

later than that period has as yet been proved to have a place in the text.

It is also noteworthy that in the Pentateuch the Pharaoh is the only ruler. Assyria and Babylon and the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah are as absolutely ignored as if they were not yet in existence. The Egypt of the Pentateuch is the Egypt of Moses', not the Egypt of Ezra's day. De Wette shrewdly pointed out long ago, in his "Critical and Historical Introduction," that a certain general acquaintance with Egypt would not be a proof that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. True; but this author, whoever he may be, describes like a spectator and with the accuracy of an eyewitness. The entire story is full of vivid touches that seem like reminiscences. Professor R. S. Poole, of the British Museum, has declared, "It is not merely that it shows a knowledge of Egypt, but a knowledge of Egypt under the Ramessides and yet earlier," and adds that the condition which the exodus narrative pictures was true of the Mosaic era, and "of no much later date."

4. Such exactness and minuteness and copiousness, if found in any other documents than these, would be counted conclusive evidence that they were the productions of an Egyptian scholar of the Ramesside period.

In the *Codex Alexandrinus*, because of a few suggestive particulars, such as the Egyptian form of the alpha in the red letter title, "The Exodus from Egypt," Dr. Maude Thompson has argued that the whole manuscript "if not written in Egypt must have been immediately removed thither."* But if an Egyptian letter or two and a few other slight hints can prove the Egyptian character of the *Codex*, why may not the Egyptian character of the original be proved from its hundreds of minute and circumstantial references, many of which have only been understood since the tombs of Egypt have found tongues? While the Pentateuch does not claim to treat on the manners and customs of the ancient Egyptians, yet incidentally and quite naively much information on obscure points is given. Indeed, it happens that scarcely a stratum of Egyptian life with which an enslaved people could be brought in contact is left untouched. The schools are not mentioned, though the learning of the times is indicated in a way once called absurd, but now known to be strictly in accordance with common usage; † but practically innumerable allusions to the private life of the common people are made, together with several references to the etiquette of the court. The kitchen, the armory, the field employments, the labor of the slaves, the brick monopoly of the king, the position of women, the international complications, the origin and position of towns and walls—all these and a thousand and one things more are touched upon, not seemingly with premeditation, but by the by, and in no single instance has an error of statement been detected.

Even Professor Kuenen draws an argument from the discovery of the

* Autotype facsimile of the *Codex Alexandrinus*, 4 vols., British Museum, 1881.

† See, e.g., Gen. xxxviii. 18; Ex. xxxiv. 28; Deut. vi. 8, xxvii. 2, 8.