sur sa mission accomplie en Egypte*. 1866: as a fruit of the foregoing mission Comte de Rougé published in a fine quarto volume, with numerous plates, his *Recherches sur les monuments qu'on peut attribuer aux six premières dynasties de Manethon*. The importance of this work to Egyptian Chro-

nology was set forth in a notice in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1867. In 1867 M. de Rougé published part first of his *Chrestomathie Egyptienne*, followed by part second in 1868. 1869: *Moïse et les Hébreux d'après les monuments Egyptiennes*.

In addition to the above, Count de Rougé published many articles upon his favorite science in the *Revue Archéologique*. He had also been a valued contributor to the *Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde* since its foundation in 1864; but at the outbreak of the war between France and Germany, he commenced at Paris a separate Review, to be devoted to works relating to Egyptian and Assyrian philology and archaeology. As yet only two numbers have appeared, and it is to be hoped that the project will now be abandoned. The Berlin *Zeitschrift* is conducted in the most liberal spirit; it prints articles in German, French, and English, and allows great diversity of discussion — even to the criticism of the opinions of its editors. One monthly is equal to the present demands of Egyptology, and a second would only entail a needless expense upon students who wish to keep themselves *au courant* with the subject. What is needed is combination and concentration, not diffusion. The *Zeitschrift* for February 1873 pays a tribute of "grateful and inextinguishable remembrance" to the character and work of its former collaborator, from the pen of Lepsius himself, the fulness and heartiness of which should pave the way to the future co-operation of the French and German schools upon this neutral field of the long-buried past.

Unless M. de Rougé left manuscripts ready for publication, his most important works must remain unfinished, and that, too, at the critical point, where his conclusions were awaited as a positive contribution to science. These are (1) his *Chrestomathy*. Of this, two parts have been published; the first, an essay upon graphic systems, in which the hieroglyphic symbols are explained; the second, an abridged grammar, which treats of the substantive, the article, the adjective, pronouns, nouns of number, and numeral adjectives. The verbs, syntax, etc. had not been reached, nor the application of rules to a selection of Egyptian texts, with a translation and a running commentary, which had been promised in the prospectus. (2) His Egyptian history from the foundation of the old monarchy by Menes to the invasion of the Shepherds, which was to be a full exposition of the civil and political life of the ancient Egyptians, their art, religion, manners, customs; in a word, a picture of the nation as it was before it became deteriorated by foreign influences or was subjugated by invasions. Only the preliminary foundation for this great work was laid by M. de Rougé in his researches upon the monuments of the first six dynasties of Manetho; but the masterly analysis and the cautious induction which mark this volume give keenness to the regret that the author was not permitted to work out his own conclusions. (3) His magnificent folio edition of the *Rituel funéraire des anciens Egyptiens*. To obviate the

errors which have crept into the text of this liturgical "Book of the Dead," through the imperfect transcription of hieroglyphics, M. de Rougé sought to give the complete text in the hieratic writing, following the most perfect copy in the papyrus of the Louvre, and collating this with other standards. The text abounds in vignettes, used for the most part as headings of chapters, and in keeping with the subject-matter. The titles of the several chapters are translated in an Introduction, and the mythological significance of each vignette is there explained. But no fragment of the translation of the Ritual itself has been added to the author's *Etudes* upon Chapter XVII, published in 1860, in the *Revue Archéologique*; and the transcription of the original text had proceeded only to the one hundred and tenth of the one hundred and sixty-five chapters or sections into which the book is commonly divided. The reproduction of the hieratic text can indeed be completed by M. Jacques de Rougé, M. Paul Pierret, or other experts of the Louvre, but the grammatical analysis and the theological commentary which should have crowned the whole from the pen of the master, we fear would be looked for in vain. This is the more to be regretted, because his most accomplished colleague, M. Théodule Devéria, had preceded him to the grave, leaving also studies and works unfinished in the same department of Egyptian mythology.

Devéria, like de Rougé, was accurate, conscientious, and thorough in his researches, cautious and philosophical in his statements, and conservative and reverent in his spirit. A posthumous work from his pen, in folio, with fine plates, has been lately issued from the press of A. Franck, Paris: *Le Papyrus de Neb-Qed*. This is a copy of the "Book of the Dead" in hieroglyphics, carefully reproduced in *fac simile* by Devéria, with a description of the manuscript and an Introduction upon Egyptian mythology from the same hand, and a translation of the text by Pierret. The latter may be reserved for comparison hereafter, with the yet unfinished translations of Brugsch and Pleyte; but the substance of the former will be embodied in the remainder of this article, as a valuable contribution to comparative mythology. According to Devéria, the starting-point in the faith of ancient Egypt was Sabianism, and the sun was made the chief object of worship, as being the most conspicuous and the most beneficent of all divine manifestations. The same view has been advanced by de Rougé, and in a qualified form, by Lepsius; and a striking confirmation of it is found in the monuments of the reformer and iconoclast Amenophis IV., who is represented as destroying the temples of the gods, and substituting the worship of the sun without images or other accessories. But was this worship originally rendered to the sun as a power, or to the divinity of whom the sun was the most sensible witness? The latter view is favored by the facts, that the most ancient sacred texts are those in which the notion of the divinity appears under the most abstract form, and that the most ancient monuments seldom exhibit images or symbols

of the divinity. The supreme divinity is the "Hidden One"; he is self-originated — "the great God creating himself"; he is "the Creator of beings and existences"; he is "the soul of the sun,"¹ and the "engenderer of the Gods, who are the successors of the sun." But what the divinity is to the soul the sun is to the body, and as the vehicle of the divinely illuminating and vivifying *Potentia*, the sun came to be invoked as a divinity: "Oh sun in his egg, gleaming in orb, shining from his horizon, floating in his clouds, who hates sin, forced along under the conduct of Shu, without an equal among the Gods, who gives blasts of flame from his mouth, illuminating the world with his splendor."² The seeming diversity of the sun's phases led to the invention of analogous titles and attributes: the rising sun was *Horus* or *Har*, the sun in his diurnal course was *Ra* or *Phra* (with the article), the setting sun was *Toum* or *Atmou*, and the sun conceived of as sleeping during his nocturnal course was *Noum* or *Xnoum*.

The sun seems to be born when he rises, and to die when he sets; but his setting in the west was also a prelude to his rising in the east — his dying was in a sense a witness that he should be born unto a new day. Hence the speculative mind of the Egyptians inferred an analogy for man: his dying was but the prelude to another birth, and between these two, the setting and the rising, the soul, like the nocturnal sun wandering through the unknown regions of the lower hemisphere, would make its mysterious peregrinations in Hades.

The absolute certainty and regularity with which day and night, and night and day, succeed each other, led to the notion of eternal duration under all the phases of outward change, and the divinity typified by the sun became itself a type of the immortality of the soul: Horus the type of birth, Ra of life, Toum of old age or of death, and Noum, who also was assimilated with Osiris, the type of existence beyond the grave.

As the type of birth, Horus must needs himself be born; yet as a divine manifestation he was conceived of as eternal. This apparent contradiction was reconciled through a combination of the two ideas. His birth was a perpetual renewing, but this proceeded from himself. As the manifestation of the diurnal sun he was born of the close of the nocturnal sun, which in its turn was only a transformation of the foregoing diurnal sun. Here was the prototype of one of the grandest of mysteries, which, appearing in the early stages of the Egyptian theogony, has passed into the theologies of later nations, and even in this age of materialism is baptized anew by science under the name "Correlation of Force"; viz. the mystery of an eternal divine manifestation under all forms, and of perpetual regeneration. The Egyptians derived from this their faith in one or many resurrections of man.

¹ Todtenbuch, Cap. xvii. For a full account of this Book and a summary of Egyptian doctrine, see *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1868, pp. 69-112.

² Cap. xvii. Birch's translation.

One personification led to another, until the first symbol of divine manifestation produced a pantheon. The sun engendered himself — brought himself forth anew day after day — in the bosom of the celestial spaces; hence these spaces were personified under the form of goddesses with the attributes of maternity. Space in its totality was personified under the name of the goddess *Nout*, and particular portions of space were further personified as motherly attributes. *Ra* was the sun in his fulness and strength, rising to the meridian, fecundating nature with his light and heat, the vivifier and regenerator, the dispenser of life, the type of all existence. The orbits which the sun appeared to describe around the earth were likened to the sinuosities of a serpent. Hence the sun was looked upon as fulfilling his course over the body of this emblematic reptile, and consequently as subduing and surmounting him. The serpent, under the name *Apap* (*Apophis*), the Python of the Greeks, was regarded as the original type of antagonism and of evil.

When once the Egyptians had adopted this great astronomical divinity, whose every phase, form, and name transformed some phenomenon of nature into a religious mystery, they could not stop there, but must meet the demands of the common mind through incarnations and anthropomorphisms, reduplicating the attributes of the primordial being. *Osiris*, the type of goodness incarnated to redeem humanity, was, in fact, only an effluence or a reduplication of the primordial deity. The good being thus personified, in order that this might triumph, it was necessary to provide for it an antagonist, the principle of evil: this was *Set* or *Typhon*. The conflict of these two, and the relation of the fable of *Osiris* to the Egyptian doctrine of the future state, were explained at length in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January 1868. It was in *Horus*, that de Rougé saw the symbol of an eternal divine generation, "the mighty, the justified, the son of *Isis*, the child of *Osiris*. The divine chiefs unite themselves to him, they recognize the universal Lord himself."